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1 Minutes
   Regular Meeting of May 27, 2014 ................................................................. 4
   Action Requested: Approval of the Minutes

2 Announcements by the President
   President Janet Napolitano is unable to attend

3 Announcements by the Chancellor at Riverside
   Chancellor Kim A. Wilcox will address the Division

4 Announcements by Vice Chancellors
   A. Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor Paul D’Anieri will address the Division
   B. Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Maria Anguiano will address the Division
   C. Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services Ron Coley will address the Division

5 Announcements by the Deans or other Executive Officers
   A. Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Steve Brint will address the Division
   B. Secretary-Parliamentarian: Election Results ............................................. 10

6 Announcements by the Chair
   A. School of Medicine Bylaws ..................................................................... 12
   B. School of Business Administration curriculum change-Withdrawal of Approved Changes to Administrative Studies Program Requirements ......... 28

7 Special Orders
   A. Consent Calendar*
      i) Approval of Curricula Changes
         a) BCOE – Computer Engineering Undergraduate Program ............ 36
         Action Requested: Approval of the Consent Calendar

* Approval of all items on the Consent Calendar requires a single unanimous vote called for as the first order of business under Special Orders. At the request of any member of the Division, any such item must be withdrawn and considered in its regular order on the agenda [bylaw 4.1.2].
B. Annual Reports of Standing Committees, received and placed on file†
   i) Committee on Academic Freedom (update) ........................................ 38
   ii) Committee on Academic Personnel ................................................... 39
   iii) Committee on Charges (update) ..................................................... 48
   iv) Committee on Committees (update) .................................................. 49
   v) Committee on Courses (update) ....................................................... 51
   vi) Committee on Distinguished Campus Service (update) ................... 52
   vii) Committee on Distinguished Teaching (update) .............................. 53
   viii) Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity - n/a ...................... 54
   ix) Committee on Educational Policy (update) ....................................... 57
   x) Executive Council ............................................................................ 59
   xi) Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer (update) .......................... 67
   xii) Committee on Faculty Welfare (update) ........................................... 68
   xiii) Graduate Council (update) ................................................................ 69
   xiv) Committee on In Memoriam - n/a .................................................. 70
   xv) Committee on International Education (update) .............................. 71
   xvi) Library, Information Technology and Scholarly Communication Committee – n/a
   xvii) Committee on Physical Resources Planning (update) .................... 71
   xviii) Committee on Planning and Budget .............................................. 72
   xix) Committee on Preparatory Education – n/a ....................................... 73
   xx) Committee on Privilege and Tenure – n/a ........................................ 74
   xi) Committee on Research (update) ...................................................... 141
   xii) Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (update) .................................. 144
   xiii) Committee on Scholarships and Honors (update) ........................... 145
   xiv) Undergraduate Admissions Committee (update) ............................... 146
   xv) Committee on University Extension (update) .................................... 147

C. Annual Reports of the Faculties, received and placed on file†
   i) Executive Committee – Bourns College of Engineering ....................... 148
   ii) Executive Committee – College of Humanities, Arts & Social Sciences .............................................. 151
   iii) Executive Committee – College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences. 153
   iv) Executive Committee – Graduate School of Education ...................... 156
   v) Executive Committee – School of Business Administration ................ 158
   vi) Executive Committee – School of Medicine................................. 161

D. Degree reports, received and placed on file† ................................................. 163

E. Regular Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties, received and placed on file†

† Reports received and placed on file "are received as presented and require no further action" [bylaw 4.1.3]. Only the reporting committee can change or withdraw these reports; however, at the request of any member of the Division, a report will be moved into its regular order on the agenda (Item 10. Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties) where it may be discussed, and motions relating to the report may be offered.
8 Report of the Representative to the Assembly
   n/a

9 Report of Special Committees
   None

10 Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties
   A. Executive Committee of Graduate School of Education – proposed change to Bylaws E4.1.1, E4.2, E4.4 ................................................................. 178
   B. Executive Committee of School of Business Administration – proposed changes to SOBA 4.2 and SOBA 4.2.1 ......................................................... 180
   C. Committee on Educational Policy - Proposal to Establish R’Courses at UCR ........................................................................................................... 181

Action Requested: Individual approval of each proposed change

11 Petitions of Students
   None

12 Unfinished Business
   None

13 University and Faculty Welfare
   UCR Campus Store Manager Stacy Weidner will address the Division

14 New Business
   None

November 26, 2014

P.S. Gorecki, Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
Meeting
The Riverside Division of the Academic Senate met on Tuesday, May 27, 2014 at 2:10 p.m. in the Genomics Auditorium Room 1102A. Chair J. Wudka presided. The meeting was attended by 82 members of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

Minutes
The Minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 25, 2014 were approved as presented.

Announcements by the President
There were no announcements by the President.

Announcements by the Chancellor at Riverside
Chancellor Kim A. Wilcox addressed the Division and began by asking the Division to join him in a moment of silence in recognition of the six students killed and thirteen wounded in an attack the previous week at the University of California, Santa Barbara.

The Chancellor updated the Division on the status of several executive searches and thanked everyone for their participation in search committees and vision seminars. The Chancellor discussed his intention to add 300 new ladder rank faculty to the campus, noting that the campus is in a strong financial position to absorb these increases thanks in part to prudent fiscal management by his predecessors. With such a large influx of new faculty, almost every department will be impacted; however it is his intention to initially focus on engineering and natural sciences to “jump start” external dollars and investment for capital development to assist with further recruitment. Positions will be filled using a mix of strategies incorporating guidance from the long-range development plan, standard hiring processes and administrative planning. The new Provost will be instrumental in implementing the new hiring procedures. In order to accommodate the new faculty, the Chancellor intends to focus on efficient use of existing space and development of a 100,000 ft² interdisciplinary research building, which includes additional classroom space. The building will not be owned by a specific department or college but will be a shared space. All growth must be shaped in the broader context of positioning the new Provost to be effective and instrumental in the recruitment process.

Having spent the first two quarters of his term focused on community engagement and raising UCR’s national profile, the Chancellor advised the Division that he is now meeting with Senate committees and is focusing on shared governance. The delay in meeting with the Senate fortunately allowed him a more informed perspective on the university’s procedures and he is looking to create deeper Senate involvement in many areas, including the campus budget process.

The Chancellor discussed capital planning and his intention to explore options to develop to the south of the campus rather than on the historic agricultural groves to the west of the campus. The current location of all campus buildings does not provide access by the community nor overall visibility, and development on Box Springs would provide an observable example of campus growth.
The Chancellor then accepted questions from the floor. A member praised the Chancellor for his vision of campus growth but voiced concerns over the noise pollution from the freeway. The Chancellor responded that he hopes to develop further up the hillside where there is less noise pollution; however, he acknowledged that he has not explored the environmental impact of developing in this location.

The Chancellor was asked when the recruitment of the 300 new faculty members would begin, and what the startup costs would be. The Chancellor responded that the recruitment has already begun, and that there have been 30 more searches than normal this academic year. He expects the recruitment to be spread over 5 years as the campus could not handle a faster influx of new faculty. He further advised that the campus has resources in reserve to absorb the cost of new hires. A member commented that the searches need to begin earlier in the year. The Chancellor responded that he hopes to more fully empower Deans to make hiring decisions and reduce the role of the Chancellor and Provost to help streamline the recruitment process. The Chancellor was also asked about the ability to hire Targets of Excellence. The Chancellor responded that he hoped to give the Deans more ability to act quickly when the opportunity to hire Targets of Excellence arises without being hindered by bureaucracy.

The Chancellor concluded by thanking members for coming to the recent series of symposia on the future of higher education and by advising the Division that he could be reached at any time by email and hopes to have more conversations with individual faculty members over the summer.

The Chancellor then presented Professor Allen Mills (Physics and Astronomy) and Professor Jingsong Zhang (Chemistry) with the Chancellors Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement. The Chancellor commented that, while UCR is considered one of the best research universities in the world, it is often overlooked that over half of our undergraduate students are involved in faculty led research, and he praised the faculty for their continued leadership in this area.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE VICE CHANCELLORS
Chair Wudka called upon the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement, Peter Hayashida, to address the Division.

Vice Chancellor Hayashida took the opportunity to explain the role of University Advancement. The mission of University Advancement is to “inspire pride, commitment and investment,” while also promoting mentorship and advocacy in students, alumni and friends of the university. The department includes strategic communications, media relations and publications. The University is currently focusing on alumni and students relations, emphasizing student leadership and philanthropy to encourage a culture of “giving back” earlier in their careers. VC Hayashida informed the Division that the Office of University Advancement is responsible for promoting UCR’s expertise in local and national press and creating awareness of faculty and student achievements. University Advancement also oversees fundraising and major gifts (donations over $100,000). These relationships can take decades to develop, and many, but not all, are university alumni. Vice Chancellor Hayashida highlighted the role that faculty can play in developing these relationships, as many major donors are inspired by individual faculty research specialties or personal relationships.

Vice Chancellor Hayashida then accepted questions from the floor. A member asked what percentage of donors are current faculty or emeriti. Vice Chancellor Hayashida responded that he did not have specific data but that staff and faculty are incredibly generous and there is due
to be another push for donations and contributions in 2015-2016. A member asked what the university is doing to get major donations. Vice Chancellor Hayashida responded that the university’s senior leadership team is very active in making connections with potential major donors, but it can be hard to get those connections without having a personal relationship, so it is a question of finding those relationships.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE DEANS OR OTHER EXECUTIVE OFFICERS
There were no announcements by the Deans.

Chair Wudka called upon the Secretary Parliamentarian to provide the report on election results. The Secretary Parliamentarian informed the Division that the results of the elections could be found on page ten of the meeting agenda. Due to his status as a candidate for reelection, Chair Wudka recused himself for the first section of the election report and handed the meeting to Vice Chair of the Division, Jennifer Hughes.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of Chair of the Division for Professor Jose Wudka to serve a two-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

Chair Wudka again presided for the remainder of the election report. One valid nomination had been received for the position of Vice Chair of the Division for Professor Mariam Lam to serve a one-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the BCOE Executive Committee from the department of Computer Science and Engineering for Professor Marek Chrobak to serve the remainder of a three-year unexpired term to conclude on August 31, 2015. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the BCOE Executive Committee from the department of Electrical Engineering for Professor Amit Roy Chowdhury to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

The Secretary Parliamentarian informed the Division that in the interim time between publication of the agenda and the Division meeting, the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences held a faculty meeting (on May 21, 2014), at which time they confirmed the following appointments:

- Professor Amanda Lucia was appointed representative to the CHASS Executive Committee to be elected from among Art History, English, History, Comparative Literature and Foreign Languages, Philosophy, Religious Studies, Hispanic Studies or Women’s Studies for a two year term of office effective September 1, 2014;
- Professor Jonathan Ritter was appointed representative to the CHASS Executive Committee to be elected from among the fine arts for a two year term of office effective September 1, 2014;
- Professors Christine Ward Gailey, Jennifer Najera and David Arthur Malueg were appointed to the CHASS Executive Committee to be elected from among Anthropology, Economics, Ethnic Studies, Political Science, Psychology and Sociology for a two year term of office effective September 1, 2014; and
• Professors Jeff Sacks and Sherryl Vint were appointed CHASS representatives to the Committee on Committees for a three year term of office effective September 1, 2014.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the CNAS Executive Committee from the Department of Botany and Plant Sciences for Professor Patricia Springer to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the CNAS Executive Committee from the Department of Entomology for Professor John Heraty to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the CNAS Executive Committee from the Department of Mathematics for Professor Bun Wong to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the CNAS Executive Committee from the Department of Biochemistry for Professor Daniel Gallie to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

Two valid nominations had been received for the position of member of the GSOE Executive Committee for Professors Marsha Ing and Cixin Wang to serve a two-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominees.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of member of the SOBA Executive Committee from the Area of Operations and Supply Chain Management for Professor Mohsen El Hafsi to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

One valid nomination had been received for the position of representative to the Committee on Committees from the School of Business Administration or Graduate School of Education for Professor Mohsen El Hafsi to serve a three-year term beginning September 1, 2014. The Secretary-Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot for the nominee.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
Chair Wudka congratulated Professor Dan Hare on behalf of the Division following his election as Vice Chair and Chair-Elect for the systemwide Academic Senate.

SPECIAL ORDERS
The Consent Calendar was unanimously approved.

The annual reports of standing committees, annual reports of the faculties, degree reports and regular reports of standing committees and faculties were received and placed on file.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE ASSEMBLY
Professor Bahram Mobasher provided the Division with an update from the Assembly meeting on April 16 2014.
• Chancellor searches are underway with Senate input at UCSF and UCI.
• The SAT writing portion is now optional, however the UC system is planning to make the writing portion compulsory for all UC applicants.
• Dan Hare was unanimously voted to be the vice-chair of the UC system senate.
• The UCR School of Public Policy program was unanimously approved by the Assembly.
• There will be a further review of the self-supporting professional degree program to address concerns and incorporate advice from sub-committees.
• The Governor has proposed a 5% increase in the state's appropriations for the UC; however this does not meet the required 7% increase in general expenses. The assembly speaker has proposed an 8% increase, with the final budget expected in May.
• The 30 meter telescope project has been approved and funding released.
• Phase 2 of the Climate survey analysis is underway. Chancellors have been asked to identify areas for each campus to focus on, develop goals and create a time table by the end of the calendar year.
• Following a workshop at UCI, a task force of Graduate Deans, Graduate Councils and students from each campus have developed proposals to improve doctoral education and develop best practices.
• President Napolitano met with leadership teams on all 10 campuses to review their budgets and 5- and 10-year projections. President Napolitano is meeting with the Governor at the end of May to discuss ways to stay solvent and not go into deficit.
• President Napolitano met with Cal State and community colleges to discuss collaboration on outreach programs.
• UCR continues to lead the UC Mexico initiatives with Chancellor Wilcox making several trips to Mexico City to increase educational collaborations/partnerships.
• President Napolitano intends to reach out to the private sector to get support for initiatives that focus on basic research for technology transfer.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES
There were no reports of Special Committees

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES AND FACULTIES
Professor Giles Waines introduced and moved adoption of the nominations of Distinguished Professor of the Graduate Division Harry Green, Department of Earth Sciences, and Professor Umar Mohideen, Department of Physics and Astronomy, as the recipients of the Distinguished Campus Service Award. The contributions of both nominees are summarized in the report of the Committee found on pages 144 and 145 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously and Professors Green and Mohideen were presented with their awards.

Professor Pete Sadler introduced and moved adoption of the nomination of Professor Kimberly Hammond, Department of Biology, as the recipient of the Distinguished Teaching Award. The contributions of Professor Hammond are summarized in the report of the Committee found on page 146 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously and Professor Hammond was presented with the award.

Professor Lynda Bell introduced and moved adoption of the nomination of Professor Ashok Mulchandani, Department of Chemical and Environmental Sciences, as the recipient of the Graduate Dissertation Advisor/Mentoring Award. The contributions of Professor Mulchandani are summarized in the report of the Committee found on page 147 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously and Professor Mulchandani was presented with the award.
Professor John Fischer introduced and moved adoption of the nomination of Distinguished Professor Howard Friedman, Department of Psychology, as the Faculty Research Lecturer for 2014-2015. The contributions of Professor Friedman are summarized in the report of the Committee found on page 148 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously. Professor Mary Gauvain provided thanks on behalf of Professor Friedman who was unable to attend the meeting.

Professor Ward Beyermann introduced and moved for adoption the proposed changes to Regulation 6.12.1, found on page 150 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Jose Wudka introduced the proposed name change of the Department of Electrical Engineering, found on page 160 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Jose Wudka introduced the proposed name change of the Department of Theatre, found on page 165 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Jose Wudka introduced the proposed name change of the Department of Women’s Studies, found on page 171 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Lynda Bell introduced and moved for adoption the proposed changes to Bylaw 8.4.12, found on page 177 of the full agenda. The motion was approved unanimously.

Professor Kathryn DeFea introduced and moved for adoption the proposed changes to the Admissions by Exception Policy, found on page 180 of the full agenda. This motion was adopted unanimously.

PETITIONS OF STUDENTS
There were no petitions from the students.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
Due to time constraints the update from the University Librarian on the Open Access policy was tabled for a later meeting.

UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE
There were no items relating to university and faculty welfare.

NEW BUSINESS
There was no new business.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

P. Keller, Acting Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

Alastair Kay
Recording Secretary
To be received and placed on file:

1. **SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

A call for Nominations was issued for the following positions:

   *Four Members, SOM Executive Committee* (2 year term)
   *Elected from the Clinical Sciences*

   Three valid nominations received:
   - Devin Binder, Division of Biomedical Sciences*
   - Paul Lyons, Division of Clinical Sciences
   - Greer Sullivan, Division of Clinical Sciences

   After a second Call for Nominations, one additional valid nomination received:
   - Scott Allen, Division of Clinical Sciences

   * Under School of Medicine Bylaw ME5.2.1, the faculty of the School of Medicine shall elect four Senate members from the Division of Biomedical Sciences and four Senate members from the Division of Clinical Sciences. However, if there are not enough Senate faculty members available from either Division, unfilled positions can be filled by members elected from the other Division.

Following an email request for additional nominations in place of nominations from the floor at a faculty meeting, the Secretary Parliamentarian was instructed on July 18, 2014 to cast a single ballot on behalf of the faculty for the four nominees listed above.

2. **COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES**

A call for Nominations was issued for the following positions:

   *Two Members, CHASS Executive Committee* (1 year term)
   *Elected from the English Department and Gender and Sexuality Studies*

   Two valid nominations received:
   - Jennifer Doyle
   - Sherine Hafez

At the Faculty Meeting of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences on October 15, 2014 and on November 19, 2014, the Secretary Parliamentarian was instructed to cast a single ballot on behalf of the faculty for the two nominees listed above.
To be received and placed on file:

1. **BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING**

A call for Nominations was issued for the following position:

   **One member, BCOE Executive Committee** (to complete a 3 year term)
   Elected from the Department of Computer Science and Engineering

   One valid nomination received:
   - Iulian Neamtiu, Department of Computer Science and Engineering

2. **COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES**

A call for Nominations was issued for the following position:

   **One Member, CNAS Executive Committee** (to complete a one year unexpired term)
   Elected from the Department of Environmental Sciences

   One valid nomination received:
   - David Crowley, Department of Environmental Sciences

3. **SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY**

A Call for Nominations was issued for the following positions:

   **Chair Position, SPP Executive Committee** (3 year elected term)

   One valid nomination received:
   - Kurt Schwabe, Department of Environmental Sciences

   **Four members, SPP Executive Committee** (3 year elected term)

   Four valid nominations received:
   - Juliann Allison, Department of Global Studies
   - Ken Baerenklau, Department of Environmental Sciences
   - David Biggs, Department of History
   - Ariel Dinar, Department of Environmental Sciences
# REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
# FEBRUARY 25, 2014

To Be Adopted

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE FACULTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Proposed Changes to School of Medicine Bylaws

Text deleted from the present Bylaws marked by a double strikethrough
Text deleted from the initial proposal marked by a single strikethrough
Text added in the initial proposal marked by italics
Text added in the final proposal marked by underlining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Initial Proposal</th>
<th>Final Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Faculty of the School of Medicine shall form and conduct the governance of the School of Medicine subject to the bylaws and regulations of the Academic Senate of the University of California.</td>
<td>ME1 Membership</td>
<td>The Faculty of the School of Medicine shall form and conduct the governance of the School of Medicine subject to the bylaws and regulations of the Riverside Division and Systemwide Academic Senate of the University of California.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ME1 Membership

**ME1.1** The Faculty of the School of Medicine at the University of California, Riverside consists of (a) the President of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the School of Medicine; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the School of Medicine; (f) other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate; (g) faculty members of the School in all other series.
ME1.2 Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote and to be counted toward a quorum in meetings of the Faculty of the School of Medicine. However, all persons with academic appointments in the School of Medicine with teaching responsibilities (e.g., faculty in the Clinical Professor series) may attend meetings of the Faculty and have the privilege of the floor. These clinical faculty members may vote on matters discussed in all faculty meetings, but their votes will be recorded as 'advisory', and kept separate from the votes recorded from Academic Senate members.

ME1.2 For aspects of shared governance that are the responsibility of the Academic Senate, only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote and to be counted toward a quorum in general meetings of the Faculty of the School of Medicine. However, all persons with academic appointments in the School of Medicine with teaching responsibilities (e.g., faculty in the Clinical Professor series) may attend meetings of the Faculty and have the privilege of the floor. These clinical faculty members may vote on matters discussed in all faculty meetings, but their votes will be recorded as "advisory," and kept separate from the votes recorded from Academic Senate members. All members of Standing Committees (see below) and any ad hoc committees appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee, unless otherwise indicated by these bylaws, may vote on questions that will be referred to the Faculty Executive Committee for approval, and on questions that will be referred for final Academic Senate action to another Academic Senate agency. Voting rights are extended to Faculty who are non-members of the Academic Senate to the fullest degree permitted by legislative ruling 12.75 of the Academic Senate of the University, which states that "Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate Agencies when those agencies are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving
Academic Senate, or giving advice to University Officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit bylaw provisions.”

ME2 Duties of Faculty

ME2.1 The Faculty of the School of Medicine shall set policies for the admission of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine and for completion of the degree.

ME3 Officers

ME3.1 The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair and a Vice Chair.

ME3.1.1 The Chair of the Faculty is elected by Senate procedures for a three-year term and is not immediately eligible to succeed himself/herself. The election of the Chair and the members of the Executive Committee who are Academic Senate members is conducted by the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the bylaws of the Riverside Division. If the Chair is unable to complete the term of office, the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate shall within two months conduct an election in accordance with the procedure prescribed in the bylaws for the unexpired term provided that the unexpired term is longer than six months. In the interim or in the event the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair will serve as

advice to University Officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit bylaw provisions.”
Chair.
or in the event the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair will serve as Chair.

**ME3.1.2** The Vice Chair is chosen by the Faculty Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is two years.

**ME3.1.3** The Chair assumes office on the first day of September following his/her election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The Vice Chair takes office immediately upon appointment.

**ME4 Meetings**

**ME4.1** Meetings are called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Faculty Executive Committee. At the written request of fifteen percent of the voting members of the faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. He/she must call at least one meeting each year. The faculty meeting may be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Vice Chair.

**ME4.1.1** A quorum consists of thirty percent of the members of the Faculty, or ten Faculty members, whichever number is greater.

**ME4.1.2** A motion to submit a measure to mail or secret

**ME4.1.1** A quorum consists of thirty percent of the members of the Faculty, or ten Faculty members, whichever number is greater.

**ME4.1.2** A motion to submit a measure to mail or secret

**ME4 Meetings**

**ME4.1** Faculty meetings may be chaired by the Chair or Vice Chair of the Faculty. Meetings must be called by the Chair at least once in an academic year. The Chair is also required to call a meeting upon receipt of a written request for a meeting by fifteen percent of the voting members of the Faculty

**ME4.1.1** A quorum consists of thirty percent of the members of the general Faculty, or ten Faculty members, whichever number is greater.

**ME4.1.2** A motion to submit a measure to mail or secret
ballot has precedence over a motion for an open vote in a meeting.

**ME4.1.3** The Chair of the Faculty will send, at least 5 days prior to the faculty meeting, copies of the call for the meeting and will make all pertinent documents available to each member of the Faculty. The Faculty shall not change curricular requirements of the School or change these bylaws at the meetings at which such proposals for change are first made unless notice is previously given to all members of the Faculty in a call to the meeting.

**ME4.1.4** These bylaws constitute primary rules of order for meetings of the Faculty and of the committees of the Faculty. The order of business is that prescribed in Chapter 4 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

**ME4.1.5** The minutes of every meeting of the Faculty (with the exception of those concerned with personnel matters) shall be sent before the next faculty meeting to every member of the Faculty.

**ME5 Committees**

**ME5.1** Standing Committees: There shall be six standing committees of the School of Medicine: The Faculty Executive Committee, the Medical Education Committee, the Medical School Admissions Committee, the Medical

**ME5 Committees**

**ME5.1** Standing Committees: There shall be seven (7) standing committees of the School of Medicine: The Faculty Executive Committee, the Medical Education Committee, the Medical School Admissions Committee, the Medical

**ME5 Committees**

**ME5.1** Standing Committees: There shall be seven (7) standing committees of the School of Medicine: The Faculty Executive Committee, the Medical Education Committee, the Medical School Admissions Committee, the Medical
School Progress and Promotions Committee, the Graduate Advisory Committee, and the Volunteer Clinical Appointments Committee. Each Standing Committee may appoint such subcommittees as it deems necessary to conduct its business.

**ME5.2** There shall be a Faculty Executive Committee consisting of at least eight (8) Faculty members and the Chair of the Faculty, who serves as Committee Chair. The Dean and the Senior Executive Dean of the School of Medicine will serve as non-voting ex officio members of this committee. In addition, two representatives shall be elected by the faculty in the clinical series (who are not members of the Academic Senate), and these representatives shall be entitled to participate in the deliberations of the Committee, but without the right to vote (as in Bylaw 1.2). These elected representatives must hold at least half-time appointments in the Clinical Professor series of the School of Medicine.

School Progress and Promotions Committee, the Graduate Advisory Committee, the Clinical Faculty appointments committee, and the Volunteer Clinical Appointments Committee. Each Standing Committee may appoint such subcommittees as it deems necessary to conduct its business. Each committee and any subcommittee will develop a conflict of interest policy that will be discussed, amended if desired, voted upon each year, and submitted to the Faculty Executive Committee as a point of information.

**ME5.2** There shall be a Faculty Executive Committee consisting of at least eight (8) Faculty members and the Chair of the Faculty, who serves as Committee Chair. The Dean and the Senior Executive Dean of the School of Medicine will serve as non-voting, ex officio members of this committee. In addition, two representatives shall be elected by the faculty in the clinical series (who are not members of the Academic Senate), and these representatives shall be entitled to participate in the deliberations of the Committee and to vote on issues that are outside the responsibilities of the Academic Senate. For issues within the responsibilities of the Academic Senate, non-Senate Faculty are without the right to vote (as in Bylaw 1.2). These non-Senate elected representatives must hold at least half-time appointments.

School Progress and Promotions Committee, the Graduate Advisory Committee, the Clinical Faculty appointments committee, and the Volunteer Clinical Appointments Committee. Each Standing Committee may appoint such subcommittees as it deems necessary to conduct its business. Each committee and any subcommittee will develop a conflict of interest policy that will be discussed, amended if desired, voted upon each year, and submitted to the Faculty Executive Committee as a point of information.

**ME5.2** There shall be a Faculty Executive Committee consisting of at least eight (8) Academic Senate Faculty members and the Chair of the Faculty of the School of Medicine, who serves as Committee Chair with voting privileges. The Dean and the Senior Executive Dean of the School of Medicine will serve as non-voting, ex officio members of this committee. In addition to the members of the committee listed above, two representatives shall be elected by the non-Senate Faculty, and these representatives shall be entitled to participate in the deliberations of the Committee and to vote on issues that are outside the responsibilities of the Academic Senate. For issues within the responsibilities of the Academic Senate, non-Senate Faculty members are without the right to vote (as in Bylaw 1.2). These non-Senate elected representatives must hold at least half-time appointments in the Clinical Professor series of the School of Medicine.
in the Clinical Professor series of the School of Medicine. elected representatives must hold at least half-time appointments in the Clinical Professor series of the School of Medicine.

ME5.2.1 The faculty of the School of Medicine will elect the eight (8) representatives, four from the Division of Biomedical Sciences and four from the Division of Clinical Sciences, to the Faculty Executive Committee. If there are not enough faculty members available from either Division, unfilled positions will be filled by members of the other Division.

ME5.2.1 The Faculty of the School of Medicine shall elect representatives - four Senate members from the Division of Biomedical Sciences and four Senate members from the Division of Clinical Sciences, to the Faculty Executive Committee. If there are not enough Senate faculty members available from either Division, unfilled positions will be filled by members elected from the other Division.

ME5.2.1 The faculty of the School of Medicine shall elect representatives - four Senate members from the Division of Biomedical Sciences and four Senate members from the Division of Clinical Sciences, to the Faculty Executive Committee. If there are not enough Senate faculty members available from either Division, unfilled positions will be filled by members elected from the other Division.

ME5.2.2 The term of office of members of the Faculty Executive Committee is two years, and these members are eligible for reappointment.

ME5.2.2 The term of office of members of the Faculty Executive Committee is two years, and these members are eligible for reappointment.

ME5.2.2 The term of office of members of the Faculty Executive Committee is two years, and these members are eligible for reappointment.

ME5.2.3 Election of the eight (8) Senate members of the Faculty Executive Committee is as provided in chapter 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. For purposes of these elections, members of the Faculty Executive Committee are considered officers of the Faculty of the School. Members of the Faculty Executive Committee take office on September first of the academic year following their election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election.

ME5.2.3 Election of the eight (8) Senate members of the Faculty Executive Committee is as provided in chapter 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. For purposes of these elections, members of the Faculty Executive Committee are considered officers of the Faculty of the School. Members of the Faculty Executive Committee take office on September first of the academic year following their election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election.

ME5.2.3 Election of the eight (8) Senate members of the Faculty Executive Committee is as provided in chapter 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. For purposes of these elections, members of the Faculty Executive Committee are considered officers of the Faculty of the School. Members of the Faculty Executive Committee take office on September first of the academic year following their election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election.

ME5.2.4 Whenever the Faculty Executive Committee determines that a vacancy exists in its membership, the
Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate conducts an election in accordance with the prescribed procedure provided the vacancy is to last more than six months. A vacancy shall be declared to exist and the committee member considered to have resigned if she/he anticipates an absence from the committee of more than six months. Vacancies of six months or less are filled temporarily by appointment by the Chair of the Faculty with the advice and consent of the Executive Committee.

**ME5.2.5** The Faculty Executive Committee has the following functions:

**ME5.2.5.1** The Faculty Executive Committee has the **general** oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the School and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the Committee deems advisable.

**ME5.2.5.2** The Faculty Executive Committee appoints and designates the Chairs of all other standing committees, and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty.

**ME5.2.5.3** The Faculty Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to

Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate conducts an election in accordance with the prescribed procedure provided the vacancy is to last more than six months. A vacancy shall be declared to exist and the committee member considered to have resigned if she/he anticipates an absence from the committee of more than six months. Vacancies of six months or less are filled temporarily by appointment by the Chair of the Faculty with the advice and consent of the Faculty Executive Committee.

**ME5.2.5** The Faculty Executive Committee has the following functions:

**ME5.2.5.1** The Faculty Executive Committee has oversight of the educational program, academic welfare, and discipline of students in the School. **Additionally,** it has the power to bring before the Faculty of the School of Medicine and Riverside Division of the Academic Senate any matters that the Committee deems advisable.

**ME5.2.5.2** The Faculty Executive Committee appoints and designates the Chairs of all other standing committees, and all special committees of the Faculty, unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty.

**ME5.2.5.3** The Faculty Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to

Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate conducts an election in accordance with the prescribed procedure provided the vacancy is to last more than six months. A vacancy shall be declared to exist and the committee member considered to have resigned if she/he anticipates an absence from the committee of more than six months. Vacancies of six months or less are filled temporarily by appointment by the Chair of the Faculty with the advice and consent of the Faculty Executive Committee.

**ME5.2.5** The Faculty Executive Committee has the following functions:

**ME5.2.5.1** The Faculty Executive Committee has oversight of the educational program, academic welfare, and discipline of students in the School. **Additionally,** it has the power to bring before the Faculty of the School of Medicine and before the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate any matters that the Committee deems advisable.

**ME5.2.5.2** The Faculty Executive Committee appoints and designates the Chairs of all other standing committees, and all special committees of the Faculty, unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty.

**ME5.2.5.3** The Faculty Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to
students of the School in all cases which do not involve the suspension of regulations or that involve only minor adjustments in the curricula and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The Committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The Committee will report all degrees approved to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

ME5.2.5.4 The Faculty Executive Committee makes recommendations to the Faculty in the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of all School instructional programs and curricula.

ME5.2.5.5 The Faculty Executive Committee acts for the Faculty in making recommendations to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate regarding course and program changes.

ME5.2.5.6 The Faculty Executive Committee participates in all aspects of shared governance of the campus, and the Chair sits on the Executive Council of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

ME5.3 There shall be a Medical Education Committee consisting of all pre-clerkship course coordinators, clerkship directors, and curricular thread coordinators, the Senior Associate Dean for Education and the Senior
Associate Dean for Student Affairs of the School (ex officio), and two elected medical student representatives from each class (non-voting).

Associate Dean for Student Affairs of the School (both ex officio, both voting), and two elected medical student representatives from each class (non-voting). All teaching faculty are welcome to attend and have the privilege of the floor, but unless in one of the categories above, do not vote.

All teaching faculty are welcome to attend and have the privilege of the floor, but unless in one of the categories above, do not vote.

ME5.3.1 The duty of this Committee is to advise the Faculty Executive Committee on matters pertaining to the educational policy and curriculum of the UCR School of Medicine.

ME5.3.1 The duty of this Committee is to advise the Faculty Executive Committee on matters pertaining to the educational policy and curriculum of the UCR School of Medicine.

ME5.3.1 The duty of this Committee is to advise the Faculty Executive Committee on matters pertaining to the educational policy and curriculum of the UCR School of Medicine.

ME5.3.2 This Committee will have two (2) subcommittees: the Pre-Clerkship Subcommittee and the Clerkship Subcommittee, responsible for matters pertaining to the curriculum.

ME5.4 There shall be a Medical School Admissions Committee consisting of the Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs, ex officio, a Chair, and a minimum of ten (10) additional faculty members appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs.

ME5.4 There shall be a Medical School Admissions Committee consisting of the Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs (ex officio, voting), a Chair, and a minimum of ten (10) additional faculty members appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs. All appointed members have the right to vote whether members of the Academic Senate or not.

ME5.4 There shall be a Medical School Admissions Committee consisting of the Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs (ex officio, voting), a Chair, and a minimum of ten (10) additional faculty members drawn from members of the Academic Senate and drawn from among non-Senate Faculty, appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee in consultation with the Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs. All appointed members have the right to vote whether members of the Academic Senate or not. Members will be appointed annually, with no term limit.
ME5.4.1 The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee the admission of students into the UCR School of Medicine. Members will be appointed annually, with no term limit.

ME5.5 There shall be a Medical School Progress and Promotions Committee appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee composed of at least six (6) members plus a Chair, typically chosen from those who serve as pre-clerkship course coordinators or clerkship directors, with representatives of both Biomedical Sciences and Clinical Sciences faculty. The Senior Associate Dean for Education serves as an ex officio member of this committee. Members shall be appointed annually, with no term limit. All appointed members have the right to vote whether members of the Academic Senate or not.

ME5.5.1 The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee the promotion of medical students from the first year to the second year, from the second year to the third year, and from the third to the fourth year, as well as recommend students for graduation.

ME5.6 There shall be a Graduate Advisory Committee consisting of two Graduate Advisor(s) and three faculty members and two Graduate Advisors.
Advisor(s). One Graduate Advisor will be responsible for recruitment and admission of graduate students and the other Graduate Advisor will be responsible for enrolled student affairs. All Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program faculty members in good standing are eligible for service to this Graduate Advisory Committee. Members of the committee are appointed by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Research, upon recommendation of the Graduate Advisors.

Appointments are made annually, with no term limit. The Faculty Executive Committee will also nominate the Graduate Program Director. This nomination is to the Dean of the Graduate Division who consults with Senior Administration in the School before forwarding a nomination to the EVC/Provost. One or other of the Graduate Program Advisors may also serve as Graduate Program Director. The duty of the Graduate Program Director is to represent the Program within the School, as well as on campus. All appointed members have the right to vote whether members of the Academic Senate or not.

The duty of this Committee is to advise the School of Medicine faculty on matters pertaining to Ph.D., M.D.-Ph.D. and M.S. degree programs.

The duty of the Graduate Advisory Committee is to advise the Faculty of the School of Medicine on matters pertaining to Ph.D., M.D.-Ph.D. and M.S. degree programs.
ME5.7 There shall be a Volunteer Clinical Appointments and Advancements Committee. The Committee shall consist of three (3) faculty members, the Chair of the Division of Clinical Sciences and up to three (3) faculty members in the Volunteer Clinical Professor series.

ME5.7.1 The duty of this Committee is to advise the Chair and faculty members of the School of Medicine, the Dean of the Division, and the Executive Vice Chancellor on appointments and advancement of clinical faculty to Volunteer Assistant, Volunteer Associate, and Volunteer Full Clinical Professor levels.

ME5.7.2 This Committee is subject to the procedures of Volunteer Clinical Appointments as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding of 9/2003 and subsequent changes approved by the Faculty of the School of Medicine, the Dean of the Division, and the Executive Vice Chancellor.

ME5.7.3 Members of this Committee will be appointed annually by the Executive Committee of the School of Medicine with renewable two year terms of service.

ME5.8. There shall be a
Committee on Clinical Appointments and Advancements. The Committee shall consist of four (4) faculty members; three (3) faculty members from the Division of Clinical Sciences and one (1) faculty member from the Division of Biomedical Sciences. The committee shall elect its own Chair. All appointed members have the right to vote whether members of the Academic Senate or not.

ME5.8.1. The charge of this committee is to advise the Faculty of the School of Medicine, the Dean, and the Provost on appointments and advancements of non-Senate Clinical faculty to the Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, and Clinical Professor.

ME5.8.2. This committee shall be subject to the procedures of Clinical Appointments as outlined in the UCR SOM Clinical guidelines, and subsequent changes shall be approved by the Clinical Appointments and Advancements and Faculty Executive Committees, Dean, and Provost.

ME5.8.3. Members of the Committee shall be appointed with staggered starts and a three year term, by the Faculty Executive Committee in consultation with the Executive Dean of the School of Medicine.

Committee on Clinical Appointments and Advancements. The Committee shall consist of four (4) faculty members, Senate or non-Senate, of whom three (3) shall be drawn from the Division of Clinical Sciences and one (1) shall be drawn from the Division of Biomedical Sciences. The committee shall elect its own Chair. All appointed members have the right to vote whether members of the Academic Senate or not.

ME5.8.1. The charge of this committee is to advise the Faculty of the School of Medicine, the Dean, and the Provost on appointments and advancements of non-Senate Clinical faculty to the ranks of Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant, Clinical Associate, and Clinical Professor.

ME5.8.2. This committee shall be subject to the procedures of Clinical Appointments as outlined in the UCR SOM Clinical guidelines, and subsequent procedural changes shall be approved by the Clinical Appointments and Advancements and Faculty Executive Committees and Dean.

ME5.8.3. Members of the Committee shall be appointed with staggered starts and a three year term, by the Faculty Executive Committee in consultation with the Executive Dean of the School of Medicine.
ME6.1 Elections are conducted as specified in ME3.1.1, ME3.1.2, ME5.2.3.

ME6.1.1 Balloting on measures referred to the whole Faculty of the School by action of a meeting of the Faculty are conducted by the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate following the provisions of chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

ME7 Amendments and Suspensions of Bylaws and Regulations

ME7.1 These bylaws can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate and in ME4.1.3.

ME7.2 For aspects of the bylaws that are not the responsibility of the Academic Senate, as defined by Regents Standing order 105, initiative for amendment of the SOM bylaws may be taken by the SOM Faculty Executive Committee or by petition signed by five (5) or more members of the Senate Faculty of the SOM. Such amendments are to be submitted to the Senate Faculty of the SOM in writing.

ME6.1 Elections are conducted as specified in ME3.1.1, ME3.1.2, and ME5.2.3.

ME6.1.1 Balloting on measures referred to the whole Faculty of the School by action of a meeting of the Faculty will be conducted through a secure secret balloting process online, and the results shall be communicated to the Chair of the Faculty upon close of balloting. If appropriate to the subject of the ballot, Senate and non-senate votes will be counted separately.

ME7 Amendments and Suspensions of Bylaws and Regulations

ME7.1 These bylaws can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate and in ME4.1.3.

ME7.1 For aspects of the bylaws that pertain to the responsibilities of the Academic Senate, as defined in Regents Standing Order 105, these bylaws can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate and in ME4.1.3.
at least five (5) days prior to a meeting, and amendment requires a two thirds majority vote of those faculty responding to a ballot. The results of any such referendum are conclusive, and the matter may not be reconsidered for a period of ninety (90) days.

Approved by the Academic Senate members of the SOM Faculty: 8/15/2013

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate and submits suggested revisions: 1/13/2014

Received by the Executive Council: 2/10/2014
October 9, 2014

To: Barry Mishra, Chair
   Executive Committee of the School of Business Administration

From: Ken Baerenklau, Chair
      Committee on Educational Policy

Re: Withdrawal of Approved Changes to Administrative Studies Program Requirements

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has been made aware of program changes made in error. Specifically, changes made to the Administrative Studies Requirements of the majors with Administrative Studies Components that were adopted without following approved procedures, which includes review and approval by affected majors. Unfortunately these changes were presented at the May 27, 2014 Meeting of the Riverside Division. By copy of this memo CEP hereby rescinds its approval and respectfully instructs the Registrar to withdraw the changes from the 2014-2015 General Academic Catalog. (To clarify, the modifications made in the adopted change to the B.S. in Business Administration program are approved and will remain in the catalog as adopted.) The adopted document is attached to this memo with the changes to be rescinded highlighted in yellow.

In order to move forward, all affected departments must review and approve the proposed changes, as should the corresponding Executive Committees. In this case, the departments of Art History, Economics, History, Political Science, and Sociology all have majors with the Administrative Studies component and therefore all must have documented approval. This proposal must then be approved by the SoBA Executive Committee and CHASS Executive Committee.

The Committee on Educational Policy recognizes that there are conflicting processes regarding the administration of the Administrative Studies programs. However, regardless of departmental and college processes, CEP retains final approval authority of all changes to curricula. In order to remove ambiguities and to guide future change requests, CEP advises the SoBA and CHASS Executive Committees to meet and document the process by which program and course changes will be proposed. The process must then be approved by CEP and will remain on record in the Academic Senate.

Attachment – Business Administration Major Change – Reported at May 27, 2014 Division Meeting

cc Jennifer Doyle, Chair, CHASS Subcommittee
    Bracken Dailey, Registrar
    Steve Whitestone, Catalog Editor
    Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division
To be adopted:

Proposed Changes to Business Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT:</th>
<th>PROPOSED:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Majors</strong></td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The B.S. in Business Administration is a two-year upper-division major offered by the School of Business Administration (SoBA). Students can enroll in a Pre-Business status and are advised in CHASS during their freshman and sophomore years. The Pre-Business curriculum includes the prerequisites to the major and the college breadth requirements. After admission to the major, students are advised by the SoBA through its Office of Undergraduate Programs located at 2340 Olmsted Hall. The B.S. degree in Business Administration is conferred by the SoBA.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program is accredited by the AACSB International - The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admission</strong> A limited number of students are accepted into the Business Administration major, chosen according to overall GPA. Students must apply for the major when they have completed not fewer than 75 and not more than 100 quarter units of college work. Final acceptance into the major is based on completion of all prerequisites and breadth requirements within a 100-quarter-unit limit, a GPA above 2.50 in major prerequisites, and cumulative GPA of at least 2.70. (Students who have not completed the foreign language breadth requirement may be accepted into the program, but they must complete the requirement before graduation.) Exceptions to the 100-quarter-unit maximum must be requested by petition.</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR Students (excluding Pre-Business students) interested in changing major to Business Administration will be admissible to the Business Preparatory (BSPR), (which is not a major in UCR, but a holding group of transfer students who appear to be qualified for admission into business</td>
<td>No change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
administration, but have some deficiencies which need to be completed before admission into business administration) status only if they can complete their deficiencies in breadth and/or major prerequisites within one quarter (the first quarter after admission into Bus-Preparatory).

The same rule will apply to students transferring in from a community college or a four-year school. In the event these students fail to meet this one quarter requirement, they will not be admitted into the BSPR category, and will be advised to find another major at UCR.

Students are encouraged to participate in at least one internship during their junior or senior year. Students interested in international business are encouraged to consider opportunities for study through the Education Abroad Program, which has centers affiliated with more than 150 institutions in 35 countries worldwide. For further details, visit UCR’s Off Campus Academic Experiences at eapoap.ucr.edu or call (951) 827-2508.

Outstanding academic achievement is recognized by the awarding of the Delta Sigma Pi Scholarship Key to a graduating senior. Other awards, presented on an annual basis, include the Wall Street Journal’s Student Achievement Award, the Bank of America Business Leaders Scholarship, Deloitte and Touche Scholarship, Gordon Blunden/Provident Savings Bank Business Scholarship, and the Ernst & Young Scholarship.

Graduating seniors are also eligible for the School of Business Administration Award for Academic and Service Excellence, and also the SoBA Concentration Area Awards, which recognizes the student with the best overall performance in each concentration area.

Each Spring, the top 10% of juniors and seniors in the Business Administration program are invited to join Beta Gamma Sigma, the only international honors society recognized by AACSB International. Membership in Beta Gamma Sigma is the highest recognition a business student anywhere in the world can receive in a business program accredited by AACSB International. New members are recognized by an official Induction Ceremony led by the Dean of the
University Requirements
See Undergraduate Studies section.

College Requirements
Students must fulfill all breadth requirements of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences or the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum prior to transferring to the UC.

Major Requirements
The following are requirements leading to the B.S. degree in Business Administration. At least 50 percent of business course requirements must be completed at UCR.

Business Administration Major
1. Preparation for Business Administration major (8 courses [at least 32 units])

   Major prerequisites (non-BUS courses may be used to satisfy breadth requirements for the School of Business Administration):
   (1) BUS 010
   (2) BUS 020
   (3) ECON 002
   (4) ECON 003
   (5) CS 008
   (6) STAT 048
   (7) MATH 022
   (8) ECON 102 or ECON 103

   The major requirements for the B.S. in Business Administration are as follows:

2. Upper-division major requirements (18 courses [at least 72 units])

   Core courses (at least 10 courses [at least 40 units]):
   BUS 100W, BUS 101, BUS 102, BUS 103, BUS 104/STAT104, BUS 105, BUS 106/ ECON134, BUS 107, BUS 108, BUS 109

   Concentration (At least 20 units): Students in the Business Administration major (BSAD) will be required to declare a concentration at least three quarters prior to graduation, provided they be allowed to change their concentration, if justified.
The Office of Undergraduate Business Programs will manage the process. Students can declare one concentration.

Choose five courses from one of the concentrations listed below. Courses completed to meet upper division core requirements may not be used to meet concentration requirements.


Finance: BUS 132 and at least four of the following: BUS 131, BUS 134, BUS 135, BUS 136, BUS 137, BUS 138, BUS 139, BUS 140E, BUS 146, BUS 147, BUS 148, BUS153/ECON153

Management: BUS 143, BUS 144, BUS 145, BUS 146, BUS 147, BUS 148, BUS 154, BUS 149, BUS 155, BUS 156, BUS 157, ANTH105/BUS 158, BUS 173

Information Systems: BUS 125, BUS 128, BUS 171, BUS 172, BUS 173, BUS 174, BUS 175

Marketing: BUS 111, BUS 112, BUS 113, BUS 114, BUS 115, BUS 116, BUS 117, BUS 118, BUS 119, BUS 126

Operations and Supply Chain Management: BUS 122, BUS 124, BUS 125, BUS 126, BUS 127/STAT127, BUS 128, BUS 129, BUS 130, BUS 173

An additional 12 units of Business Administration elective courses excluding BUS 190. See department for a list of approved Business Administration elective courses.

An additional 3 courses (at least 12 units) of Business Administration elective courses from BUS 111-BUS 199H, excluding BUS 190. Courses completed to satisfy the five-course concentration requirement may not be used to meet this requirement. Related courses outside of Business Administration may be approved to satisfy this requirement with the approval of the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Student Affairs of SoBA.

Double Concentration for Business
Administration Students

Business Administration students can declare a second concentration within the School of Business Administration (SoBA). Declaring a second concentration is not permitted while on academic probation or during the last two quarters before graduation (150 units or more). Both concentrations must be completed within the maximum limit of 216 units, and approval must be obtained from his/her academic advisor. In such cases, all course requirements must be completed for each of the two concentrations chosen. If the student chooses a second concentration then he/she will be getting only one B.S. in Business, and the diploma will mention the primary concentration, but not the second concentration. However, if a business student wishes to add a second major in another college or school (other than SoBA), then he/she can. The Business major is the primary and the other major is the secondary. In this case he/she can be enrolled in only one concentration, and the rules of the second major will apply.

Majors with Administrative Studies Components

B.A. degrees are offered in Art History, Economics, History, Political Science, and Sociology with Administrative Studies. A B.S. degree is offered in Sociology with Administrative Studies. Specified departmental requirements are listed under respective departmental listings.

1. All requirements of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences

2. Specified requirements of the relevant department, to include at least 36 upper-division units in that discipline

3. Administrative Studies requirements (37 units)
   a) Four lower-division courses (17 units)
      (1) BUS 010, BUS 020
      (2) STAT 048 or equivalent (may be used to satisfy breadth requirements)
      (3) CS 008 (may be used to satisfy breadth requirements)
   b) Two upper-division courses (8 units) from the list below:
(1) ECON 102 or ECON 104A or ECON 130 or ECON 162/BUS 162  
(2) PSYC 140 or PSYC 142  
(3) SOC 150 or SOC 151 or SOC 171  
(4) POSC 181 or POSC 182 or POSC 183  
(5) ANTH 127 or ANTH 131

These two courses must be outside the discipline of the relevant major and cannot be courses included as part of the three-course Business Administration track or their cross-listed equivalents.

c) A three-course track (12 units) in Business Administration courses, from one of the following:

(1) **Organizations (General):** BUS 100, BUS 107, BUS 176/SOC 176, BUS 158/ANTH 105, SOC 150, SOC 151

(2) **Human Resources Management/Labor Relations:** BUS 100, BUS 107, BUS 152/ECON 152, BUS 153/ECON 153, BUS 155, BUS 157, PSYC 142

(3) **Business and Society:** BUS 100, BUS 102, BUS 107, PHIL 116, POSC 182, POSC 186

(4) **Marketing:** BUS 103, and two from BUS 112, BUS 113, BUS 114 or BUS 117

(5) **Managerial Accounting/Taxation:** BUS 108, and two from BUS 166, BUS 168A, or BUS 168B

(6) **Financial Accounting:** BUS 108, BUS 165A, BUS 165B

(7) **Finance:** BUS 106/ECON 134 and two from BUS 134, BUS 136, BUS 137, BUS 138, BUS 139

---

(1) **Accounting and Auditing:** BUS 108, BUS 154, BUS 160/ECON 160, BUS 161, BUS 162/ECON 162, BUS 165A, BUS 165B, BUS 165C, BUS 166, BUS 167, BUS 168A, BUS 168B, BUS 169A, BUS 169B

(2) **Finance:** BUS 106/ECON 134, BUS 131, BUS 132, BUS 134, BUS 135, BUS 136, BUS 137, BUS 138, BUS 139, BUS 140E, BUS 146, BUS 147, BUS 148, BUS 153/ECON 153

(3) **Management:** BUS 107, BUS 143, BUS 144, BUS 145, BUS 146, BUS 147, BUS 148, BUS 154, BUS 149, BUS 155, BUS 156, BUS 157, ANTH 105/BUS 158, BUS 173

(4) **Information Systems:** BUS 101, BUS 125, BUS 128, BUS 171, BUS 172, BUS 173, BUS 174, BUS 175

(5) **Marketing:** BUS 103, BUS 111, BUS 112, BUS 113, BUS 114, BUS 115, BUS 116, BUS 117, BUS 118, BUS 119, BUS 126

(6) **Operations and Supply Chain Management:** BUS 104, BUS 105, BUS 122, BUS 124, BUS 125, BUS 126, BUS 127/STAT 127, BUS 128, BUS 129, BUS 130, BUS 173
(8) Management Information Systems: BUS 101, BUS 171, BUS 173
(9) Production Management: BUS 104/STAT 104, and two from BUS 105, BUS 122, BUS 127

JUSTIFICATION:

[For addition of Beta Gamma Sigma]: Beta Gamma Sigma is the only honors society to be recognized by AACSB International. Since SoBA is accredited by AACSB, it is important that we formally recognize our school’s membership in Beta Gamma Sigma by including it in our section regarding honors opportunities for students.

[For change to 12 unit Business Administration elective requirement]: This section has been modified to clarify the upper-division business elective requirement. Students can choose courses in any concentration and other independent study courses to satisfy this requirement, so the inclusion of the course range for approved elective courses will make this requirement easier for students to understand. In addition, the inclusion of the sentence for the approval of business-related courses outside of the School will provide flexibility for SoBA to allow students to satisfy major requirements in cases where the addition of courses outside of SoBA will enhance the educational goals and objectives of students. For example, for students concentrating in Finance, Economics courses may be approved, or for students concentrating in Information Systems, applicable courses in Computer Science may be approved. The review and approval for these courses will be determined by the Associate Dean or Assistant Dean overseeing the Undergraduate Business Program in SoBA.

[For removal of the double concentration paragraph and addition of statement for a maximum of one concentration]: Removal of this section will clarify ambiguity between double concentrations and double majors. With appropriate approval from the Associate Deans (or delegated representative), students can still declare double majors. However, to ensure time-to-degree and course availability for Business Administration students (and Business Administration minors and other majors requiring Business courses), students are only allowed to declare one concentration.

[For change to Administrative Studies requirements]: The change in the three-course Administrative Studies upper-division Business requirements aligns this requirement with the concentration options available for Business Administration students. The previous requirements reflect the Business Administration curriculum before significant changes in 2010. By codifying these requirements, we will ensure that Administrative Studies students are provided with the same courses that our major and minor students can complete.

APPROVALS:

Approved by Business Administration Program Committee: 3/25/14
Approved by the School of Business Administration Executive Committee: 3/28/14
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 4/28/14
PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER ENGINEERING UNDERGRADUATE REQUIREMENTS

To be adopted:

PRESENT:
Computer Engineering
Undergraduate Program
Major Requirements
1) Lower-division requirements (72 units)
   a) ENGR 001G
   b) CS 010 or CS 10V, CS 012 or CS 12V or CS 013, CS 014, CS 061
   c) CS 011/MATH 011
   d) EE 001A, EE 01LA, EE 001B, EE 020
   e) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH 009B, MATH 009C, MATH 010A, MATH 046
   f) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C
   g) One course of 4 or more units in an engineering discipline outside the field of computer science to be selected in consultation with a faculty advisor. Either a lower-division or an upper-division course may be used to satisfy this requirement.

2) Upper-division requirements (73 units minimum)
   a) CS 100, CS 141, CS 153, CS 161, CS 161L
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B; one course from CS 122A or EE 128
   c) CS 111
   d) CS 168
   e) ENGR 180W
   f) EE 100A
   g) EE 114 or STAT 155
   h) Five courses (at least 20 units) as technical electives from the following set of Computer Science and Engineering, and Electrical Engineering upper-division courses

PROPOSED:
Computer Engineering
Undergraduate Program
Major Requirements
1) Lower-division requirements (72 units)
   a) ENGR 001G
   b) CS 010 or CS 10V, CS 012 or CS 12V or CS 013, CS 014, CS 061
   c) CS 011/MATH 011
   d) EE 001A, EE 01LA, EE 001B, EE 020
   e) MATH 008B or MATH 009A, MATH 009B, MATH 009C, MATH 010A, MATH 046
   f) PHYS 040A, PHYS 040B, PHYS 040C
   g) One course of 4 or more units in an engineering discipline outside the field of computer science to be selected in consultation with a faculty advisor. Either a lower-division or an upper-division course may be used to satisfy this requirement.

2) Upper-division requirements (73 units minimum)
   a) CS 100, CS 141, CS 153, CS 161, CS 161L
   b) CS 120A/EE 120A, CS 120B/EE 120B; one course from CS 122A or EE 128
   c) CS 111
   d) CS 168
   e) ENGR 180W
   f) EE 100A
   g) EE 114 or STAT 155
   h) Five courses (at least 20 units) as technical electives from the following set of upper-division courses

CS 122A, CS 122B, CS 130, CS 133, CS 150, CS 152, CS 160, CS 162, CS 164, CS 165, CS 166, CS 168, CS 169, CS 170, CS 171, CS 172, CS 177, CS 179 (E-Z), CS 180, CS 181, CS 183, CS 193
The technical electives selected from h) must include either CS 179 (E-Z) or EE 175A and EE 175B and EE 175C. The selection of the remaining technical electives must be planned, in consultation with a faculty advisor, to include at least one coherent sequence of two classes from either Computer Science and Engineering or Electrical Engineering. The technical electives must be distinct from those used to satisfy the upper-division requirements specified in items a) and b) above.

Students may petition for exceptions to the above degree requirements. Exceptions to Computer Science course requirements must be approved by the Computer Science and Engineering undergraduate advisor or chair, and exceptions to Electrical Engineering course requirements must be approved by the Electrical Engineering undergraduate advisor or chair. Exceptions to other requirements require the approval of the undergraduate advisors or chairs of both departments.

Visit the Student Affairs Office in the College of Engineering or student.engr.ucr.edu for a sample program.

JUSTIFICATION: ENGR160 is a new course that will be offered for the first time in Fall 2014. It covers optimization theory with a focus on engineering applications, and was listed as ENGR as it is useful to all engineers and is not intended to be discipline specific.

A thorough understanding of optimization theory and practice is critical to the engineering profession, therefore, ENGR 160 is appropriate to add to the set of technical electives for the CEN undergraduate program.

Removal of CS 168 from list of optional technical electives is to update clerical error. CS 168 is a requirement and thus cannot be double counted as a technical elective.

APPROVALS:
Approved by the Computer Engineering Faculty: April 9, 2014
Approved by the BCOE Executive Committee: October 9, 2014
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: November 10, 2014
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Academic Freedom conducted the remainder of its business by email. Following is a summary of Committee activities from May 1, 2014 to August 31, 2014.

The Committee on Academic Freedom considered but had no comments to offer on the numerous editorial and organizational changes found in the proposed revisions to APM 190, Appendix A-2 and the proposed revisions to the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use.

The Committee on Academic Freedom reviewed the UCAAD Recommendations for Local Diversity Committee Empowerment and considers that any recommendations for future action to fall more appropriately within the jurisdiction of CODEO.

However, the committee would like to note that the first recommendation from UCAAD, namely that CODEO have representation on the Senate Executive Council, has been in place at UCR since 2006, a move which CAF endorses. The committee believes that representation on Executive Council is very important and may be the strongest avenue for voicing the Senate’s diversity-related concerns, and for making recommendations about CODEO representation on other campus-wide committees and search efforts. CAF also notes that some of the recommended actions may already be enacted on campus, on an ad hoc basis.

T. Morton
F. Schiwy
B. Chetzijnier, GSA Representative
L. Cardenas, AS Representative
H. Henry, Ex-Officio
G. Warnke, Ex-Officio
K. Montgomery, Chair
The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is an important part of faculty governance and collegial responsibility in the University of California system. As a committee of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, CAP is appointed by the Senate’s Committee on Committees and charged with providing advice to the Chancellor on academic personnel matters and representing the Division in all matters relating to appointments and promotions. CAP consists of ten members, who represent a wide variety of academic disciplines from across campus. All members hold the rank of full professor and serve for offset periods of three years (with annual reappointment) so that there is continuity and memory on the committee. CAP reviews all academic personnel files for merit, appraisal, promotion, and appointment and makes recommendations to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor. CAP is also asked to provide feedback and recommendations about a variety of Senate matters and administrative directives.

CAP’s goal is to assure that its recommendations are based on rigorous application of the academic personnel procedures in the CALL and the APM, and to assure that decisions are based on a fair and thorough evaluation of evidence in the file.

CAP met on 45 occasions during the 2013-14 academic year. Meetings were approximately 3 hours in length. CAP again is appreciative of the efforts of staff and faculty alike for their efforts in the academic personnel review process.

By the final May submission date in the CALL, there were only 8 outstanding files campuswide. CAP attributes this success to strict adherence to the deadlines set forth in the CALL and to the effort by all involved in the personnel review process.

I. Personnel Actions
a. Summary of Reviews
CAP reviewed 301 personnel actions during 2013-14 and sustained an average turn-around time of 19 days from the time a file is received at CAP from the Academic Personnel Office to the time the CAP recommendation is forwarded to the administration. Committee work during this period includes (a) receipt of the file in the Academic Senate Office by the CAP Analyst, who reviews the file to assure that it is complete for CAP review; (b) assigning of primary and secondary readers to each file by the CAP Chair, who serves as the third reader; (c) announcement to all CAP members that the file is available for their review online; (d) thorough review of the file by the assigned readers in preparation for discussion by the full committee at the next CAP meeting; (e) presentation of the file and discussion/vote by the full committee; (f) preparation of the draft CAP recommendation by the primary and secondary readers; (g) review and signature by the CAP Chair, who forwards the CAP report to the CAP
Analyst to be finalized and forwarded to the Academic Personnel Office.

The Academic Senate office also maintains data reflecting the processing time (including the percentage of files that are forwarded according to due dates in the CALL) by department and school/college, as well as turn-around time for files reviewed by ad hoc committees. These data are available from the Academic Senate Office.

A decision of the Chancellor's office is defined as an over-rule if it is contrary to the majority recommendation from CAP on rank, step, or the awarding of an off-scale.

- Of the 174 merit actions reviewed by CAP, CAP endorsed 153. The final decision of the Chancellor's office over-ruled CAP’s recommendation in 7 instances.
- Of the 58 accelerated merits proposed, CAP and the administration disagreed in 5 instances.
- Of the 46 promotions to Associate Professor or Professor, CAP supported 41. The Chancellor's office overruled CAP’s recommendation in 2 cases.
- The Chancellor's office and CAP agreed on all 11 cases proposed for advancement to Professor Step VI or to Professor Above-Scale.
- Of the 15 appraisals, the Chancellor's office and CAP disagreed in 3 cases.
- CAP and the administration agreed on supporting 27 of the 29 proposed new appointments. One case will be resubmitted in the 14-15AY and one case is pending a final decision.
- CAP and the administration were in agreement on all reappointments. Five requests were supported and one request resulted in a non-reappointment.
- CAP and the administration agreed on 4 of the 5 career reviews processed. Two cases resulted in a three-step merit increase. One case resulted in a four-step merit increase. One case resulted in a promotion. One case resulted in a promotion plus one-step merit increase.
- Out of the 15 quinquennials reviewed, the Chancellor’s Office and CAP disagreed in 2 cases.

A detailed table summary of CAP’s personnel reviews merits, promotions, advancements, appraisals, appointments, career reviews, and quinquennial reviews, is appended.

b. **Follow up to the cases listed as pending in the 12-13 CAP Report**
Of the 16 promotion to Associate Professor reviews, 1 was noted as pending. This case was finalized and the promotion to tenure denied. Of the 145 merit reviews, 1 was noted as pending. This case was finalized and the merit denied. Of the 15 appointment reviews, 1 was noted as pending. This case was finalized and the appointment to Assistant Professor approved.

c. **Ad hoc Committees**
The Committee on Academic Personnel continued to act as its own ad hoc for all promotion to tenure and Advancement to Above-Scale cases, a process which results in early decisions for the majority of these promotion cases. During the 13-14 review year,
CAP did not utilize an ad hoc committee.

d. Shadow CAP
To avoid conflict of interest, the personnel actions for current CAP members and their spouses/partners are reviewed by Shadow CAP, a 5 or 6-person committee appointed by the Committee on Committees from a pool of former CAP members from the previous five years. During 2013-14, Shadow CAP reviewed 4 cases and one Endowed Chair appointment. The 2013-14 Shadow CAP members were the following:

Chair, Robin DiMatteo
Julia Bailey-Serres
Marek Chrobak
Erika Suderburg
John Trumble
Raymond Williams

e. Assistant Professor Appointments
In January 2008, final decisions for appointments to Assistant Professor Step I-III were delegated to the deans. The 2013-2014 CAP conducted a post-appointment audit of all 11-12 and 12-13 Dean’s level hires. CAP continues to support the delegation for appointments to Assistant Professor Step I-III. However, CAP rescinded its waiver of review for all appointments for Acting Assistant Professor, Step III and clarified the expectation is that all reappointments for Assistant Professor Step I-III will continue to be reviewed by CAP.

f. eFile
CAP reviewed 260 of its 301 cases via the eFile system (86%). This compares to the 215 of 252 eFiles reviewed in 2012-13 (85%).

g. Other Personnel Actions (not included in the total number of files reviewed by CAP)
- Dickson Emeritus Professorship: CAP reviewed and endorsed three nominations for the 2013-14 Dickson Emeritus Professorship, sent forward by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
- Emerita/us titles: CAP reviewed and provided feedback to the administration on the use of Emerita/us titles for three non-Senate faculty.
- Professor of the Graduate Division appointments: CAP reviewed 7 files for appointment as Professor of the Graduate Division. All appointments were approved.

II. CAP Discussions with and Policy Recommendations to the Administration

In addition to regular CAP meetings to review personnel cases, CAP met on occasion with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, the College/School and Divisional Deans, and with Departmental Chairs. CAP participation in these joint administrative sessions is especially helpful in
assuring a shared understanding of the review process and guidelines, and of the expectations at every level of review. CAP is grateful for the spirit of cooperation of the campus administrators. CAP provided advice to and initiated or participated in discussions with the administration on the following issues:

a. **Revisions to the CALL**
CAP reviewed and provided feedback to the VPAP on change requests received by the campus at large and recommended six new revisions to the CALL for the 14-15AY.

b. **CAP Review of Proposed Department Chair Appointments**
CAP reviewed the list of proposed department chair appointments for the 2013-2014 academic year and expressed no concern about the recommendations submitted.

c. **Endowed Chair Appointments**
CAP reviewed and provided recommendations on appointments of the Howard H. Hays Chair in University Honors, the Yeager Senior Chair in Bioengineering, the Salma Haider Chair in SOM, and the BCOE Presidential Chair.

d. **Administrative Appointments – other Appointment “pre-reads”**
As per campus administrative appointment procedures, CAP provided a “pre-read” on the professorial files for the position of Chancellor, the position of Vice Provost of International Affairs, the position of Provost, and the position of Graduate School of Education Dean. CAP completed a preliminary evaluation for two Target of Excellence candidates and a spousal hire. CAP also reviewed and commented on one preemptive retention effort.

III. **CAP Advice to the Academic Senate**

a. **CAP Representation at Systemwide Senate and the Executive Council**
CAP continued its active participation on the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel. The 2013-14 CAP representative was Jang-Ting Guo. CAP Chair Haggerty represented the committee on the UCR Academic Senate’s Executive Council.

b. **CAP Review of Proposed Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual and other personnel processes**
CAP was asked to review and comment on proposed revisions to the following APM sections:

- The Committee discussed the proposed revisions to APM 210-1-d and found the changes help clarify the ambiguity and misperception associated with its original version. However, the committee was concerned with devising our campus’ local strategy to implement this new policy (if approved) in a consistent and effective manner. For example, how to adequately assign "equal weight" to a candidate’s contributions promoting equal opportunity and diversity as we assign any other contributions in the areas of research,
teaching and service? This will surely become a challenge in future academic personnel reviews.

The Committee considered, but had no comments to offer on the numerous editorial and organizational changes found in the proposed revisions to APM 133-17-g-j; APM 210-1-c; APM 220-18-b; and APM 760-30-a.

- The Committee unanimously approved the proposed changes to the APM 600 series, APM 025, 670, 671 and had no further recommendations.

CAP was asked to review and comment on the following Systemwide reviews:

- The Committee discussed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 and approved of the changes with the following recommendations:

  The language provided in UCSD’s proposal states that “voting privileges could be extended only to those Adjunct and Heath Sciences Clinical Professors who hold an appointment of more than 50% (“career”) in the department” whereas the proposed bylaw 55 language change indicates that voting privileges would be extended to all non-Academic Senate Faculty in Health Sciences. UCR has a growing non-senate health science faculty composed of several career paths that are not limited to the Adjunct and Heath Sciences Clinical Professors series. If it is UCSD’s intent to limit senate voting rights to these two career tracks, the proposed bylaw 55 language should reflect what is stated in the proposal.

- The Committee discussed the proposed revised amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 and supported the enactment of version 2.

CAP was asked to review and comment on the following Campus reviews:

- The Committee reviewed and unanimously approved the proposed implementation procedures for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan with no further recommendations.

- The Committee reviewed the proposals for departmental name changes in BCOE and CHASS and expressed the following concerns:

  1) Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering

    CAP had various concerns about department overlap and independence of programs that it hopes were dealt with in College Executive Committees. No CAP issues seem specifically at issue here.

  2) Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre, Film and Visual Production
The CHASS Executive Committee consultation with the affected departments seems unbalanced. The proposal includes a written response from the Theatre department, but there is no response from Media and Cultural Studies, Art, nor Creative Writing.

3) Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Gender and Sexualities Studies

CAP approved of the proposed change with no further recommendations.

- Members of CAP considered the proposal to change its by-laws to allow Associate Professors to serve.

The Committee was immediately struck by the importance of the issues raised, but did not feel that there is a quick and easy solution of the kind recommended.

A survey of other UC CAPS revealed that in every case, whatever their stated policy, only Full Professors, and often Professors only above Step VI, serve on CAP. This is for the obvious reason that considerable experience in the personnel process is necessary before serving on CAP. Often CAP members have been department chairs before serving on CAP for this very reason. In any case, most Associate Professors have not had much personnel experience and lack the necessary preparation for the regular workings of CAP.

An even more pressing concern is what we would be asking of Associate Professors, already so overworked in terms of service, if we were to shackle them with the overwhelming burden of CAP service.

Another practical concern emerges if one considers departmental voting practice. According to by-law 55, many departments do not allow Associate Professors to vote on Full Professor files. Whatever one may think of that policy, it does not follow that on a committee like CAP Associate Professors should decide on personnel matters for faculty of the Full Professor ranks.

Several members of CAP feel sympathy with the plea for more diversity. CAP becomes more diverse as members of the faculty are advanced, and we all assume that we can look forward to a continually more diverse CAP.

- The Committee unanimously endorsed the proposed change to the Bylaws of the Riverside Division.

- The Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the Campus Off-Scale Policy and recommended the numerical listing under Unsatisfactory Academic Progress be corrected.
Unsatisfactory Academic Progress: (1) A negative outcome on a reappointment. (2) A negative outcome on an on-time or decelerated merit action. (3) An assessment of negative on an appraisal. (3) An assessment of unsatisfactory on a quinquennial review.

CAP has concerns with this policy and looks forward to discussing the revision to the full Off-Scale Policy at a later time.

- CAP discussed the request for the campus to use the working title of Teaching Professor for those in the Lecturer with Security of Employment (LSOE) series and found that this title may not be the right title to designate to this group.

- The Committee considered and approved the 12 FTE transfer requests.

c. **Bylaw 55 delegations**
CAP continues rely on each department to send its Bylaw-55 delegations and departmental voting procedures to the Senate. Departmental Bylaw-55 designations are collected each year through the end of October.

Finally, CAP thanks all who have contributed to the personnel process. The process works as well as it does only because of the hard work and dedication of all involved.

Respectfully submitted,

George Haggerty, Chair
Christine Chiarello
Shou-Wei Ding
Jianying Gan
Ann Goldberg
Jang-Ting Guo
Russell Hille
Ashok Mulchandani
Thomas Patterson
Linda Walling
### Table I: Summary of Promotions and Advancements

#### Promotions to Associate Professor:
- Total Proposed: 27
- Total Reviewed by CAP: 27
- Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 26 (1 file was withdrawn)
- Total Approved by Chancellor: 24
- Approval %: 92%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In one case, a merit was approved in lieu of promotion

#### Promotions to Professor:
- Total Proposed: 19
- Total Reviewed by CAP: 19
- Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 19
- Total Approved by Chancellor: 18
- Approval %: 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>SPLIT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Advancements to Professor VI & Above-Scale:
- Total Proposed: 11
- Total Reviewed by CAP: 11
- Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 11
- Total Approved by Chancellor: 11
- Approval %: 100%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Ad hoc committees used on advancement to AS only, not to step VI.

### Table II: Summary of Merit Actions*

- Total Proposed: 174
- Total Reviewed by CAP: 174
- Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 174
- Total Approved by Chancellor: 151
- Approval %: 87%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP</th>
<th>Chancellor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td># of Files</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within AS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE/SOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Merits</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include advancement to VI or advancement to AS

**Key to Abbreviations:**
- CAP = Committee on Academic Personnel
- CHAN = Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor
- SPLIT = Recommendation not clearly positive or negative
- AHS = Recommended/Approved Step Higher than initially recommended by Department
- AOS = Recommended/Approved OS salary in addition to merit advance recommended by Department
- NOS = Recommended/Approved merit advance but not additional OS salary recommended by Department
- ALS = Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department
- LOS = Recommended/Approved Step Lower than initially recommended by Department and an off-scale
TABLE III: SUMMARY OF APPOINTMENTS

Total Proposed: 29
Total Reviewed by CAP: 28
Total Pending Final Decision: 1
Total Reviewed by Chancellor: 27
Total Approved by Chancellor: 27
Approval % 100%

(Not including appointments delegated to the Dean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>13-14 Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE/LSOE/SoE</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Professors</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors in Residence</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL APPOINTMENT ACTIONS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE IV: MISCELLANEOUS ACTIONS

Appraisals:
Total Proposed: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Qualified Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Split</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC/Chancellor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Career Reviews:
Total Proposed: 5
2 Resulted in a merit of 3 steps
1 Resulted in a merit of 4 steps
1 Resulted in a promotion
1 Resulted in a promotion plus a merit of 1 step

Assistant Professor Reappointments:
Total Proposed: 6
Total Approved: 5

Quinquennial Reviews
Total Proposed: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory w/ Qual</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Split</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVC/Chancellor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V: SUMMARY OF OFF-SCALE SALARIES APPROVED BY CHANCELLOR (OR DESIGNEE)

New off-scale awards were distributed as below for each college or school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Merit based recommendation (1/2 step)</th>
<th>Off-scale awarded in lieu of proposed acceleration</th>
<th>*Admin Merit based award</th>
<th>Off-scale awarded at Appointment</th>
<th>A/S Appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoBA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total o/scales awarded = 53
To be received and placed on file:

In August 2014, the Committee received a case alleging violation by a faculty member of the faculty code of conduct (APM 015). Given that this complaint was received in the middle of the summer break, all applicable parties were advised that the Committee was unable to satisfy the required quorum until late September, 2014. The committee communicated its intent to make every effort to complete its review by the end of the October 2014.

T. Close
B. Dodin (F)
A. Kposowa
B. Liu
H. Reagan
B. White
K. Vafai, Chair
To be received and placed on file:
The Committee on Committees reports the following 2014-2015 appointments made since the last report of May 27, 2014:

- Appointed Professor Connie Nugent to the Committee on Academic Freedom
- Appointed Professors Eugene Anderson and Peter Chung to the Committee on Charges
- Appointed Professor Cathleen Geraghty and Barry Mishra to the Committee on Courses
- Appointed Professor Carl Cranor as Chair of the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service
- Appointed Professor Anthony Norman and Ameae Walker to the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service
- Appointed Professor Pete Sadler as Chair of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching
- Appointed Professor Gabriela Canalizo and Neal Schiller to the Committee on Distinguished Teaching
- Appointed Professor Meera Nair to the Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity
- Appointed Professor Keith Widaman to the Committee on Educational Policy
- Appointed Professor Howard Friedman and Alex Raikhel to the Faculty Research Lecturer Committee
- Appointed Professor David Lo as Chair of the Graduate Council
- Appointed Professor Ryan Julian to the Graduate Council
- Appointed Professor Chikako Takeshita as Vice-Chair of the Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication Committee
- Appointed Professor Robert Lathan as Acting-Chair of the Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication Committee
- Appointed Professors Anthony Norman, Melanie Sperling and Marguerite Waller to the Committee on Memorial Resolutions
- Appointed Professor Coleen Macnamara as Chair of the Committee on Preparatory Education
- Appointed Professor John (Bill) Gary as a member and UCOPE representative for the Committee on Preparatory Education
- Appointed Professor Richard Luben as Chair of the Committee on Physical Resources Planning
- Appointed Professor Cheryl Hayashi to the Committee on Physical Resources Planning
- Appointed Professors David Cocker, Iryna Ethell, Jerayr Halebian, and Georgia Warnke to the Committee on Planning and Budget
- Appointed Professor Keh-Shin Lii as the Senate’s Planning and Budget Representative on the Committee on Sales and Service Activities
- Appointed Professor Stefano Lonardi as Chair and UCPT Representative for the Committee on Privilege and Tenure
- Appointed Professor Heidi Brayman Hackel as the UCORP Representative for the Committee on Research
- Appointed Professors Yawen Jiao and Jeanie Lau to the Committee on Research
- Appointed Professor Ray Williams and Chair of the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
- Appointed Professor Dimitrios Morikis as Chair of the Committee on Scholarship and Honors
- Appointed Professors Tim Higham and Yang Ye to the Committee on Scholarship and Honors
- Appointed Professor Mindy Marks to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions
- Appointed Professor Ian Dicke and Isghou Kaloshian to the Committee on University Extension
- Appointed Professor Helen Henry to the Grievance Consultation Panel
- Appointed Professor Erika Suderburg to the Shadow Committee on Academic Personnel

Respectfully Submitted,

Mariam Lam, Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages, Chair
  Peter Chung, School of Business Administration
  Robert Clare, Physics & Astronomy
  Ilya Dumer, Electrical Engineering
  Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
  Hailing Jin, Plant Pathology & Microbiology
  Jodi Kim, Ethnic Studies
  Derek Roff, Biology
  Marguerite Waller, Women’s Studies
  Laosheng Wu, Environmental Sciences
To be received and placed on file:

Since the 2013-2014 Academic Year Annual Report to the Riverside Division and during the time period of May 1 to August 31, 2014, the Committee on Courses approved a total of 15 new courses (14 undergraduate and 1 graduate). The Committee also approved changes in 13 Courses (6 undergraduate and 7 graduate); and 10 University Extension instructors. The Committee reviewed and approved 94 Associate-In requests for Summer Session 2014.

The Committee on Courses did not meeting during the period of May 1 to August 31, 2014, but did approve courses scheduled for the June meeting by email. No substantive decisions or actions were taken during the remainder of the time period.

Richard Smith, Chair
Edith Allen
Michelle Bloom
Philip Brisk
Jacob Greenstein
Paul Eric Lyons
Kristoffer Neville
Greg Palardy
Jiri Simunek
Todd Sorensen
Laurny Nellum, ASUCR Representative
Denise Machin, GSA Representative
To be received and placed on file:

Between May 1, 2014 and August 31, 2014, the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service submitted to the Division the nominations of Distinguished Professor of the Graduate Division Harry Green, from the Department of Earth Sciences, and Professor Umar Mohideen, from the Department of Physics and Astronomy, for the 2013-2014 Distinguished Campus Service award. The nominations were approved at the May 27, 2014 meeting of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, at which time Professors Green and Mohideen were presented with their awards.

G. Waines, Chair
C. Cranor
M. Martins-Green
R. Redak
T. Shapiro
To be received and placed on file:

Between May 1, 2014 and August 31, 2014, the Committee on Distinguished Teaching submitted to the Division the nomination of Professor Kimberly Hammond, Department of Biology, for the 2013-2014 Distinguished Teaching award. The nomination was approved at the May 27, 2014 meeting of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, at which time Professor Hammond was presented with the award.

J. Holt, Chair
P. Sadler
S. Straight
L. Wright
Y. Wu
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Educational Policy met three times during the period from May 1 to August 31, 2014. Chancellor Wilcox attended the Committee’s May 28, 2014 meeting, and the Committee provided him with an overview of the Committee’s charge and policy issues discussed by the Committee throughout the academic year.

A primary responsibility of CEP is undergraduate program reviews. During the time period of May 1 to August 31, 2014, CEP received Compliance to the Action Implementation Plan Reports from Creative Writing, Earth Science and English. CEP reviewed the reports and unanimously approved of the programs’ responses, closing the review process for these three programs.

The Committee updated the procedures for BCoE internal reviews using ABET in place of an external panel, to include the additional requirement of faculty and student satisfaction surveys as a mandatory component of the review process.

The following is a list of open undergraduate program reviews that CEP is working to close as of August 31, 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AY Review Conducted:</th>
<th>Program Reviewed:</th>
<th>Current step:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>Media and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>Final Findings and Recommendations Report to be sent from CEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Final Findings and Recommendations Report to be sent from CEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>Action Implementation Plan Meeting scheduled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Final Findings and Recommendations Report to be sent from CEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Chemical &amp; Environmental Engineering (Internal)</td>
<td>Program response to Preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report is due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014</td>
<td>Computer Science &amp; Engineering (internal)</td>
<td>Program response to Preliminary Findings and Recommendations Report is due.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another important function of CEP is to review and comment on all issues relevant to undergraduate education and occasionally on issues of a more general nature. When warranted, these discussions result in new regulations and policies. Topics discussed and/or acted upon by the committee in consultation with other senate committees and/or the Administration during the time period of May 1 to August 31, 2014 have included:
CEP reviewed a proposal from the Committee on Courses to eliminate the V designation for online courses and to consider these courses to be equivalent to face-to-face courses with the same course number. Proposed changes by the Committee on Courses to the Remote Learning Guidelines, which is a policy shared by both CEP and the Committee on Courses, were also reviewed. The CEP voted to unanimously approve the proposal with two amendments: The online designation should also not appear in the student’s transcript, and departments proposing a course with more than one mode of delivery submit a separate syllabus for each mode to the Committee on Courses for review. CEP’s approval and amendments were communicated to the Committee on Courses.

The Committee was tasked by Senate Chair Wudka to review an issue regulating the number of units required for graduation, specifically regulation 900.B.1. This regulation limits the average number of units a student can be required to take each quarter, and may conflict with the expectation of graduating in four years with a minimum of 180 units. The Committee discussed concerns that the regulation represents a protection for the student; however, it seemed to be inconsistent with the expectation of graduating in four years with a minimum of 180 units, and this could negatively impact four-year graduation rates. CEP unanimously voted to recommend removing the regulation.

Senate Chair Wudka asked CEP to prepare a formal proposal for the R’Courses program to be submitted for a full senate review. The Committee discussed a proposed structure for the program and reviewed a draft copy of the proposal to be finalized by CEP in the next academic year.

The Committee reviewed a request from Senate Chair Wudka to opine on the issue of who should pay for the cost for online proctoring if used in online courses. The Committee unanimously voted to recommend that the student should pay the fee because this expense is similar in spirit to other course materials purchased by student, such as test forms and blue books. The Committee also discussed the important issue of whether online proctoring is effective, secure and who has the responsibility and authority for determining the nature of the assessment process. The Committee recommended that Senate Chair Wudka task CEP at a later date to review these broader issues regarding online proctoring and to establish a comprehensive policy on the practice.

The Committee developed and unanimously approved a draft on a local version of SR 760, which specifically defines how unit values are determined from course workload. This was in response to a request from UCEP that originated with the WASC. WASC wanted accredited institutions to provide a reasonable and transparent formula describing how course credit is awarded. The system-wide regulation provides a general description of the relationship between student workload and course units, and each division was tasked with developing a specific policy. In addition to a draft policy on the local implementation of SR760, the Committee submitted a document with proposed review criteria for online and hybrid courses to Senate Chair Wudka.

Senate Chair Wudka asked the Committee to review a student submitted proposal for a gender studies breadth requirement and to advise on whether the proposal deserved a full review by the Senate. Without a position on the proposal’s content, the majority of the Committee voted to recommend a full review by the Senate in the next academic year.
Ward Beyermann, Chair  
David Fairris, Vice Chair  
Mark Springer, Representative to UCEP  
Ken Baerenklau  
Denver Graninger  
Michael Haselhuhn  
Yingbo Hua  
Margherita Long  
Jiri Simunek  
Tom Stahovich  
John Wills  
Andrew Hua, ASUCR Representative  
Migna Zhuang, GSA Representative
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Council report describes the discussions and actions taken in 11 meetings held from September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014.

Each Executive Council meeting included a report from Chair Jose Wudka on issues reviewed at Academic Council meetings, the Chancellor’s Cabinet meetings, and other critical issues raised by the faculty or the administration. Chair Wudka also gave regular updates on the various subcommittees on which he serves in his capacity as the Chair of the Senate.

At its first meeting of the year, Executive Council approved its Conflict of Interest statement and noted as “Received” the Conflict of Interest Statements from all Senate Standing Committees.

Issues considered and/or actions taken by the Executive Council include the following:

**Bylaw/Regulation Submissions:**

**Bylaw 8.9 - Merging of the Committee on Library & Scholarly Communications with the Committee on Academic Computing & Information Technology:** A proposed revision to bylaw 8.9 was received by Executive Council, with a request that Executive Council approve the action in lieu of the Division. Justification for the revision included agreement that within the separate committees is a wide area of overlap in all technology-assisted instructional matters, neither are overly busy committees, and the proposed new structure will improve the efficiency of both groups (now combined) without imposing unreasonable burdens on their members. In order to allow the Committee on Committees to appoint members effective immediately, a motion was made to approve bylaw 8.9 in lieu of submitting for approval at the next Division meeting (which was longer than 30 days away). After discussion, the motion passed with 17 voting yes (one by mail), none voting against and no abstentions. Executive Council encouraged the newly formulated committee to review these bylaws and change the committee name to something more reflective of its duties. The Division was updated at its meeting on November 26, 2013.

**Bylaw HS2.8.3 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences:** The proposal will allow students in the minor, to take one or two courses in the major as long as the courses are not applied to the major itself. The college suggested the change due to the large number of interdisciplinary students within CHASS. Executive Council received the bylaw proposal and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

**Bylaw 8.12.1 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on Educational Policy:** CEP proposed a change which would not require membership from a representative of each of the professional schools. The proposal was initiated because of the unavailability of faculty from some schools and colleges due to the small population of its eligible senate members. The members of Executive Council suggested alternative language to CEP and the proposal was ultimately forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.
Bylaw SOBA4.2 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the School of Business Administration: SOBA Faculty Chair Barry Mishra offered that the proposed changes were intended to allow flexibility for the school. There was also general discussion of the role of the Dean or other senior administrative officers within sub-committees of the Executive Committee of a college (or Division or School). Chair Mishra advised that the SOBA Executive Committee will be reviewing the originally proposed revisions and asked that the bylaw proposal not be forwarded to the Division at this time. The bylaw was subsequently resubmitted and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.1.1 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Riverside Division: Executive Council discussed the proposal to revise Division Bylaw 8.1.1 so that Senate members holding administrative positions higher than department chair may not serve as chairs of divisional committees or serve as divisional representatives on systemwide committees. There was considerable discussion about what constitutes an administrative position and the lack of clarity in the proposal. The proposal was rescinded and Executive Council was advised that the proposal would be revised and re-submitted at a later date.

Bylaw 8.4.12 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Graduate Council: Members of the Executive Council suggested that CCGA does more than what is listed in the bylaw and that the Graduate Council actually sets policy rather than advises the Graduate Division. After discussion of the proposed revision, Lynda Bell, Chair of Graduate Council asked that the proposal be rescinded to allow additional discussion within the Graduate Council committee. The bylaw change was subsequently forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw ME – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the School of Medicine: There were a series of changes proposed by the School of Medicine, the most significant of them being a clarification of the School’s policy to allow advisory votes for non-senate faculty in as many areas as possible. After discussion, the Executive Council had nominal grammatical suggestions. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.18 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on Planning and Budget: The Committee on Planning and Budget submitted a bylaw change which broadens the perspective of the members by allowing participation of junior faculty and increases the likelihood of participation by the smaller departments, schools and colleges who may not have enough tenured faculty to accommodate all Senate committees. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.4.4 and 8.4.5 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on Academic Personnel: CAP revised its bylaws to formalize the practice of using Shadow CAP. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Bylaw 8.15.1 – Proposed Change in the Bylaws of the Committee on International Education: The Committee on International Education submitted a bylaw revision to reflect the change to the name of the International Student Resource Center and to clarify the role of administrative representatives and non-voting ex officio members. The bylaw was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.
Regulation 6.12.1 – Proposal to Change Riverside Regulation 6.12: The Committee on Educational Policy submitted a regulation change proposal and offered that a timetable for the full implementation of changes in graduation requirements (general university requirements, college breadth requirements, and major requirements) is currently specified in R6.12. However, changes to prerequisites for courses, majors, or any curricular change not involving graduation requirements, are not covered by existing legislation. Proposed R6.12.1 establishes a default implementation date for such changes. Exceptions to this default may be granted presuming an alternative is specified and approved as part of the change to the prerequisite requirement. According to current regulations, a proposal for changes to prerequisites for courses, majors, or any curricular change not involving graduation requirements could be implemented before students had any time to make adjustments to prepare for the change. More importantly, this stepped up implementation could be inadvertent; it might be the result of an oversight, involving the failure to specify the implementation timetable in writing. This may create a serious and unintended hardship for the students affected. The regulation proposal was noted as received by Executive Council and was forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

Discussion of a suggestion to change the CAP Bylaws: There was considerable discussion of a submission suggesting the bylaws of CAP be modified to allow Associate Professors to serve on the committee. The proposal introduced several factors and justifications, among them suggesting that women and minorities are not well represented on CAP due to the restrictive bylaw. Several Senate committees reviewed the proposal and while many were sympathetic to the argument, most did not give support. Of considerable concern was the contradiction between the proposal and Senate Bylaw 55, which does not allow Associate Professors a voting right on Full Professor files unless delegated by the department. Executive Council unanimously agreed that per policy, the faculty who submitted the proposal should receive the committee responses along with the comments of Council, including the advisement that continued official review of the proposal will require the document to be submitted in the standardized bylaw review format.

Systemwide Review Submissions:
In each case below, Executive Council reviewed the responses from applicable Senate committees tasked with reviewing the proposal and providing input. Executive Council discussion is intended to assist the Division Chair in drafting responses on behalf of the Riverside Division.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to the UC Policy on Supplemental to Military Pay: There was little discussion by Executive Council due to its general agreement with continuation of the policy which provides salary supplements to UC faculty and staff serving on active military duty. There was, however, one point concerning personnel whose salary, fully or partially, is covered by an extramural source that the members of Executive Council felt should be addressed in our campus response. In this case, Executive Council suggests the policy should clarify that the supplementary salary will be provided by the campus. In addition there were two questions that merited clarification: 1) wherefore came the time limit of 2 years on the supplementary salary, and 2) the rationale for including a limiting date of June 30, 2018. Neither of these limitations has an obvious justification, and may be interpreted as a lack of full support for the affected personnel.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to the Compendium: There was prolonged discussion and serious concerns about some of the proposed changes to the Compendium, and general dissatisfaction with the manner in which the proposed changes were presented. In
particular, Executive Council urged for any future revisions to be accompanied by a concise justification. The main concerns related to the proposed revisions to the MRU policies and the new MRP policy:

The contents of the request for proposals for multi-campus research programs (section V.C) is solely the job of the VPRGS, with no Senate consultation at any level required; in fact no consultation at all is apparently required. Given the controversies that have surrounded the VPRGS office in the past this does not seem prudent.

The requirements on the VPRGS in consulting with the divisions when determining the overall research goals are weak in the extreme (section V.C.1). Though in the past the VPRGS convened an advisory group (the Portfolio Review Group - PRG), there is no requirement for him/her to do so in the future; even the PRG is only mentioned in a footnote (presumably as an example of a mechanism the VPRGS might use to elicit input), and its role is qualified as only 'likely to have an effect'. This lack of specificity can lead to the disenfranchisement of one or more of the divisions depending on the whims of the VPRGS, or for the consultation with the Senate to devolve into a pro-forma exchange.

UCORP is (appropriately) singled out as the lead committee in most MRU/MRP actions, but there is no explicit requirement that this Committee elicit input from Council. And while this might be implicit, a specific requirement to this effect would be useful, providing an alternative avenue for the divisions to provide input.

It is doubtful that a blanket sunset policy is either sensible or wise.

In addition, there was general confusion about the interrelation between the MRU, MRP and MRPI programs, as well as their differences; Executive Council suggests that a comparison table be included to clarify these issues.

**Systemwide Review of the Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55:** Committee responses indicated no consensus on whether to support or oppose the proposal. This was partly because of ambiguities in the documentation provided, and partly because of genuine differences of opinion within senate committees. Several committee responses included concerns that the proposal violates the spirit of the Regents' standing order 105.2 and of ruling 5.67 of UCR&J. Other committees were skeptical about the possibility of rescinding the voting rights once granted: Council agreed and discussed that while this might be technically possible, it would be very difficult in departments with a large number of non-Senate faculty (NSF) members. It was also discussed that while some departments might opt to extend voting rights to their NSF, others might not, leading to inequalities across the school and increased tensions within the latter departments. It was also pointed out that NSF are employed under a renewable contract and do not receive tenure. Because of this there might be circumstances where they feel pressured to vote in a particular way. In addition, the potential regular fluctuation in the NSF body would require a continuous education effort to ensure consistency in the voting criteria.

Though the proposal is directed towards NSF in the school of Health Sciences, committee members and Council members noted that if the proposal were to be adopted other non-senate groups may demand to be included, and there would be no compelling reason to deny such a request. On the other hand, it was pointed out that the adoption of bylaw 55.E would allow the affected departments to adopt a more inclusive policy that would foster the participation of NSF in departmental matters, leading to increased cohesion and collegiality. Other members opined
that the effect can be restricted to our School of Medicine and did not believe that peer pressure within departments would prevent Senate faculty from rescinding the voting rights of NSF.

During the discussion several members voiced the opinion that there are various modifications to the policy that may be easier to adopt. One example would be to extend NSF voting rights, but only for NSF personnel actions. There was, however, general consensus that Senate faculty should not be excluded from voting in NSF personnel actions.

A main concern was the possibility that adopting this proposal will lead to different standards for the merit and promotion of faculty among departments within the campus, and for equivalent departments between sister campus, and that this will have a negative impact not only on the departments themselves, but on the system as a whole. Several council members noted that their departments have for a long time included votes from NSF members (included as 'advisory' in the department's letter) and this has led to no negative effects.

Council members suggested that the campus response include the request that the proposal be amended by:
- Including the specific list of NSF titles covered
- Changing the measure of NSF participation from 'effort ' to a general measure ('effort' does not apply to all categories covered by the proposal)
- Allowing divisions to include restrictions on e-mail voting (or including such restrictions in the bylaw itself): in some disciplines NSF may have minimal contact with the campus so that unrestricted e-mail voting can easily degenerate into a pro-forma process
- Stating whether divisions will be allowed to impose specific restrictions on the scope of NSF Votes

Ultimately Council supported version 2 of the proposal with a vote of +11-5-2.

**Systemwide Review of the Proposed Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition:** The Executive Committee reviewed the draft policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) and echoed the concerns raised by several of the reviewing committees. The greatest concern raised by Graduate Council and Planning and Budget was the lack of coordination between the supplemental tuition and self-supporting program policies, and the limited discussion of the implications these policies will have on the structure of the University of California. Executive Council suggested the division respond with a strong recommendation for a thorough joint discussion of supplemental tuition and self-supporting programs, especially of mechanisms to ensure that the core mission of the institution will not be damaged by the adoption of the recent policy proposals. Council is very concerned about the UC giving its imprimatur to exclusive programs that may erode the commitments to the UC to academic excellence and availability of education. Other suggestions include adding to the policy the requirement that the Senate be consulted at those times where faculty consultation is elicited; including an expectation that the programs soliciting PDST should maintain the level of academic excellence expected from the University of California. Concerns included the onerous nature of the procedures described in the draft policy and the suggestion that this policy could lead to a lack of uniformity within the UC system, leading to formally equivalent, but de facto tiered set of programs.

**Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 025, 670 and 671:** Executive Council discussed the proposed APM changes and supports the recommendations made by the reviewing committees. Specifically, the School of Medicine suggested that the discussion
surrounding the $40,000 earning threshold be clarified. On pg. 4 of the introductory material the fourth bullet point refers the 'first' $40,000 earned, and it is unclear whether this refers also to the $40,000 on bullet point 2, or to subsequent earnings. In addition, the Committee on Research suggests that further details be provided on how APM025 affects employees in the Professional Research series. Similar clarifications are needed for students working under an SBIR (small business innovation research) and STTR (small business technology transfer) grants.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 190, Appendix A: All committees reviewing the proposal indicated support which was echoed by Executive Council.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 510 and Sections Within the 600 Series: Several committees of the Riverside Division opined on the proposed changes to the various section of the APM under consideration. The following is a summary of the recommendations and concerns discussed at Executive Council:

- **APM 510:** Section 16.d merited a clarification as to which campus covers the sabbatical leave for cases where a faculty member takes leave at another UC campus. In section 18 step c is unnecessary and conflicts with step g
- **APM 650:** there was concern that the restriction on the pay levels for technical assistants would decrease the competitiveness of the campus
- **APM 661:** it was determined that the campus response should include a suggestion that the calculation in section 16.b be maintained using 1/11th of the yearly salary instead of 1/12th as the first more accurately reflects the monthly salary. In addition the language under “Health Sciences Compensation Plan” was unclear and incomplete as there are other paths for earning additional salary.
- **APM 662:** Section 8 should address teaching by emeriti. In Section 16.b there was no reason to forbid compensation for faculty who volunteer to teach extra courses, but to allow it if they are requested to do so. In section 17.i it was unclear why the podium hours are used instead of credit hours
- **APM 666:** there was concern that the 10% cap might cause inequities due to difference in salaries of the affected faculty. The proposed language would restrict issuing honoraria to undergraduate program reviewers in the home campus, which is not an issue at UCR, but might be so at other campuses. In addition (sect. 24.b) the requirement that the chancellor notify the campus may present an unwarranted burden. Finally, there was a concern that faculty may put receiving honoraria as a condition for visiting other UC campuses

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 035. Appendices A-1 & A-2: The committees of the Riverside Division which reviewed the proposed changes to APM-035 were generally supportive of the revision. There were, however, serious concerns about the use of vague and imprecise language that required clarification. Executive Council discussed the committee recommendations and supported a campus response which listed the specific recommendations of each committee.

Miscellaneous Review Items:

**Review of Changes to UCR's Implementation of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan:** In fall 2011, UCR’s School of Medicine received conditional approval to implement the Health Sciences Compensation Plan. The provision was that the plan be modified to bring it to compliance with the newly revised APM 670. The HSC Plan and Committee responses were
received and discussed by the Executive Council for forwarding to David Bocian, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

**Review of the Proposed Campus Student Absence Statement:** Executive Council supported the statement submitted by Dan Jeske, NCAA Faculty Representative and the effort to have the statement included in the faculty handbook. Executive Council understood that revision to the faculty handbook was an issue for Office of the President and advised Chair Wudka to work with the EVCP to develop a local annual reminder. EVCP Rabenstein agreed to issue a joint senate/administrative memo each fall, encouraging all faculty to take into consideration the suggestion below when dealing with student absences:  

*Students’ attendance at University classes is always expected. It is recognized that students’ absences may result from external circumstances, as well as from activities that are important to a student’s overall educational experience and are consistent with the University’s mission to serve students. Some of these activities are also beneficial for the campus culture and image. Faculty are encouraged to be cognizant of these principles when articulating their procedures for handling absences in their course policies.*

**Review of Proposed Changes to the Admission by Exception Policy:** Executive Council reviewed and discussed the proposed changes to the Admission by Exception (AxE) policy and the opinions submitted from the committees of Educational Policy, International Education, Preparatory Education and Rules & Jurisdiction. Some of the suggestions provided by these reviewers were already included in the version Council reviewed. The main concern of Council was the exclusion of a standing member from the Bourns College of Engineering (BCoE) from the Special Review Committee (SRC). After some discussion Council suggested the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions further modify the policy to include a representative from the College of Engineering. The Proposal was noted as received by Executive Council and forwarded to the Division for a full vote at its next regular meeting.

**Review of Changes to the Campus Off-Scale Policy:** Several standing committees of the Division reviewed the off-scale policy and the proposed changes. While there was overwhelming agreement that the policy itself should be reconsidered, the general consensus was that the changes proposed by the administration were in the best interest of the faculty and should be implemented immediately. On advice from Executive Council, Chair Wudka will inform the VPAP and the EVCP that the representatives of the Division would like to engage in a full discussion and review of the campus off-scale policy.

**Discussion of Photo Roster Availability:** Executive Council discussed the proposal to remove restrictions on the availability of photo rosters. The council recognized the usefulness of this change and, though it also understood the concerns that led to the current restrictions, did not find that these represent a compelling reason to continue limiting access to the roster. The Council then voted unanimously to remove all restrictions on the availability of photo rosters.

**Review of Proposal to Establish Two Summer Session Oversight Committees:** Several committees reviewed and supported the proposal, however there was concern that the new structure did not allow for an over-arching member who will serve continuously on both committees. Several committees felt that this lack of overlap may potentially diminish the senate position in summer session decisions and leaves each committee vulnerable to disconnect between the administrative and academic discussions. Vice Chair Hughes confirmed that as the sole senate representative in the current structure she has experienced a process that is not vigorous or effective. Graduate Council too is concerned with the lack of
Senate oversight in the current model and hopes that the proposal may help address that deficiency. After considerable discussion, Council suggest two changes to the proposal, 1) the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education be added as an ex-officio member of the Administrative Committee and 2) to insure regular meetings of both committees, perhaps even set a minimum number of meetings (once a quarter).

**Review of the Draft UCR Libraries Strategic Plan:** While most committees who reviewed the document were impressed with the ambition of the plan, there was significant concern expressed about the lack of articulation of plan implementation. In addition, there was general concern from several committees about the lack of clarification of future maintenance or growth of a physical, print collection. The CHASS Executive Committee and Faculty Welfare in particular were concerned that the plan did not include any discussion of either maintaining or improving the current print collection. Faculty Chair Edwards spoke at length of the need for its faculty to have access to print material such as images, musical scores and other print based research material which is not digitized and/or which is costly. CHASS therefore is significantly concerned about the library seeming to phase out its print collection and suggests a disconnect in understanding exists between the library and the teaching and research activities of CHASS faculty and the importance of print material on the CHASS merit/promotion process. Executive Council agreed that the strategic plan process should move forward only with significant faculty (and student) input and collaboration. To that end, the Senate’s Committee on Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication was tasked with forming an ad hoc subcommittee that will advise the University Librarian thorough the implementation of the strategic plan for the UCR Libraries. This subcommittee will include representation from the Graduate Council, Committee on Research, Committee on Educational Policy and the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences; it should provide regular reports to the LIT&SC Committee for the committee chair to present at Executive Council and, when pertinent, to provide recommendations for Senate action.

**Review of the Online License Agreement:** Council reviewed and discussed the online agreement and suggested minor revisions. Specifically that inclusion of an introductory paragraph would be helpful. Chair Wudka will work with campus counsel to finalize the document.

**Review of the Priority Enrollment Policy Proposed by the Committee on Educational Policy:** Executive Council discussed the proposal submitted by CEP to introduce a policy of undergraduate priority enrollment. The policy will be used to identify which body has final authority in deciding who gets priority enrollment (CEP); will establish the criterion by which CEP will make its determination; and, describes the procedure that interested parties will use to request priority enrollment. Absent of this policy there is no written documentation used by the campus to address these issues. It was clarified that this policy is not intended to address issues such as priority enrollment for certain courses for majors. The policy was forwarded to the Division for approval at its next meeting.

**Discussion of Implementing an R’Course Program at UCR:** The Committee on Educational Policy received and approved a proposal from the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education to initiate an undergraduate student-led course program. The program is intended to provide undergraduate students with an opportunity to teach classes to their peers on a topic that they have some familiarity with. Usually this is linked to some type of experience they had (e.g., summer intern), and it is on a topic not covered in our regular offerings. Since it is student driven, the cycle to develop, review and deliver the course must be shorter than for regular courses, which represents a challenge to insure adequate Senate oversight with a contracted
cycle - typically one academic year. Per the program process, the solicitation to offer the opportunity to teach a course will be distributed in early fall with a deadline later in the quarter. Students who are selected to teach will spend the winter quarter training and the class itself will be conducted in the spring.

Chair Wudka and CEP Chair Beyermann explained that the Berkeley campus has been offering student led courses since 1965 and now offers 190 of these courses each semester. Chair Beyermann further explained that the Committee on Educational Policy worked closed with the Office of Undergraduate Education to revise the initial proposal so that students were tied to a faculty member, and the course is more like a general topics course (where the Senate approves a template and the specific content can change depending on who teaches it without additional Senate involvement). To streamline the process, the review is conducted by a Governing Board, which includes Senate representation.

After considerable discussion Executive Council supported the R’Course program but asked that the Committee on Educational Policy revise the policy so that there is codification of the number of units each course can have and the total number of units of this type of course each student can accrue during their undergraduate term at UCR. Executive Council also suggested that there be a GPA requirement for the students who apply to teach a course, that duties of the instructor of record be clearly delineated, and that there be an annual report submitted to the Committee on Courses. Chair Beyermann will bring a revised proposal to Executive Council for later consideration

Proposal to Establish a Master's of Public Policy Degree Program at UCR: The Proposal to establish a Master’s of Public Policy was reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council and the Committee on Planning and Budget. The Executive Council expressed enthusiasm for the degree and discussed its significance for the campus. The proposal was presented to the Division for a vote at a Special Meeting on November 4, 2013.

Request to use working titles for the Lecturer with (Potential) for Security of Employment Series: Council appreciated and supported the need to adopt a working title as it would indeed clarify the role, responsibilities and ranking of this type of lecturer. Several reviewing committees indicated that the proposed working title might be confused with the existing title of “Distinguished Teaching Professor” awarded by the UCR Academy of Distinguished Teachers. Because of this Council suggests instead that the title of “Professor of Instruction” be adopted instead.

Proposals for Department Name Changes:
Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies: Executive Council reviewed the name change request and noted that the new name seemed grammatically awkward but otherwise the proposal was sound. Per the campus procedure for name change for an Academic Department, the name change proposal was forwarded to the Division for approval.

Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre, Film and Digital Production: After considerable discussion the Executive Council expressed concerns about the lack of documentation which may have demonstrated consultation with other departments (Creative Writing, Art, Media and Cultural Studies and Computer Science) and the results of such consultations. Some in the committee suggested “bouncing back” the proposal to the CHASS Executive Committee requesting this additional information. However, per campus name change procedures, approval (or disapproval) by Executive
Council is not required; nonetheless a plurality of members did want to have more information from the CHASS Executive Committee. It was determined that the concerns of Executive Council would be forwarded to the CHASS Executive Committee, who would then determine if they wanted the item forwarded to the Division for approval or they wanted to reconsider the proposal. The CHASS Executive Committee asked that the item be forwarded to the Division as submitted. The request was included in the May 2014 Division Agenda.

**Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering:** Several of the committees who reviewed the proposed name change commented that the name change may cause confusion for students given the already existing department of Computer Science and Engineering. Executive Council agreed that the BCOE Executive Committee will be advised of the concerns discussed at Executive Council and offer that the same questions may come up during Division review. Per the campus procedure for name change for an Academic Department, the name change proposal will be forwarded to the Division for approval.

Respectfully submitted by,
**Jose Wudka, Chair, (Physics & Astronomy)**

Division Officers:
- Jennifer Hughes (History), Vice Chair
- Piotr Gorecki (History), Secretary/Parliamentarian
- Bahram Mobasher (Physics & Astronomy), Senior Assembly Representative
- Ilhem Messaoudi Powers (SOM), Junior Assembly Representative

Standing Committee Chairs:
- James Baldwin (Nematology), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
- Kenneth Barish (Physics), Planning and Budget (P&B)
- Lynda Bell (History), Graduate Council (GC)
- Ward Beyermann (Physics & Astronomy), Educational Policy (CEP)
- Kathryn DeFea (Biomed), Undergraduate Admissions (UAC)
- Erica Edwards (English), CHASS Executive Committee
- George Haggerty (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
- Mariam Lam (Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages), Committees (COC)
- Barry Mishra (SOBA), SOBA Executive Committee
- Eugene Nothnagel (Botany & Plant Sciences), Preparatory Education (PRP)
- Michael Vanderwood (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
- Akula Venkatram (Mechanical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
- Ameae Walker (School of Medicine), SOM Executive Committee
- Georgia Warnke (Political Science), Faculty Welfare (FW)
- Gillian Wilson (Physics & Astronomy), CNAS Executive Committee
- Zhenbiao Yang (Botany & Plant Sciences), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)

Cynthia Palmer, Executive Director
To be received and placed on file:

Between May 1, 2014 and August 31, 2014, the Faculty Research Lecturer Committee submitted to the Division the nomination of Distinguished Professor Howard Friedman from the Department of Psychology for the 2014-2015 Faculty Research Lecturer award. This nomination was approved at the May 27, 2014 meeting of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

Distinguished Professor Alexander S. Raikhel from the Department of Entomology delivered the 2013-2014 Faculty Research Lecture on Friday, June 6, 2014. The lecture, which was attended by over one hundred colleagues, students and guests, was titled “Mosquitoes – Deadly Foes of Humanity.”

C. Varma, Chair
N. Ellstrand
B. Federici
J. Fischer
R.R. Russell
To be received and placed on file:

Since its last Annual Report, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) met on 3 occasions. Following is a summary of Committee activities from May 1, 2014 to August 31, 2014:

- The Committee on Faculty Welfare considered, but had no comments to offer if the numerous editorial and organizational changes found in APM section 133-17-g-j, Limitation to Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles, and APM section 220-18-b, Professor Series.

- The Committee discussed the proposed revisions to APM section 210-1-c &d, Review and Appraisal committees. While the committee agreed with the policy’s intent to encourage contributions to diversity, it did not see how the policy could be uniformly applied across all academic disciplines.

- The Committee discussed the proposed revisions to APM section 760-30, Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing. While the committee agreed with the proposed changes, it felt the language lacked specific detail as to what constitutes stopping the clock.

In addition to the above, the Committee on Faculty Welfare is charged with the award process for the Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship. To provide an opportunity to receive a more diverse applicant pool, the deadline to submit applications for the 2014-15 Dickson Professorship was extended to May 15, 2014.

The Committee carefully reviewed the nine applications received and felt each application was very strong and proposed important and interesting work. In the Committee’s view, three of the submitted proposals were the most well-developed. With the unanimous support of the Committee on Academic Personnel, the Faculty Welfare Committee awarded three Professorships for the 2014-15 year to: Professor Emeritus Ronald Chilcote (Economics), Professor Emeritus Michael Pollak (Physics and Astronomy) and Professor Emeritus Irwin Wall (History).

L. Kotz  
J. Lyubovitsky  
T. Norman  
A. Page  
K. Pyke  
M. Roose  
M. Grindal – GSA  
A. Best – ASUCR  
G. Warnke, Chair
GRADUATE COUNCIL
UPDATED ANNUAL REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
December 2, 2014

To be received and placed on file:

The Graduate Council met once during the period of May 15, 2014 through August 31, 2014. Complete records of Council activity are on file in the Office of the Academic Senate.

The Courses and Programs Subcommittee made recommendations and the Council acted on 10 Courses; 5 new courses and 5 changes in existing courses.

The following requests for changes in requirements for graduate programs were reviewed and approved:

- Music (Ethnomusicology)- Change in time to degree.
- Statistics M.A.- Change to comprehensive exam
- M.A. in Public History- Changes in line with those made to History PhD and M.A. programs.
- English – Change protocols on course requirement options

Graduate Council voted to close out the graduate program reviews for the following programs: Sociology (internally reviewed in 2012/13), Political Science (reviewed in 2013/14) and Physics (reviewed in 2013/14).

Graduate Council received the Environmental Sciences task force report. The task force was established after the program’s 2011/12 extramural review. The Graduate Council will review and discuss the report in the Fall.

Graduate Council discussed and responded to the Presidential Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDP). Graduate Council reviewed and ruled on a graduate student grade appeal.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynda Bell, History, Chair
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering, Vice Chair
Rick Redak, Entomology, Secretary
Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology, Chair of Courses & Programs Subcommittee
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry, Chair of Fellowships Subcommittee
Wendy Ashmore, Anthropology
Malcolm Baker, Art History
David Lo, School of Medicine
John Kim, Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages, CCGA Representative
Rene Lysloff, Music
Rollanda O’Connor, GSOE
Daniel Schlenk, Environmental Sciences
Jing Shi, Physics
Jorge Silva-Risso, SoBA
Tom Payne, Computer Science & Engineering
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Preston Williams, Graduate Student Representative (guest)
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on International Education met once during the period of May 1 to August 31, 2014. The committee met on May 22, 2014 to receive updates from the University Committee on International Education and the various departments represented by the ex officio members on the committee. No substantive decisions or actions were taken at the meeting.

Christina Schwenkel, Chair
Amalia Cabezas
Cecile Cho
Philip Christopher
David Crowley
Thomas Eulgem
Thomas Perring, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education (ex officio)
Sharon Duffy, Dean of University Extension (ex officio)
Karen McComb, Director of the International Student Resource Center (ex officio)
Bronwyn Jeninks-Deas, Director of University Extension’s International Education Programs (ex officio)
Jeffrey Kiribook (Undergraduate student representative)
Edgar Tellez (Graduate student representative)
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning met once during the period of May 1 – August 31, 2014. The May 9, 2014 meeting was with Chancellor Wilcox and was intended to inform the Chancellor of the functions of the committee in relation to shared governance.

J. Baldwin, Chair  
J. Allison  
W. Grover  
J. Isermann  
R. Luben  
Y.S. Poon  
M. Wrathall
To be received and placed on file:

From September 1, 2013 to August 31, 2014, the Committee on Planning & Budget (P&B) met a total of 22 times, with an average meeting length of 2.5 hours. The Committee discussed and considered several business items from the campus and from Office of the President.

Campus level review subjects:

- P&B reviewed and supported FTE transfers for 11 faculty.
- Department name changes in CHASS and BCOE - P&B reviewed and approved the proposed name changes for the Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, the Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre, Film and Digital Production and the Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Gender and Sexuality Studies. All three were approved by P&B however, there was discussion of the potential for overlap and confusion between the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Department of Computer Science and Engineering. The name changes were subsequently approved by the Division.
- Review of the Proposal to Revise Senate Bylaw 8.1.1 – The bylaw proposal was submitted in an attempt to eliminate administrative reporting obligations that would be in conflict with an administrator’s role if he/she served as a committee chair or systemwide divisional representative. While the committee supported the intent of the proposal it was unable to endorse the proposal as presented. The committee suggested the revision include the specific administrative titles which would disallow Senate service.
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 8.18 - Membership on the Committee on Planning & Budget has been difficult to fill for several academic cycles, a situation made more problematic by requiring members of tenured rank. The proposed change broadens the perspective of the members by allowing participation of junior faculty and increases the likelihood of participation by the smaller departments, schools and colleges who may not have enough tenured faculty to accommodate all Senate committees. The revision was subsequently approved by the Division.
- Review of changes to the Campus Off-Scale Policy - The Committee on Planning & Budget discussed the changes to the Campus Off-Scale Policy and approved the proposed modifications. There are other, more general concerns about the policy and the committee looks forward to additional discussions at a later time.
- Proposal for a MPP degree program – P&B was supportive of the proposal for the MPP degree program after receipt of additional details not submitted with the initial documentation. Specifically, before voting, the committee requested an analysis of the required academic planning and resource allocations necessary to successfully launch and maintain the MPP degree program. The Committee also requested an expanded operating budget which included the costs (and number) of faculty FTE and school administrators. The requested clarification was received almost immediately and P&B was able to submit its endorsement with a unanimous positive vote. The program was subsequently approved by the Division at a special meeting.
Systemwide level review subjects:

- Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 025, 670 & 671 - P&B reviewed the proposed changes, and had no corrections, questions, or comments.

- Review of the Proposed Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition – P&B reviewed UCOP’s proposed revisions to the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) policy and implementation protocol. The revisions appeared to largely add detail rather than significant policy changes; nonetheless, P&B suggested that a summary of any substantial changes to the policy should have been included with the proposed revisions to help with the evaluation. The committee offered the following comments:
  1. It would be better to consider the PDST and SSGs together as an integrated plan and which clearly distinguishes the two.
  2. The description of the characteristics of PDSTs should be more clearly defined (section VIII).
  3. A statement emphasizing that academic excellence is a requirement (and of central importance) should be added.

In addition, as part of the campus budget process, P&B met with various Deans and Vice Chancellors to discuss the specific college and school budget requests. P&B’s recommendations regarding the budget were made in the form of a report to the Chancellor (attached).

Respectfully Submitted,

Daniel Hare
Kimberly Hammond
Barry Mishra
David Pion-Berlin
Roger Ransom
Michael Vanderwood
Kenneth Barish, Chair
June 5, 2014

To: Chancellor Kim Wilcox

Fr: Kenneth Barish Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
    Kimberly Hammond, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
    J. Daniel Hare, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
    Barry Mishra, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
    David Pion-Berlin, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
    Roger Ransom, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget
    Michael Vanderwood, Member, Committee on Planning & Budget

Re: Committee on Planning & Budget Summary of Recommendations

The UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) originates from the standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (d), which authorizes the Academic Senate to appoint committees to advise a Chancellor concerning budgets. The advice of the 2013-14 CPB is summarized in this document.

The campus has been in the process of wholesale leadership changes, with a new Chancellor, the search for a new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, appointment of a new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, the search for a new Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the search for a new Dean for the School of Graduate Education, and the naming of a permanent Dean for the School of Business Administration. At the same time, the campus is emerging from years of cuts due to the financial crisis with the prospect for growth and reinvestment. While additional funds are limited and tempered by mandated cost increases, growth is in sight and the campus has some reserve funds due to conservative budgeting during the financial crisis. This year the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) met with all academic and major non-academic units. The focus was on assessing the current state of the campus and the reality of achieving the aspirational goals laid out in UCR 2020. In short, we are excited by the prospects of growing the faculty and reinvesting in the quality of the University, but are concerned that there is no realistic and comprehensive plan to achieve the aspiration goals and that blind growth in an attempt to meet our aspirations may be risky. Quantity and quality of space, support for graduate students, and transparent budgeting top our areas of concern.

The reports of the discussion with each unit are attached.
The following summary of our recommendations is based on common themes that emerged from the above discussions. We recommend that:

- **New Faculty and Initial Complements**
  Increasing the percentage of filled faculty positions, which is low compared to other UC schools, should be a top priority. CPB supports growth aligned with the ultimate achievement of having a profile consistent with a premier research institution, e.g. AAU institution. However, the growth should be balanced and realistic. The feasibility and time scale to achieve the goals of the strategic plan need to be reexamined annually based on budget limitations. Critical needs, including resources needed to maximize the productivity of current faculty, must not be neglected. We are concerned that the growth numbers that have been mentioned, 250 or 300 new faculty by 2020, are unrealistic. We recommend a full study of the resources, space, and initial complement requirements take place prior to setting a growth target. Further, we think that a sustainable initial complement policy must be developed and budgeted.

- **Graduate Student Support**
  The growth of the graduate student population is a key element of UCR 2020 and is intricately tied to the success of current and new faculty. An integrative planning process should take place, and it should include a thoughtful and realistic discussion on the size and shape of the graduate student population. Increases in the graduate student population are deeply related to new faculty, space, central fellowship money, TA positions, and extramural grants. A study of the job prospects for graduate students, both inside and outside of academia, must also be performed. Producing a large number of graduates with grim job prospects would have a large negative effect on the reputation of the campus. Additionally, a market study of professional masters programs should be conducted if supplemental fees and tuition from students in those programs is assumed. Given today’s uncertain research funding environment, however, the campus needs to make additional strategic investments. In particular:

  a) Additional funds should be allocated to pay the in-state tuition of students on extramurally funded GSRs. This will incentivize the inclusion of more graduate students on grants, which will have the added benefit of maximizing research output and in turn lead to more and larger awards.

  b) The temporary TA money for the unfunded students (not state support, but paid tuition) should be increased to fully fund TAs at the targeted FTE levels. In addition to pedagogical reasons, this is needed to relieve the workload of our graduate students to maximize their research output, shorten their time to degree, and support graduate student growth. The additional cost will diminish as we replace our unfunded state students with out-of-state or state-funded in-state students.

  c) Additional fellowship funds to make recruitment packages competitive should be strategically allocated to attract the highest quality graduate students and
shorten the time to degree. The recruitment of higher quality students will also maximize graduate student retention and minimize time to degree.

Additionally, changes to graduate student non-resident tuition accounting should be made. Given that non-resident tuition (NRT) remains on the campus since the funding streams model has been implemented, the non-resident fees should not be an inhibiting factor in recruiting the best students for a particular graduate program. We recommend that programs and grants be rebated for any NRT fees and for the Graduate Division to work with individual departments and programs to set a transparent policy as to the ideal fraction of international students.

➢ Extramural Grant Targets

A careful, integrative planning process should be undertaken to determine realistic targets for increasing extramural grant income from Federal agencies under current and foreseeable Federal budgetary constraints. Anecdotal evidence from a recent NSF panel member suggests, for example, that, whereas available funds for that NSF Division are essentially unchanged since 2002, the number of proposals has increased 2.5 times. Flat funding coupled with increases in the number of grant applications has several implications for UCR’s ability to achieve its goals for increased Federal funding under UCR 2020. Thus, the committee recommends careful consideration be given to the following questions under the current, austere, opportunities for Federal funding:

a) What funding rates should be anticipated for faculty in different disciplines?
b) What size of grants should be anticipated for faculty in different disciplines?
c) How should the goal of tripling grant income by 2020 be modified?

➢ Space

The Committee similarly is concerned that the faculty recruiting target is unrealistic considering the amount and quality of available space for faculty across campus. This includes office space as well as facilities for research and graduate students. We have heard about space constraints from the deans of the three schools and colleges targeted with bulk of UCR’s growth – CNAS, Engineering, and Medicine – and were not presented with a feasible solution. The Committee is concerned that faculty recruiting will be done “on the cheap” with regard to competitive allocations of research space. Compared to the institutions with which we compete for faculty, we recommend that careful, meaningful calculation be done to determine the amount of space necessary to meet the faculty recruiting targets, and that space be identified, before additional recruiting is done. Similarly, the faculty is concerned whether there is sufficient space to admit and train more undergraduate students in the sciences and School of Medicine. We recommend that CNAS conduct a study of the utilization of space for lectures and teaching laboratories to determine the capacity of the College to admit and train students in its majors and to provide lower-division instruction, particularly in Biology, Mathematics and Physics, to undergraduates from the College of Engineering.
Retention Support
Retention of our most productive faculty poses a great threat to our aspirations. Particularly recently tenured faculty retention costs should be considered an anticipated cost of doing business. The retention process should be a strategic process and should including consideration of the costs associated with replacing existing faculty members, including initial complement. Anticipated costs should be explicitly budgeted and the process (both pre and post retention) should be transparent as to not alienate current and future faculty. Improved support and mentoring of faculty may also help reduce the number of faculty looking to leave.

Undergraduate Education and Student Success
The Office of Undergraduate Education should have a role in admissions. This has the potential to both increase the quality of our undergraduate population and increase our out-of-state population. Converting the Office of Undergraduate education to an academic unit parallel to the Graduate Division should also be considered. This is the case on the majority of UC campuses. We recommend a group be formed to study the ramification of this issue across the campus. Student success programs should be well balanced and not neglect the success of our students in upper division classes, and their efficacy should be regularly evaluated from all perspectives (student, faculty, and administration).

Joint Appointments
Joint appointments are critical to the success of the School of Public Policy and necessary for the campus to take full advantage of the School of Medicine. However, not all joint appointments have worked well in the past and agreements between the School of Medicine and other units have been elusive. There are complex issues involved, such as 9 vs. 12 month appointments, teaching expectations, and merit and promotion issues. We recommend these issues be confronted immediately by all stakeholders. These issues need to be solved.

Clustering and Consolidation
Colleges have consolidated and/or clustered services in recent years; however, the cost savings and efficacy are unclear. The Committee recommends that “user satisfaction” surveys be performed to ensure that the recent centralization and consolidation of services still provides the faculty the same level of expertise and support as when such services were maintained in departments. Clustering may be working as a budget tool but if so, it still comes at a cost of significantly decreased loss of moral among the staff and a loss of internal cohesion among the faculty staff relationship.

Budget Transparency and Consistency
Transparency of campus budgets and the budget process, including discussion of determining priorities with allocations from central administration to the college, from the college to the department and from the department to individual faculty is paramount. The College and School budgets should be published annually, as is already
the case for the University budget, and resource allocations should be transparent. Consistency demands that common methodology be implemented for budget requests, reporting, and accountability. We recommend that a comparison of budgeted and expenditures must be made for all units. For example, there should be no reason why the colleges should have to utilize unfilled FTEs (staff and faculty) to pay for staff and faculty benefits. These costs are predictable and mandatory, and we recommend that these funds be allocated from the central administration to the Colleges in full. Another example is the seeming imbalance between TA needs and workload; we recommend increasing TA needs to align with workload.

**Collaborative Budget Process**

Even at the end of the academic year CPB was not fully involved in the budget process and while we appreciate the transparent explanation from the EVCP and anticipate future meetings with the new EVCP, we would like to see the Academic Senate have a greater presence in budget presentations from all sectors of campus. We hope that this was a one-time oversight and recommend that the Committee on Planning and Budget be invited to have significant participation and more advisory input in future budgetary processes. Administrative collaboration with the faculty via the Academic Senate must be an on-going process throughout each academic year.

We look forward to continued discussion of these items and appreciate your consideration of our recommendations.

Attachment: 2013-2014 Report by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget

**cc:** J. Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division of the Academic Senate  
D. Rabenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost  
M. Anguiano, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget
2013-2014 REPORT BY THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

The UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) originates from the standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (d), which authorizes the Academic Senate to appoint committees to advise a Chancellor concerning budgets. The advice of the 2013-14 CPB is summarized in this report.

The campus has been in the process of wholesale leadership changes, with a new Chancellor, the search for a new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, appointment of a new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, the search for a new Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the search for a new Dean for the School of Graduate Education, and the naming of a permanent Dean for the School of Business Administration. At the same time, the campus is emerging from years of cuts due to the financial crisis with the prospect for growth and reinvestment. While additional funds are limited and tempered by mandated cost increases, growth is in sight and the campus has some reserve funds due to conservative budgeting during the financial crisis. This year the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) met with all academic and major non-academic units. The focus was on assessing the current state of the campus and the reality of achieving the aspirational goals laid out in UCR 2020. In short, we are excited by the prospects of growing the faculty and reinvesting in the quality of the University, but are concerned that there is no realistic and comprehensive plan to achieve the aspiration goals and that blind growth in an attempt to meet our aspirations may be risky. Quantity and quality of space, support for graduate students, and transparent budgeting top our areas of concern.

The attached recommendation summary of the committee is based on common themes that emerged from the above discussions. The summary of recommendations has been submitted to the Chancellor. Individual reports of each unit with additional recommendations are included. We also discuss changes to the campus budget process, which this year largely excluded CPB. We did submit short notes on budget principles and priorities to the new Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget. These notes are included in the report.
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REPORT ON THE GRADUATE DIVISION

Dean Childers visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on January 14, 2014. We thank him for the forthright and informative discussion.

Background

The aspirational campus goal outlined in UCR 2020 is for the number of graduate and professional students to be 20% of the total student population by 2020, up from the current 12.6%. The 20% number stems from the plan to achieve the profile of an AAU institution. The graduate population as of Fall 2013 was 2676 students, accounting for 12.6% of the total student numbers enrolled at UCR. In order to meet this goal, we would need to increase our current population by 87% in 7 years assuming a total 2020 population of 25,000 students. A breakdown of targeted levels for Ph.D. Students, Masters, and M.D. is shown in the following figure.

This figure comes from a presentation at the Chancellor’s retreat in Fall 2013. It is consistent with the long range enrollment plan submitted to the Office of the President.

Given these aspirations, a number of questions come to mind. Is there a plan to meet these aspirations? PhD. Students are expensive. How will they be supported? How will these students be distributed among the graduate programs? How effective is the Graduate Division in meeting the needs of our current students? Are there programs in place to maximize the success of current and new students?
The Graduate Division mainly distributes recruitment funds, and the majority of students are supported through T.A.s, which are allocated in the Colleges, and GSRs, which primarily comes from extramural funding for PIs. Therefore, the discussion and recommendations pertain to multiple units on campus.

Summary of Discussion Items

Graduate Student Success
Dean Childers reported that in recent years the Graduate Division has expanded services to the campus with the establishment of the Grad Success resource center. This grant-supported mentoring program has proven successful. The 100 or so self-selected 1\textsuperscript{st} year participants have an attrition rate of 3% compared to the campus rate of 12%, has become a model for other UC's, and is being expanded for students from all years. Increasing retention is the most cost-efficient means to increase the graduate population. Professional development programs include the Writing Center, which has been taken advantage of by a large portion of graduate students, a certification program for advanced pedagogical training, and professionalization workshops and seminars. CPB commends the Graduate Division for a number of new initiatives and their overall efforts in improving graduate student success.

NSF Graduate Research Fellowships
Dean Childers discussed how the Graduate Division has been active in increasing the number and quality of NSF GRPF grant proposals, with the campus averaging 12 awards over the past few years. This has been facilitated by initiatives including workshops, involvement of the writing program, and incentives to students to submit grants. This has led to a change of culture and currently results in $6M in external money to fund graduate students, and CPB feels we are on the road to future increased success.

Graduate Student Funding
We had a long discussing with Dean Childers regarding graduate student funding. The money allocated as financial aid to the Graduate Division for graduate students has increased some over the past three years, however, when taking into account increases in tuition and benefits, the amount available to programs for stipends from central fellowship funds have effectively been reduced on a per student basis. The funding of the Provost's Research Fellowship for the very best students, however, is a positive step. The Graduate Division provides fellowships, primarily for the first year or two. The bulk of funds that support graduate students over their tenure at UCR are provided by TA positions and/or externally funded GSRs. Graduate programs set their targets based on their carrying capacity and expected TA and GSR funds, and the Graduate Division reacts to those requests.

Permanent funding allocations for TAs to the colleges by the campus administration are based on a formula based on undergraduate FTEs. The Colleges receive separate supplemental funds for the overenrolled students, but at a 50% funding level. It is at the discretion of the colleges how funds are distributed among the programs. In the past, college deans added additional
support with soft funds. When the budget crisis hit, these supplements were reduced or eliminated, leading to volatility. For example, the reduced TAs resulted in CHASS dropping off in SIRS from 223 to 159 students in one year. CNAS still allots some supplemental funds for TAs to make up for the 50% funding level for the overenrolled students, but at a greatly reduced level than several years ago.

While TA funds provide the bulk of funding to graduate students, they are formula based on an undergraduate student metric and are not, in general, strategically allocated. In other words, the major source of graduate student funding is not strategically targeted to programs that have targeted growth. Unless the process is changed, this leads to an inherent tension. State support (central fellowships, TAs or state supported TAs) accounts for 70% of graduate funding in CNAS, 98% in CHASS, and 45% in BCOE. This is high compared to other UC schools. Funds to support additional graduate students will largely have to come from extramural grants and any funds generated from professional Master’s programs. Recent trends in research funding place this plan in doubt. While we expect funds to be increased with the addition of new faculty, a jump in funding per faculty in the near future cannot be assumed.

CPB feels that the Graduate Division is being run efficiently and is maximizing the use of the budgeted graduate financial aid in a time of diminishing resources, but think additional investments need to be made by the campus administration in the short term to increase the quality and quantity of graduate students. The administration should do what it can to incentivize placing graduate students on extramurally funded GSRs. One mechanism would be for the campus to support the tuition for students placed on externally funded GSRs.

Graduate Student Enrollment Planning
While the campus has aspirations to significantly grow its graduate population, we pressed Dean Childers because there is no plan to achieve these aspirations. In addition to the funding challenge, there is no study as to how these students will be distributed across programs. It will clearly be related to the corresponding increase in faculty, but without a planning process that takes into account the full picture, it appears to be unrealistic. CPB has concern that growing for growth sake is risky. Dean Childers noted that this type of planning process should come from the EVC. The last few years have been consumed with emerging from the financial crisis, and it is now time to start this discussion across campus.

Professional Masters Programs
The growth of professional masters programs is seen as a mechanism to fund PhD. students. The School of Public Policy and Medical School are clear areas that will see expansion. Dean Childers believes there are additional areas of opportunity that we not fully taking advantage of, e.g. bioinformatics, agribusiness, and engineering. CPB agrees that these programs should be developed where appropriate, but that a marketing study needs to assess these areas before they can be integrated into any planning process.
Non-Resident Tuition
The non-resident tuition (NRT) inhibits the recruiting of international students in many graduate programs. However, this is now an internal matter since the implementation of the funding streams model. With funding streams, NRT funding remains on the UCR campus (except for a 1.5-2% assessment sent to UCOP). Therefore, there is little net cost to adding a non-resident graduate student and a rebate system could be developed to eliminate this issue. We discussed this with Dean Childers, and he agreed that the removal of NRT could have large positive effects for some graduate programs, e.g. economics, comparative literature, and Spanish. CPB believes the accounting mechanism for graduate student NRT should be revamped. There may be reasons to target particular levels of domestic/international students on a program-by-program basis, but this should be a transparent policy rather than a result of a self-imposed financial factor.

Recommendations

1. An integrative planning process should take place, and it should include a thoughtful and realistic discussion on the size and shape of the graduate student population. Increases in the graduate student population are deeply related to new faculty, space, central fellowship money, TA positions, and extramural grants. A study of the job prospects for graduate students, both inside and outside of academia, must also be performed. Producing a large number of graduates with grim job prospects would have a large negative effect on the reputation of the campus. Additionally, a market study of professional masters programs should be conducted if supplemental fees and tuition from students in those programs is assumed.

2. The growth of the graduate student population is a key element of UCR 2020 and is intricately tied to the success of current and new faculty. Given today’s uncertain research funding environment, however, the campus needs to make additional strategic investments. In particular:
   a. Additional funds should be allocated to pay the in-state tuition of students on extramurally funded GSRs. This will incentivize the inclusion of more graduate students on grants, which will have the added benefit of maximizing research output and in turn lead to more and larger awards.
   b. The temporary TA money for the unfunded students (not state support, but paid tuition) should be increased to fully fund TAs at the targeted FTE levels. In addition to pedagogical reasons, this is needed to relieve the workload of our graduate students to maximize their research output, shorten their time to degree, and support graduate student growth. The additional cost will diminish as we replace our unfunded state students with out-of-state or state-funded in-state students.
   c. Additional fellowship funds to make recruitment packages competitive should be strategically allocated to attract the highest quality graduate students and shorten the time to degree. The recruitment of higher quality students will also maximize graduate student retention and minimize time to degree.
3. Changes to graduate student non-resident tuition accounting should be made. Given that non-resident tuition (NRT) remains on the campus since the funding streams model has been implemented, the non-resident fees should not be an inhibiting factor in recruiting the best students for a particular graduate program. We recommend that programs and grants be rebated for any NRT fees and for the Graduate Division to work with individual departments and programs to set a transparent policy as to the ideal fraction of international students.

4. The considerable effort required of faculty graduate admissions committees and graduate advisors should also be rewarded. This can help even out the efforts across campus and is particularly necessary as the graduate population grows. In most cases, the time and effort required greatly exceeds the “compensation” given, and the efforts are not fully recognized in merit and promotion consideration.
REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY (SPP)

Dean Deolalikar visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on January 14, 2014. We thank him for sharing the progress of the launch of the SPP and for discussing the challenges.

Background

The School of Public Policy (SPP) was approved by the UC Regents in 2008 and launched in 2013. It will have an integrated social-environmental orientation, with a focus on policy issues that affect the region such as immigration, population growth, environmental degradation, traffic congestion, suburban growth, and healthcare. The School is well aligned with the campuses strategic plan. The SPP focuses on issues concerning the local community, the Professional Graduate Degree Programs will add 200 graduate students, and include the addition of synergistic programs with the SOM, CNAS, and CHASS.

Summary of Discussion Items

Dean Deolalikar discussed the roll-out plan for the SPP, which the Committee found to be reasonable. A summary of the plan is given below.

Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

The vast majority of graduate students in the school will be in state-funded professional degree programs. In a professional degree program, one-third of tuition is mandated to go back to financial aid (but is allocated to the grad division and does not necessarily go back to the program). At least one-third of the Professional Fee Supplemental Tuition must be spent by the program for graduate student support, the remainder goes to the program.

The Master of Public Policy is the flagship program for the SPP. The proposal was approved by the campus in the Fall of 2013 and submitted for system wide review. The goal is to begin recruiting during Fall 2014, with an inaugural class of 20 to 25 students in September 2015. The number of entering students is anticipated to increase by 5 students per year, and this 2-year program will have 120 students at full build-out in 7-8 years. The top development priority is to fund a significant fraction of the inaugural class.

A joint MD-MPP program is being developed. Given the School of Medicine’s focus on community medicine and preventative health, there is strong interest in augmenting their MD degrees with public policy of public health background. It is expected that approximately 10 students in the School of Medicine’s 1st year class are interested in adding 1 year of coursework beyond their MD, graduating in 5 years with a MD and MPP.

A proposal for an MS in Global Health is in progress, and is expected to be submitted for campus approval in the near future. The 1 ½ -year program is targeted to enroll 20-25 students/year at full build-out.
A CHASS undergraduate program in public policy was developed in 2007, which has 130 majors and is increasing. The plan is to move and expand the program when there is enough faculty in the SPP and the MPP is up and running (2-3 years).

A PhD program is envisioned, but further down the road. The expected size is approximately 5 students per year. While a large PhD program is not anticipated, it is central in developing the research mission and attracting top faculty.

**SPP Faculty and Joint Appointments**

12 FTE are set aside by the administration for the SPP. The plan is for half to be joint appointments (50%) with other units. The total faculty number, then, will be 18 with 6 full time faculty and 12 with joint appointments. Most of the joint appointments will be filled by UCR faculty members who shift 50% of their position to the SPP.

Already 5-6 faculty are interested in shifting 50% of their FTE to the new school. Two recruitments for new faculty are underway, one joint with CHASS and one joint with GSOE. Next academic year, another 5-6 current faculty will transfer 50% of their FTE to the school. According to this plan, one half of the faculty lines will then be filled before arrival of the first students.

In addition to faculty, Professors of Practice, the equivalent to adjunct faculty, will play a key role in teaching specialized classes in their areas of expertise.

**Issues Noted**

The following issues came out of the discussion as critical for the success of the SPP:

1. The campus will need to determine how to successfully implement joint appointments since the limited campus experience thus far has not been favorable. In particular, merit and promotion issues for joint faculty have been problematic as there are often different expectations for teaching, service, etc. Advance planning on the evaluation process for faculty with shared FTEs is crucial.
2. The school must be vigilant in tracking student placement after graduation.
3. Adequate resources given to maintain the growth of school.
4. Adequate space. This could be a problem after a couple of years.

**Recommendations**

1. Joint appointments are critical to the success of the SPP; however, not all joint appointments have worked well in the past. We recommend these issues be confronted in advance of joint hires and steps taken toward a solution. Joint appointments are also central to taking full advantage of the School of Medicine. A plan of action should be developed between the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel, the Dean of the Colleges and Schools, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

The Committee met with VCSA Sandoval on January 21, 2014. We thank him for the informative discussion.

Background

Student Affairs is one of the largest budgetary units at UCR. The total budget for Student Affairs was $131.7, only 5% of which was General Funds and another 9% generated from student fees. These funds pay for a wide variety of student services, including Student Health Services, the Career Services Center, and the Recreation Center. VCSA Sandoval also handles the organizational functions for recruitment and admission of students.

The largest budgetary responsibilities are tied to income from Sales & Services, which funds Student Housing and Dining and the Bookstore. The unit is also responsible for maintaining physical facilities at the HUB and the Student Rec Center. These activities, together with staff benefits, account to more than 75% of the SA budget.
Summary of Discussion Items

The committee discussion touched on a variety of topics:

Housing and Dining
These operations are run on what VCSA Sandoval called a “non-profit” business model where the intent is to pay for the services without generating a profit. This turns out to be a considerable challenge – particularly with regard to dining services. While food services in the dorms are able to pay for themselves, it has been difficult to find vendors for the retail food outlets around the campus. Vendors complain that food operations are not 24/7, and there are major breaks between quarters and over the summer. Vendors therefore find on campus sites less attractive than nearby off campus sites. A second problem is the difficulty dealing with labor arrangements if UCR uses help at non-union rates. VCSA Sandoval did not have any ready fixes for these difficulties – they represent an ongoing process of negotiations.

The Campus Bookstore
Campus Bookstore has a budget of $6 million. [Note: it is unclear if the figure in the table accompanying the presentation refers to the total budget or just the “subsidy” from the campus budget. CPB assumes the latter.] The situation appears to be getting worse, not better over time. Since the visit with VC Sandoval, it’s been announced that Barnes and Noble was selected to take over bookstore operations.

Student Healthcare
We discussed the challenges of providing health services as the student population continues to grow. VCSA Sandoval emphasized the need to expand on-line assistance for student healthcare. He also stressed the shortage of psychiatric help to provide mental health for both undergraduate and graduate students. He has asked for a budget augmentation in this area to meet future needs.

Admission of New Students
VCSA Sandoval feels that a major success of his department has been to increase the quality of students coming to UCR. An important component of this has been the profiling of students using a “pipeline” that fits student needs to the UCR academic experience. These efforts have improved both the SAT scores and the GPA of incoming students over the past four years. The following graphs document that success. He emphasized that the rise in scores is evident across all three schools shown in the graph.
Organization of the Budget
We discussed at some length the difficulties of organizing the Student services budget. A situation VCSA Sandoval feels created some difficulties in setting budget priorities is that the allocation of funds from student fees is a joint decision between his office and students serving on a budget committee. The student priorities do not always coincide with those of the administration, and this makes budget decisions that are consistent with the campus 2020 goals somewhat problematic.

Recommendations

1. Roughly three quarters of the SA budget is, in effect, a business operation that lies largely outside the academic sphere that is the central concern of our committee. The committee agrees that maintaining the quality of campus housing and dining is an essential part of attracting students. We also recognize the importance of health services, and support the efforts to expand these services as our student population increases.

2. The Committee commends the efforts of VCSA Sandoval to facilitate the “pipeline” of qualified students accepted to UCR at both the graduate and undergraduate level. This is an essential part of the 2020 plan and deserves continued support.

3. While the Office of Student affairs does a fine job of processing files, CPB feels strongly that the Office of Undergraduate Education should have a role in admissions. This has the potential to both increase the quality of our undergraduate population and increase our out-of-state population.

Overall, the committee feels that the goals expressed by VCSA Sandoval are consistent with those in the present academic plan.
REPORT ON THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Interim Dean Mitchell visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on January 28th, 2014. We thank Dean Mitchell for his informative and forthright presentation.

Background

The Graduate School of Education (GSOE) is a professional school focused on graduate education, yet it recently added an undergraduate minor. The GSOE has 21.25 faculty members and 11.65 funded staff members. The GSOE also has 3.4 unfunded staff positions. The GSOE has 100 teacher credential and M.Ed. students, and 110 masters and Ph.D. students. The school offers programs of study in five graduate areas (i.e., Higher Education; Education, Society and Culture; Special Education; Educational Psychology; School Psychology) and teacher education. During the 2013-2014 academic year, three faculty searches and one Dean search were held. One of the faculty searches was successful at the time of Dean Mitchell’s visit and the Dean search is still in progress.

Summary of Discussion Items

Budget Priorities

The GSOE has four budget priorities developed to reflect the vision articulated in UCR 2020.

Priority 1 is to expand graduate student enrollment by increasing the number of faculty. The assumption inherent in this priority is that by increasing faculty, more students will want to attend the GSOE. The Dean reported the largest number of high quality graduate students have been in the school psychology doctoral program. In addition to increasing the faculty, the Dean is working to increase student enrollment by enhancing financial support packages, and more aggressively recruiting students.

Priority 2 is to support the development of the Child Wellbeing Initiative in collaboration with the School of Medicine and the School of Public Policy. A workgroup of 10 faculty from the three professional schools worked together to conceptualize the initiative. A search for a joint appointment for a director for the initiative was unable to produce a candidate this year.

Priority 3 is to expand and support the Undergraduate Minor in Education. The GSOE is offering 3 to 4 classes per quarter for the Education minor. The GSOE suggests there is a need to add 5.5 FTE of new Teaching Assistants to support the growth of the program.

Priority 4 is to expand the teacher education credential and M.Ed. programs to address an anticipated teacher shortage. GSOE’s desire to expand the teacher education program has received resistance from the administration, yet there is a substantial need for high quality teachers in the Inland Empire.
Budget Process
An annual budget request is made to key staff members in Teacher Education, Student Recruitment, Information Technology and Development. This year, a faculty retreat was held to obtain faculty input. Budget priorities were also presented to the GSOE Executive Committee and at a faculty meeting. The budget process appears to be very transparent and responsive to faculty input.

Extramural Funding
The Dean uses discretionary funds to encourage grant development. In addition, one staff member is funded to support grant development and works in collaboration with the Office of Research. Interim Dean Mitchell suggested a need to strengthen cross academic unit research support and a need by the campus (via the CALL) to formalize recognition of research proposal submission versus only recognizing grant submissions that are eventually funded.

Concerns
The problems that the GSOE are currently facing are related to space and resources. The Interim Dean expressed concern that the GSOE will be challenged to find space for new faculty hires in the near future. The GSOE is also finding it difficult to find classrooms large enough to support their Education minor classes. The Interim Dean identified a need to add 5.5 FTE TA support for Undergraduate Minor.

Benchmark Compared to UCSB
As requested by CPB, Interim Dean Mitchell provided key benchmark data from UCSB. UCSB has a 15 million dollar endowment that supports many aspects of their college. The data suggest the UCSB College of Education has approximately twice the faculty size as GSOE and significantly more than twice the number of Ph.D. students.

Effect of CSU Ed.D.
As requested by CPB, information about how the addition of the Ed.D. to CSU programs affected GSOE was included in the presentation. Interim Dean Mitchell suggested the CSU Ed.D.’s option eliminated a joint doctoral program that UCR faculty were in the midst of developing and indirectly led to the elimination of the Education Leadership and Policy program in the GSOE.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that the GSOE consider a more targeted approach to faculty recruitment designed to increase student enrollment. From the documents provided, it is unclear how the current faculty recruitment plan will lead to an increase in the number of graduate students. There are currently several faculty members in the GSOE who advise very few students, therefore it seems critical to identify why adding faculty members will lead to an increase in students. The recruitment plan does not indicate specific areas that GSOE faculty believe will attract new students.
2. CPB supports the proposed addition of new TA lines as long as the increase in positions is consistent with current guidelines.

3. The GSOE is commended for having a very transparent budget process and is encouraged to more clearly connect budget requests to UCR 2020.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (VPUE) Steven Brint, visited the Planning and Budget Committee on January 28, 2014. The Committee thanks the VP for a thorough and informative presentation and discussion.

Background

The Office of Undergraduate Education provides leadership for the University with the aim of improving the quality of undergraduate education. Its focus is to implement a series of cross-campus educational programs designed to enhance undergraduate student performance and educational experiences. This includes improving the first year learning communities, enhancing support for first generation and racial ethnic minority students, developing state-of-the-art academic support services, encouraging undergraduate research, expanding study abroad opportunities for UCR students, and improving the University Honors Program. The Office has expanded its jurisdiction in recent years, having absorbed the Academic Resource Center in 2007, the University Writing Program in 2008, Summer Sessions in 2009, and Study Abroad in 2013. UE’s mandate links up with UCR’s 2020 Strategic Plan in at least two areas: enhancing student success and improving the honors program.

Summary of Discussion Items

Learning Communities
The Colleges run the learning communities while UE funds them. Advising within these communities has suffered as a result of the past fiscal crisis. Normally there should be a student to advisor ratio of 300:1; currently it is 600:1. Being overworked, advisors have not been able to adequately guide students in planning to graduate in four years. VP Brint noted differences in performance of LCs across campus. Whereas there has been a bump in GPA and retention rates in CNAS and BCOE, there have been no such improvements shown in the CHASS LCs. Insufficient peer mentorship may have something to do with this. As a result, Vice Provost Brint has withdrawn some funds from the CHASS LCs and asked that these programs be re-designed.

Undergraduate Research
UE has expanded opportunities for students to participate in research and creative activity. VP Brint created the Chancellor’s Research Fellowship, the research symposium has expanded with 150 submissions last May, and awards have been granted to help students attend conferences.

Honors
The Vice Provost has attempted to strengthen the honors program, with a goal of having our students win Rhodes and other prestigious scholarships, and exploring the possibility of establishing an honors college. He notes that not enough faculty have agreed to take on course honors sections in part because Departments are not receiving enough buyout funds to make it worthwhile. The Committee discussed the option of reducing the number of sections and
having larger buyouts, or keeping the same number of sections and requesting more funds from the campus.

**UE as an Academic Unit**

A major reorganizational issue was a proposal by CPB, for UE to become an academic unit. Vice Provost Brint believes such a move does make sense because UE already runs courses, awards degrees, and reviews student petitions in the summer. The academic programs run by the Office of Undergraduate Education, e.g. University Honors, could then be housed more naturally in a Division of Undergraduate Affairs. This conversion may be resource neutral and would give greater prominence to undergraduate education because the Vice Provost would then sit on the Dean’s Council, as does the Dean of the Graduate Division (with which UE shares some similarities).

**Admissions**

Currently, UE has no direct responsibility for admissions, though the Vice Provost has been actively involved in enrollment issues. VP Brint believes that admissions, now under the jurisdiction of the Office of Student Affairs, should be shifted to UE. The Committee raised questions about the extensive paperwork involved in processing applications and whether this might place an undue burden on UE. Though reading transcripts and statements is fairly routine and can be handled by staff, there is not, according to VP Brint, a clean division between paperwork and analysis, and thus academic assessments must be made. More importantly, there are outreach functions that demand faculty input, such as working with feeder high schools to improve student preparation for entering the university, and improving recruitment strategies for attracting better students to UCR. In general, there is a need for improved analytical studies regarding admissions, better outreach and recruitment, and closer articulation of requirements for success in campus majors with admissions criteria. All of this could be enhanced should admissions come under UE’s purview.

**Graduation rates, racial diversity and advising**

The Vice Provost issued a comprehensive report on graduation rates, indicating that an increase in admission standards in CNAS, BCOE and CHASS has had no negative impact on the racial diversity of the student body. The VP said a better job still needs to be done to recruit top-ranked minority students to UCR. As far as prospective business students are concerned, he recommends that CHASS adopt a program of early advising for students thinking of entering SOBA. The difficulty is that students who major in business and don’t attend SOBA have much poorer graduation rates than those who do attend SOBA. Majoring in Economics is not yet an option for the pre-business students who lack the math skills. VP Brint believes we need a balanced approach, which recruits better pre-business students with enhanced math skills, so that some percentage of these students can feed into majors like economics, relieving SOBA which cannot absorb all of them.

**UE Staff**

There is a critical need for more advisors, additional tutors in the ARC staff, and a staff person for honors. The most critical staff need is in Human Relations, owing to the absorption of
several campus units in recent years, and responsibilities UE has in dealing with employee grievances.

Recommendations

1. The Committee believes that notwithstanding budget limitations, UE has performed remarkably well. It has absorbed new units and developed new programs which have helped to enhance the educational performance and experience of our undergraduates.

2. The Committee proposes converting UE into an academic unit parallel to the structure devised for the Graduate Division. This is the case on the majority of UC campuses. We recommend for a group be formed to study the implications and implementation.

3. The Committee also believes that the VPUE should play a more active role in admissions, which is more likely to occur should certain admissions functions be placed within UE’s jurisdiction.

4. The Committee also acknowledges the importance of UE making additional staff hires.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Vice Chancellor Pazzani visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on February 6, 2014. We thank him for a forthright and informative discussion.

Background

The UCR Strategic Plan requires that the campus greatly increase its grant income. VC Pazzani stated that UCR must more than triple its annual grant income from its current amount of $63.8 M in 2012 to $200 M in 2020.¹

There are three main routes toward tripling grant income:

1. Increasing the total number of grant awards per faculty member.
2. Increasing the size of the faculty.
3. Assisting the faculty to secure larger grants.

Certainly all must occur, and all require a more active and engaged Office of Research, now the Office of Research and Economic Development (RED), than was the case before the UCR Strategic Plan was adopted.

Summary of Discussion Items

Vice Chancellor Pazzani presented data showing that UCR lagged comparator institutions in R&D expenditures, recognizing that many comparators had established medical schools that contributed 50 – 60% of the funds attributed to our comparators. He then provided the committee his thoughts toward tripling our grant income, either in total or from all Federal granting agencies and emphasized increasing the effort for UCR faculty to work in teams toward obtaining more NSF awards over $1 M.

It was VC Pazzani’s view that UCR faculty had not been encouraged to think on the scale necessary for a tripling of grant income, and UCR had not developed the infrastructure to assist and encourage the faculty to apply for large grants (i.e., over $1 M). Simultaneously, UCR policies and procedures seem prohibitive and cumbersome, in his experience, if UCR is to achieve such a lofty goal.

The committee was pleased to see the growth and reinvigoration of the Office of Research and Economic Development since the arrival of VC Pazzani. Although the committee appreciated VC Pazzani’s perception of the campus administrative culture and the need to improve the

¹ In a meeting with another administrator $43.1M was cited as the current baseline figure for direct C&G federal expenditures, requiring that the campus nearly quintuple grant income. The discrepancy may come from whether indirect costs are included or in the definition of federal C&G expenditures. CPB was unable to resolve this discrepancy and focuses here only on VC Pazzani’s goal of tripling annual grant income.
grantsmanship of the faculty overall, the committee also was skeptical of: 1) the ability of the RED office to change the administrative culture on the campus and 2) how effective the campus efforts will be to increase funding success. Members noted that all of our competitors are also making efforts to increase their success in securing extramural grants, so what is needed is not simply for UCR to improve its extramural funding success, but to improve our funding success more than our competitors are improving theirs.

VC Pazzani’s budgetary requests focused upon increasing RED staff in anticipation of additional clinical trials research proposed by the UCR SOM and to provide better training to campus staff in the preparation and submission of grants on behalf of the faculty.

Recommendations

1. A careful, integrative planning process should be undertaken to determine realistic targets for increasing extramural grant income from Federal agencies under current and foreseeable Federal budgetary constraints. Anecdotal evidence from a recent NSF panel member suggests, for example, that, whereas available funds are essentially unchanged since 2002, the number of proposals has increased 2.5 times. Flat funding coupled with increases in the number of grant applications has several implications for UCR’s ability to achieve its goals for increased Federal funding under UCR 2020. Thus, the committee recommends careful consideration be given to the following questions under the current, austere, opportunities for Federal funding:
   a) What funding rates should be expected for faculty in different disciplines?
   b) What size of grants should be expected for faculty in different disciplines?
   c) How should the goal of tripling grant income by 2020 be modified?

2. The Committee, however, encourages the Research & Economic Development office to continue to question and change campus procedures and culture that inhibit the process of grant preparation and submission and inhibit collaboration across academic units.

3. The Committee also support continued strategic investment in RED to continue to better support faculty in their pursuit of extramural support.
REPORT ON THE OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR AND UCR CAMPUS BUDGET

Executive Vice Chancellor Rabenstein visited the Senate committee on Planning and Budget on 11 February 2014. We thank him for an informative discussion and a transparent view into the 2013/2014 Campus Budget process.

Summary of Discussion Items

Campus Budget
EVC Rabenstein noted that while the two categories of 1) Systemwide state funds and 2) tuition and fees account for 37% of the total UC budget, those two categories account for 62% of the UCR budget. This means that because UCR is much more dependent on state funding than larger campuses, it has been adversely affected by the recent budget cuts much more so than most other campuses. One of the ways that UCR can grow funding in the future is to increase grant support from federal mechanisms (research grants) as well as from philanthropic sources. Another way is to gradually replace the unfunded undergraduates with non-resident undergraduates.

EVC Rabenstein’s sobering presentation pointed out that UCR remains $73M behind what we need in permanent funding because of unfunded mandates of $65.6M and a $7.4M deficit due to residual budget cuts that were not restored in 2013/2014. This also includes increases in UCRP costs that remain unfunded. Finally, although we have had an increase in support from UC Systemwide after the passage of Proposition 30, UCR remains in a deficit position that increases at a rate of 3.5% a year (the costs of running the University increase at 6% a year but we only reserve a 2.5% a year increase in funds from the State). At this point the University is still not in a positive position, but the central administration looks forward to improving the situation with several initiatives including increasing faculty numbers to meet the UCR 2020 goals.

The budget was still not firm at the date of our meeting.

Enrollment Targets, Increases in Enrollment and Overenrolled Students
EVC Rabenstein reminded us that to meet the aspirations of an AAU University, UCR should increase the student body up to 25,000 students by 2021. To achieve this goal the current number of domestic students will increase slightly, but the aim is to increase the number of non-resident undergraduate students by 350% so that by 2021, 10% of the total undergraduate student body that will pay non-resident tuition. Non-residents include both domestic out-of-state and foreign students. The majority are expected to be foreign. The non-resident tuition paid by these students will substantially increase the campus funds (~$30M) on an annual basis. In addition to the undergraduate growth, the University plans to increase the graduate student population by 88% so that the proportion of graduate students relative to undergraduate students is larger and more aligned with AAU Universities.
There is still a problem of over-enrolled students on the campus because while we gain the tuition dollars, we are not funded for them by the State. Additional resources for teaching those students must come from the UCR central administration to each of the colleges. Those costs are distributed in temporary funds within each College budget allocation annually. Although EVC Rabenstein believes that those funds are sufficient, the Colleges are still finding themselves short of funds to adequately cover teaching costs (lecturers and teaching assistants). Although the colleges still spend the money on appropriate sources, it is difficult to determine where that money goes and if it is spent effectively. Nonetheless, planning and budget’s evaluation of the college budgets was that the money is generally used for teaching resources (specifically teaching assistantships) that matches that allocated in the temporary and permanent lines.

Therefore, it is not clear why there is an inconsistency between what the EVC allocates to the colleges and what the actual expenditures are. Furthermore it is not clear, in the University budgetary planning process, that there have been sufficient funds allocated to fully educate the unfunded students. It may be unreasonable to expect that we can educate those students for the cost of their tuition alone.

**Unfilled faculty FTE, increase in faculty numbers and retention of faculty**

EVC Rabenstein believes that it is crucial that the faculty numbers grow by 250 faculty members by 2021. This would bring the total to 910 faculty members and would require that new faculty be hired at a rate of 36/year. This year (2013/2014) the university had initiated 99 searches. Of that 99, approximately 30 will be used to replace current positions, and with a predicted 68% success rate, the campus will grow by 47 faculty members. The first 100 new faculty positions will be funded from:

i. the 2011/2012 faculty allocation that was used for other purposes during the budget cut (44.4 positions)
ii. the current unfunded positions in the School of Public Policy (12 positions)
iii. the Writing Program (13 positions)
iv. Summer Session (23.6 positions)
v. Operational Research Lines (7 positions).

The remaining 150 faculty members will come from other open provisions in the Summer Session and the Writing Program as well as monies available from the addition NRTs that come to campus.

By increasing the faculty numbers, the EVC hopes that the extramural dollars coming to campus will triple and that the overhead funds obtained from that money would support further growth.

It was unclear exactly where the initial complement funds for new faculty members in the sciences will come from; however, the increased revenue generated by greater grant overhead dollars will help to defray those costs. The increased revenue coming from non-resident tuition must be used for educating those students and defraying the costs of education in general. As
such it is important that those non-resident dollars be used for the education mission rather than the research mission (initial complement) and other campus costs.

Another point that should be addressed is the fact that there is a well-recognized declining emphasis on funding for the sciences and thus, declining funding rates. While it is acceptable to ask that the faculty maintain or increase their attempts to bring in those grant dollars it is risky to depend on that income to fund critical initiatives on campus.

**UCR vs. UCSB**

EVC Rabenstein suggested that the comparison between UC Riverside and UC Santa Barbara is counterproductive and misinformed for a variety of reasons. First UCSB is budgeted for more than 4000 more students than is UCR so they receive about $25M more from the state. In addition they do not have unfunded students. Furthermore UCSB brings more grant dollars in than UCR in all disciplines except in the life sciences. Thus the indirect cost recovery at UCSB is approximately $24M more than UCR. These two factors make the comparison between the two campuses unrealistic. CPB notes that our aspirational targets most closely mimic UCSB, so such a comparison is instructive.

**Recommendations**

1. Even at the end of the academic year P&B was not fully involved in the budget process and while we appreciate the transparent explanation from the EVC, we would like to see the Academic Senate have a greater presence in budget presentations from all sectors of campus. We hope that this was a one-time oversight and recommend that the Committee on Planning and Budget be invited to have significant participation and more advisory input in the budgetary process in the future.

2. We recommend that the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget and the EVC’s office revisit the formula used to determine teaching resource allocations from the central administration to the colleges to determine if, indeed, funding is sufficient to match the stated needs.

3. It appears that in planning for future hires the EVC and the Office of Planning and Budget have creatively used the potential for finally filling much needed faculty lines and using the hoped for non-resident tuition to defray remaining costs. While there is no question that the UCR faculty number should grow in the future, this plan is at best risky if any of the targets (non-resident students, grant income, etc.) are not reached and at worse unrealistic. In addition this plan may be cutting the campus budget very close, leaving little for other purposes across the campus. It is recommended that these plans be revisited regularly by the new Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget and the new Executive Vice Chancellor to determine if the plans are still sound. Likewise, it is important that the University be able to step back from plans in the event of other financial problems.
4. Because of the important role that graduate students play in the research enterprise as well as in teaching we feel it is important that there are adequate resources put into each college to support graduate researchers and teaching assistants. Strategic investment of resources into maintaining graduate student support is necessary to promote the work that will ultimately lead to greater faculty funding. The planned increase of graduate student numbers by 88% cannot be solely paid for by an aspiration to obtain more federal grant funds. In an environment of uncertain federal support for basic research dollars, it is critical that this goal of UCR 2020 be carefully reconsidered.
REPORT ON THE UCR LIBRARIES

University Librarian Steven Mandeville-Gamble visited the Committee on Planning and Budget on February 11, 2014. We thank him for an informative and forthright discussion.

Background

Steven Mandeville-Gamble came to UCR in March 2013. His background included extensive experience in the creation and management of digital and physical collections. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble came to UCR with “a vision for how to surface the campus needs around the libraries and the services they could be providing but also recognized the need to tailor that vision to meet the UCR community needs”. He presented an ambitious plan to realize this vision and contribute to the campus strategic plan for 2020.

Summary of Discussion Items

Our discussion with Librarian Mandeville-Gamble covered a wide range of issues dealing with the UCR libraries and some major challenges facing all university libraries in the context of the digital revolution.

Use of Library Space and Resources

We began with the question of how students use the resources of the UCR libraries. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble noted that one of the most persistent requests by student groups is a need to keep the libraries open for longer hours. The obvious constraint on longer hours is the limit on allocation of staff time to maintain the longer hours. Another use of library resources by students is the availability of study spaces. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble noted that the current study rooms are heavily used, and they are also in need of major upgrades to make them “smart” rooms in terms of technology. He illustrated what he would like to see by describing North Carolina State University’s Hunt Library, where the walls of study rooms were completely covered by “whiteboard” – including the hallways. He mentioned the possibility of getting outside funds to help upgrade the study facilities.

Improvements to Search Tools to Access our Holdings

Librarian Mandeville-Gamble feels that our present search tools for locating UCR holdings are inadequate. We do not have a “One Stop” technology for locating items in our own collection, or in other collections. In fact, third party vendors were better at locating materials in our own collection than our own search engines. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble feels UCR should make use of third-party vendors rather than developing our own search software. He would like to use our resources for getting and training staff members who can employ the new technology.

Information literacy

We have moved from a world where the problem facing those searching for information has changed from a scarcity of data to a world of information abundance. Libraries must train their staffs to be in a position to develop skills in our students on how to identify which sources are
reliable. We spent several moments discussing the merits and pitfalls of Wikipedia as an example of the difficulty of assessing information when too much information is available. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble regards the challenge of improving “information literacy” to be of paramount importance to our students in the 21st century.

Electronic Books or Paper Books
Several committee members commented that digital books posed some problems with regard to ease of reading and restrictions on downloading of information. They asked for Librarian Mandeville-Gamble’s views on the use of digital books. He agreed that there were areas of inquiry such as art history and chemistry where digital books simply did not work and suggested that it was important to make sure the information in our collection was in the most “usable” format.

Books and Space Considerations
The obvious advantage of digital information is that it takes far less space to store than printed material. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble suggested that better inventory management of our printed collections might free up a considerable amount of space for new printed material. He cited his experience at Washington University, where they determined that 25% of books had not been used in 10 years, and hopes to institute a similar study at UCR.

Intellectual Property Rights and Open Access Policies
A major challenge facing libraries is the issue of intellectual property rights and access to academic journals. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble noted what amounts to a revolution in the rising costs of academic journals. The inflation rate on journals is 8.5% per year – which will eventually bankrupt most university libraries. Options to deal with this problem are limited until publishers come up with a sustainable business model that can deal with the issue of who is actually going to “pay” for the journals. At the moment the librarian feels that libraries are in the middle of the struggle over intellectual property rights and open access. His suggestions for dealing with the problem include: 1) support journals with a sustainable business model; 2) centralized purchase of journals through UCOP California Digital Library; and 3) have libraries negotiate with journals over the costs.

General Budget Considerations
Librarian Mandeville-Gamble communicated that his major budget challenges are:

- Hiring new staff with skills to implement the ideas discussed above. Investing in hiring and training of staff is the best way to improve the availability of services and collections at the libraries.
- Instituting access to third party software to enhance the search capabilities of our collections.
- Upgrading the study spaces to the status of “smart rooms” with better technology.
- Keeping up with inflation. He estimates that we lose $250,000 a year simply in the costs of journals each year.
- Finding ways to lengthen the hours the library is open to students.
• Developing a more sophisticated metric that compares program to program so that we can put funds where they can offer the most support for our strongest programs

Recommendations

1. The Library system is at the heart of our academic community. Librarian Mandeville-Gamble has outlined an ambitious program to maintain the quality of the UCR libraries. We support the direction of his “vision”.

2. The recommendations to upgrade study areas to “smart rooms” should receive strong consideration. It seems unlikely that this can be accomplished in a single budget cycle; the sooner such renovations can be done, the better.

3. The recommendation for third party search engines to create a “one stop” technology for searching not only our holdings, but those of other libraries should be vigorously pursued.

4. CPB suggests a cost-benefit analysis, including the effect on the purchase of new books, of all the IT tools being proposed.

5. Some sort of “task force” or “study group” should be set up to study the problems surrounding intellectual property. The library seems to be at a nexus of this problem and is therefore in the best position to head such a group.

6. The faculty must vet any ‘optimization’ of the library’s functions.
REPORT ON THE BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Dean Reza Abbaschian visited the Senate committee on Planning and Budget on March 11, 2014. We thank him for a forthright, informative, and insightful discussion.

Background

The specific mission of BCOE is to produce engineers with nationally recognized research which contributes to knowledge and provides curriculum that inspires creativity and imagination in students. In doing this BCOE also is interested in focusing in the Inland Empire by helping with industrial goals and new industries in our local region. With nine degree granting departments and eight centers that are collaborative across the campus, they are well situated to move towards that goal. Right now they are 38th among top public university Engineering programs according to US News and World Report, and in the top quartile of the NRC rankings. The college is planning on new online master’s degree granting programs in Energy and Civil Engineering.

Summary of Discussion Items

Bourns College of Engineering Vision and Alignment with UCR 2020

BCOE’s goal is to be in the top 25 colleges of engineering in the world, which put it in line with the campus strategic plan. In order to accomplish this, BCOE has ambitious plans to increase faculty numbers by 53%, increase the undergraduate student numbers by 30%, and increase graduate student numbers by 43%. Dean Abbaschian argued that BCOE is well poised to achieve the goal as rankings of UC Colleges of Engineering are proportional to the number of faculty and BCOE is currently ranked where it should be given the current faculty size. In addition, the college wants to increase the number of faculty who hold endowed chairs by more than 500% so that by 2020 one third of faculty positions are endowed (48 faculty members). Dean Abbaschian stressed the point that they cannot achieve the goals required to become an AAU University unless faculty numbers are enhanced so that the number of PhD students per faculty can be maintained and there is a balance struck between the numbers of graduate and undergraduate students.

Finally, Dean Abbaschian pointed out that faculty in BCOE are doing very well at attracting federal research funding. The current average annual federal direct cost coming to UCR in BCOE is $308K/faculty whereas the campus average is $170K per year. This suggests that BCOE is well situated to attract high quality faculty who will improve our position in national rankings.

Resources needed to meet the BCOE hiring plan

Dean Abbaschian emphasized what this committee has heard from all the Deans, that the most important need is space to house new faculty and teach the growing student population. He noted that EBU 3 is in the queue and would be ‘shovel ready’ when sufficient funds are identified. In the interim, Dean Abbaschian has requested space in Pierce Hall to house incoming faculty.
The next most important need is an increase in the budgeted amount for initial complement (IC). In Engineering the average IC is $600K. On average the central administration has provided $150K of these funds and the college has had to find $450K from its own sources such as money from indirect cost recovery. Those funds are insufficient to support the expected faculty growth so the college looks to the central administration to either start to fund a much greater percentage of all IC packages or to provide the college with a greater proportion of the indirect cost recovery funds.

A third need that was identified by Dean Abbaschian was for faculty retention to be made a higher priority in the eyes of central administration and the Executive Vice Chancellor’s Office. As pointed out by other Deans, the EVC’s office does not entertain a request to retain faculty unless they come with an offer from another University. Yet, often by the time an offer has been made in writing too much negotiation has transpired and the faculty is beyond the point where they will accept our retention offer. He did point out one example of a pre-emptive retention this last year which was much appreciated. The committee agrees that the EVC should be more nimble with respect to these offers and have more faith in the College Dean’s and Department Chairs when they report the potential of losing highly-valued colleagues. Dean Abbaschian would like to see the EVC’s office be willing to give more money to retain faculty early in their negotiation with other Universities. A very compelling argument that supports Dean Abbaschian’s point of view is that many times the faculty member in question has a well-supported research program with expensive equipment. When that faculty member leaves the university the University loses $2-3M in research income as well as expensive equipment. Those faculty members are then replaced by younger, less experienced faculty so it leaves the college behind.

Two Year Staffing and Budget Comparison of the College
The college budget has increased by $2.6 M over the last two years but most of that increase was necessary to support merit increases of the existing staff. The actual increase to the college budget over and above those necessary increases has been $151K. This money has been used to hire 1.5 new staff FTEs in the College. This funding rate has not been enough to support the growth that is planned and this will have to change if we are to achieve much larger student and faculty numbers.

Campus Student Growth and Support
Since 2006 undergraduate number have grown more than projected, faculty numbers have fallen below, and the number of graduate students has stayed on projection. The college attempted to implement a more selective freshman acceptance rate because the college currently loses 2/3 of those students to other parts of the campus or as a result of them leaving the University. In addition, the college is focusing more on students who transfer to the college in their junior year. This would place a smaller load on the faculty and allow faculty to focus on those students who will be successful while maintaining attention to their own research. Currently, Dean Abbaschian feels that faculty are saddled with responsibilities for undergraduate students which often causes the faculty to be less effective at their primary mission than they could be.
Out-of-state students would also be acceptable to the college as long as there was some kind of an incentive for the faculty to spend time recruiting those students from out of state or internationally. Dean Abbaschian also suggested that if they were able to implement online Master’s Degree programs to non-resident students, up to half of the student tuition and fee money would be available to pay for Teaching Assistants. The online funds would build up those TA resources.

As the other Deans have suggested, Dean Abbaschian reported that there is never enough money in the budget to cover the TA FTE that would be sufficient to adequately cover classes. Since 2006, the Graduate students in BCOE have increased 92% and the Undergraduates have increased by 88%. Nonetheless, they have received regularly only 29.7 TA FTEs until this year when they received an additional 1.7 FTE. This total of 31.7 TA FTE must cover 2300 students. This is far too few TAs and represents only a 5.7% increase in 8 years.

The same problem occurs with lecturers. Lecturer salaries come from unfilled faculty lines. In BCOE this yields $250K per year, but supporting lecturers costs $806K/year so the remaining $550K must come from the college. This last year BCOE received a one-time injection of $250K from overenrolled students. Dean Abbaschian suggests, and the committee agrees, that there should be better long term planning so that those costs that can be anticipated are guaranteed to be covered into future years.

UCR vs. UCSB
In almost all metrics, UCR receives less support for academic purposes than UCSB. This is true for BCOE as it is for other colleges. The funding rate in the college of engineering is $6K/student whereas at UCSB that funding rate is more than twice as high at $14K/student. With a similar funding rate the BCOE could use the $17.4M difference to support more TAs. Campus-wide UCSB receives $535M while we receive $536M, yet UCSB is able to afford 830 faculty while we are only able to afford 673 faculty. The committee is concerned that we still do not understand the reason for this discrepancy.

Collaborations between BCOE and the general campus
Dean Abbaschian reported that BCOE has been successful partly because it has been active in generating collaborations across colleges for several years. There are many examples of IGERTS and other training grants or collaborative proposals between several of the colleges and CNAS, SOBA, and CHASS. He suggests that the faculty are doing a great job so it is important to not saddle them with more responsibilities that may make them less effective.

Finally, Dean Abbaschian suggested that his faculty seek out development and advancement funds directly. They have not found that campus advancement adds value to their fundraising efforts. Their long term goal is to seek more support from foundations and private sources to begin to grow the number of endowed chairs.
Recommendations

1. We recommend that the campus support Dean Abbaschian’s plans for the building of EBU3 by working with UCOP to find the funds. This building is ‘shovel ready’ and building could start in very short order with little planning. We also recommend, as with other colleges, that the campus do space utilization studies to determine the space available for BCOE. In general, across campus space must be made a top priority before we can house the new faculty we want to hire.

2. We recommend that the administration either pay for a larger fraction of the initial complement or return a larger fraction of indirect costs to the college and faculty. A study of how our sister campuses allocate IC should be performed.

3. It is clear that, as in other colleges, faculty retentions in BCOE must be made a higher priority and that the central administration must act more quickly and be flexible in making retention offers before it is too late to keep a highly-valued faculty member from leaving UCR.

4. Along with the above priorities, if the campus is going to be able to sustain the growth projected, it is important that BCOE receive enough funds in Teaching FTE (TAs and Lecturers) to support the growing student population. Thus, the committee recommends increasing the amount of permanent teaching funds allocated annually to BCOE so that they can plan for teaching needs more than a year or two into the future.
REPORT ON UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

Dean Duffy visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on March 18th, 2014. We thank her for a forthright, informative, and insightful discussion.

Background

University Extension (UNEX) is organized around several departments that include programs focused on many topics including education credentials, older adults, science, nursing, technology, and international students. The majority of UNEX’s domestic students are enrolled in classes to improve or change their occupation status. UNEX has one of the largest international student programs in the country that serves approximately 5,000 students per year. International students come from China, Japan, India, Brazil, Spain, Turkey, and several other countries. UNEX employs about 130 staff members with a large proportion of the staff members used to support the international programs. UNEX’s goals are aligned with UCR’s 2020 strategic plan. There is a standing Academic Senate committee focused on UNEX programs and courses.

Summary of Discussion Items

A large part of the discussion focused on UNEX’s international programs and mechanisms used to support international students. UNEX has several campus partnerships focused on international students including programs designed to help students from China gain admission into the University of California or another North American university, and targeted concurrent enrollment with SOBA and Engineering. UNEX also has partnerships with two Japanese universities and a center in Korea, and the UC President’s new UC Mexico initiative may result in a large influx of students from Mexico as well.

UNEX is self-supporting and produces almost all of its revenue through tuition. UNEX is currently in a growth period and has been able to use recent revenue to improve facilities and support systems (e.g., student information system). Due to the recent growth, UNEX has leased the top floor of University Village and may lease other parts of the building if necessary. UNEX has been able to create financial reserves that are primarily designed to support their mortgage responsibilities if the enrollment revenue decreases substantially.

UNEX pays for several campus and UCOP systems, and also splits concurrent enrollment tuition at a 50-50 rate with campus departments. It was not clear whether the UNEX portion for concurrent enrollment students (50% for domestic and 75% for international), which are historic numbers, is justified. Approximately, 30% of UNEX revenues come from on-line programs attended primarily by students in the local region. UNEX is currently engaged in a strategic planning process designed to identify the best way to deliver education to future students. UNEX also supports the campus by providing several departments student advisors who are focused on non-matriculated students who are concurrently enrolled. Concurrent
enrollment students are accepted into classes if space is available after UCR students have enrolled.

**Recommendations**

1. CPB recognizes the value of the programs under the direction of University Extension. One area of possible concern is in concurrent enrollment of students. This has been a useful revenue source for some departments, but space considerations and growing enrollments have made it increasingly difficult to accommodate students in key classes.

2. We recommend UNEX produce a complete accounting of the expenses associated with concurrent enrollment students, separating foreign and domestic.
REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (SOBA)

Dean Wang visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on March 11, 2014. We thank him for sharing the budget and discussing the challenges and opportunities for SOBA.

Background

The School of Business Administration at the University of California, Riverside has provided students with a research-based education in the field of business. One of only three University of California schools that offer both an undergraduate and graduate component, the School of Business Administration is a professional school that offers students a unique opportunity to obtain business degrees at both undergraduate and graduate level. The school is almost 40 years old but has a checkered history due, at least in part, to inconsistent leadership and internal conflicts. Dean Wang has been the interim dean for last few years and was appointed the permanent dean recently after a limited search. He was an associate dean of SOBA before he became interim dean.

Summary of Discussion Items

Dean Wang discussed the budget plan for the SOBA, which the Committee found to be rather ambitious given the many constraints. A summary of the plan is given below.

Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

The SOBA graduate program has 294 students, well below the system average of ~850 students. The vast majority of graduate students in the school are in state-funded professional degree programs. The regular Masters in Business Administration (MBA) is the flagship program for SOBA and may be used to rank the MBA programs in business schools. Besides the state funded MBA program there is an identical self-supported Flex MBA program whose students take classes with regular MBA students. There are three self-supported programs: Accounting (MPAc), Finance (MFin) and the FlexMBA, which was originally created by previous dean (Dave Stewart) and is operational now.

The undergraduate program is the largest in the UC system at 1227 students, primarily because of the large demand for a business degree, but also because for a long time UCR was the only other school in the UC system with an undergraduate business program besides UC Berkeley. In comparison, UCB and UCI have 725 and 388 undergraduate students respectively. A small but growing minority of the business undergraduates are in the MBPP program, which recruits students from Chinese universities through UCR Extension. The school has recently undergone a difficult AACSB reaccreditation process, the final result of which is still pending. The administration released a large number of SOBA’s existing faculty lines this year to address a key concern of the reaccreditation committee. The undergraduate program was reviewed by the Academic Senate this year and the comments should be carefully evaluated when released. Self-supporting programs are new and mostly comprise of students from China. While they are used as a funding mechanism, its role in fulfilling UC objectives should be carefully evaluated.
SOBA Faculty Recruitment, Separation, and Budget
SOBA has had tremendous faculty turnover in past years, e.g. during the last two years, 8 new faculty have been hired and 9 have separated. Overall, the size of SOBA faculty has shrunk. The difficulty of faculty hiring and retention is a major issue for the campus and for the school’s accreditation. Dean Wang presented a comparison between SOBA and their UC counterparts. SOBA’s state allocation and operating budget per student is the lowest in the system, and significantly below the average. At face value, one may conclude that there has been an underinvestment in the school. However, the School’s checkered past of internal conflicts and leadership issues over a number of years are at least part of the explanation. In the current year SOBA is searching for 13 faculty lines, and has been able to attract five new faculty members so far. At this rate the plan to grow the faculty size to 46 from 23 by 2015-16 seems unrealistic. Dean Wang spoke about internal faculty problems within the school although is not clear from his statements if the internal problems are still ongoing or their source.

UC Caliber Business School
Both in Dean Wang’s presentation and in SOBA’s budget request executive summary, it is stressed that SOBA strives to become a UC caliber business school by 2020. This is clearly a worthwhile goal; however, the roadmap to achieving it is not at all clear to the committee. Dean Wang would like to increase the size of the professional graduate program from the current 299 to 384 by 2016-17, which will increase the revenue from the self-supporting program significantly. However, to be a UC caliber school, the quality of the students and their placement has to increase significantly. Dean Wang was unable to provide statistics on the UG student placement; CPB will follow-up next year.

Issues Noted
The following issues came out of the discussion as critical for the success of the SOBA:
1. SOBA seems to have had internal problems, and the large faculty turnover indicates deep underlying issues. Without a critical impartial review, it is not clear if those internal problems are still present and will pose a roadblock in moving forward.
2. The schools hiring plan seems to be unrealistic based on recent history.
3. Adequate space will be a problem after a couple of years.
4. The size of the undergraduate program appears to be too large.
5. It does not appear that there is a clear strategic roadmap to become a UC caliber school by 2020.
6. While self-supporting programs can generate significant funds, their contribution to the goal of UC should be critically evaluated.

Recommendations
1. CPB believes the Dean’s assessment is overly optimistic and too ambitious given the residual effect of past disturbances in the school. We suggest that an outside expert committee or consultants perform a comprehensive review of all business school programs including the size of the undergraduate program, analyze SOBA’s strengths and
weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and recommend the best possible direction for the school to succeed.

2. CPB recommends that future budget proposals and hiring plans be revisited in light of recommendations made by the above committee.
REPORT ON THE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT (VCUA)

VCUA Peter Hayashida visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on March 18, 2014. We thank him for sharing the budget and discussing the challenges and opportunities for University Advancement.

Background

University Advancement (UA) at UCR consists of four primary activities; alumni relations, strategic communications, development/fundraising and advancement administration and service. A key goal of UA is to raise public awareness of UCR’s excellence in knowledge creation, knowledge dissemination and service to the state and nation to secure public and private resources which enhances these academic activities in the campus. UA’s efforts benefit faculty and students directly through research support and scholarship as well as builds leading edge facilities and equipment’s that facilitates discovery, creation and dissemination of knowledge.

Summary of Discussion Items

VCUA Peter Hayashida spoke at length and answered questions about all aspects of university advancement including its budget. His presentation was thoughtful and engaging. VCUA Hayashida noted that the three key priorities of UA are (i) Building a Sustainable Culture of Philanthropy at UCR, (ii) Enhancing UCR’s National Profile (iii) Planning and Executing a Comprehensive Campaign. These are discussed below along with other discussion items.

Building a Sustainable Culture of Philanthropy

Building a sustainable culture for philanthropy requires the DNA of philanthropy to be assimilated into the campus culture. A multi prong approach of increasing focus on donor stewardship, expanding faculty staff and student engagement around philanthropy, leveraging and supporting the academic leaders’ strength, improving student and family experience and providing appropriate support for new campus initiatives and priorities can create such a culture at UCR. VCUA Hayashida noted that the campus has started several such new initiatives, such as a Dance Marathon, Student Philanthropy Week, and Philanthropic focused content across all types of media platform. These initiatives along with expanding the staff support for donor stewardship is moving the campus in the right direction.

Enhancing UCR’s National Profile

UCR’s national profile has increased rapidly in last few years starting with the Living The Promise campaign in 2012. However, compared to our sister schools UCR still has a long way to go and maintaining the momentum and continuity of national outreach cannot be overemphasized. Building a communication infrastructure for comprehensive brand building initiative is absolutely necessary. Some of the key initiatives in this area include permanently funding the Living The Promise campaign, hiring in-house campaign capacity and expertise, and expanding production and cross platform dissemination of digital media. Finally, positioning
the Chancellor and other faculty as thought leaders in the issues of access, diversity and academic excellence would provide national recognition to the campus.

Planning and Executing a Comprehensive Campaign
Currently UCR is in a comprehensive campaign based on UCR 2020. This is an ambitious fund raising initiative in UCR’s history with several major mile stones having been achieved so far. A campaign consultant, Marts and Lundy has been hired, and the initial feasibility study has been completed. The campaign has entered the quiet phase with the approval from UC president. So far approximately 96 million dollars, 24% of the goal has been raised. The campaign will go to public mode when 40-50% of the goal is achieved. Some of the current priorities of the campaign include raising leadership gifts, engaging faculty and academic leadership and creating volunteer campaign committees.

Private support and gifts
VCUA Hayashida noted that while the gifts and support trend has increased after flat lining during recession years, it has taken a dip in current years. This he believes is linked to the change in top leadership. The following graphs show the trend and gift amounts over years. CPB notes that the spikes are associated with particular gifts, e.g. most recently the Chung grant in BCOE. The redline separates the way software donation is accounted for before and after IRS rule changes. Almost 11 million dollars of the post 2012 gift is accounted for by these changes.
PRIVATE SUPPORT BY YEAR (Gift and Pledges)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2009</td>
<td>$19,557,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2010</td>
<td>$23,398,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2011</td>
<td>$34,564,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2012</td>
<td>$36,330,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2013</td>
<td>$20,768,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014 YTD</td>
<td>$18,156,521*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STAFFING FOR DEVELOPMENT

- **Development**: FY 2012/13: 44, FY 2008/09: 37
- **Strategic Communications**: FY 2012/13: 21, FY 2008/09: 21
- **Administration/UCR Foundation**: FY 2012/13: 18, FY 2008/09: 15
- **Alumni & Constituent Relations**: FY 2012/13: 14, FY 2008/09: 12
- **Vice Chancellor’s Office**: FY 2012/13: 3, FY 2008/09: 3
Budget Sources and Staffing for development
The graph above shows the staffing for development. VC Hayshed noted that the staffing has been quite stable except for strategic addition of few development officers, which increased from 37 to 44.

The budget sources for development for fiscal year 2013-2014 is 9.1 million and the different sources of the funds are shown in the graph below. More than 70% of the funds come from general funds followed by development fees. The development fees consist of a 5% charge to the new gifts and a 0.5% charge for year for administrative support to manage the UCR foundation of 125 million dollars.

BUDGET SOURCES FOR DEVELOPMENT

Benchmarking with UCSB
The following graphs provide a comparison of UCR advancement operation with UCSB. VCUA Hayashida noted that on an absolute basis, the cash support for UCR is around 22 million per year while the cash support for UCSB is roughly 60 million dollars a year (almost 300% more than UCR). However, this can be misleading as there are many factors including the nature of the school, the alumnae base and the very different story of each campus.

TEN-YEAR CASH SUPPORT COMPARISION

**Based on adjusted perm budget @ 6/30/13**
UCSB started as a research school and focuses on engineering and sciences, while UCR started as a small liberal arts college. A comparison of the budget table below shows that overall, on development, UCSB spends three times as much money as does UCR. Thus the comparison between the two schools has to be done in the right context. While the number of students currently enrolled in UCSB and UCR are almost same, UCSB spend twice as much per student on advancement activities as UCR.

### UCR UCSB BUDGET COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Budget</th>
<th>19900 Funding</th>
<th>Non-State Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>UCSB</td>
<td>UCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituent Reltns/Alumni Affairs</td>
<td>553,244</td>
<td>3,354,300</td>
<td>553,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,956</td>
<td>8,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2,963,485</td>
<td>8,621,306</td>
<td>418,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Services</td>
<td>1,336,850</td>
<td>1,982,964</td>
<td>1,336,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Admin./Foundation</td>
<td>837,170</td>
<td>885,499</td>
<td>837,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental Relations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>187,001</td>
<td>187,001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### UCR Comparator School

The two graphs below show the endowment per student and the 5 year average private support. In both cases UCR is at the bottom. Per student endowment depends on both the total endowment and the number of students and large public universities tend to lag smaller private schools like Case Western Reserve. However, it is also true that while UCR’s 5 year support is around 26 million dollars UCSB is much higher at 65 million dollars. Thus, according to VC Hayashida these are more about our aspirations as to where we want to go rather than where we are now.

#### UCR COMPARATOR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strat Comm/Public Affairs</th>
<th>2,410,111</th>
<th>772,320</th>
<th>2,410,111</th>
<th>772,320</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement</td>
<td>146,819</td>
<td>154,915</td>
<td>146,819</td>
<td>154,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Mgmt &amp; Protocol/Public Events</td>
<td>317,887</td>
<td>149,399</td>
<td>317,887</td>
<td>149,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional IT Contract</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>514,600</td>
<td>509,969</td>
<td>495,240</td>
<td>509,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,090,166</td>
<td>17,026,629</td>
<td>6,515,845</td>
<td>1,892,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- # Students: 21,005, 21,685
- Budget per student: $432.76, $785.18
Issues Noted
The following issues came out of the discussion as critical for the success of University Advancement:

1. In the past top leadership turnover has negatively affected the private gift flow.

2. While the private support at UCR is much less in absolute terms compared to UCSB it may not be a fair comparison given that the story of the two schools is quite different.

3. UCR is aware of its position among comparators, however the current comprehensive campaign based on UCR 2020 is going well and is likely to improve the situation.

4. The private grants generated by faculty and the development office should be separated.

5. Advancement is working with faculty and leadership to enhance UCR’s national profile.

6. The comprehensive campaign seems to be going well and has reached a quarter of its goal.

Recommendations

1. CPB recommends that the campus separate the private support generated by faculty endeavor from that is generated by development. This will facilitate a better understanding of the nature of quantum private support generated by faculty and development.
2. UA should create better metrics to evaluate the return on development dollars, for example along with budget per student one can look at budget/development staff or staff hours. Also dollars raised per dollar spent tells how efficiently the system is working. Again we understand no one metric can tell the whole story but relying on multiple measures can give a more accurate picture and also reduce gaming if any in the system.

3. As a campus community, we need to move toward building a sustainable culture for philanthropy into the DNA of UCR. Doing so is a noble goal for the campus and no resource should be spared to achieve this goal.

4. Overall the committee feels that things are moving in right direction and should be expedited to the extent possible.
REPORT ON THE COLLEGE OF NATURAL AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

Dean Marylynn Yates visited the Senate committee on Planning and Budget on April 3, 2014. We thank her for a forthright and informative discussion.

Background

CNAS oversees the education of all students in the sciences and mathematics and much of the lower-division education for students in engineering. The UC Strategic Plan requires that the campus triple its grant income to $200M annually and increase its enrollment of graduate students by 88%. The majority of the increases in both grant income and graduate students on behalf of the University are expected to take place within CNAS. The discussion with the Committee focused upon how such growth might be achieved and what might limit the College to meet the expectations of the Strategic Plan. CNAS also is coming to the end of a multi-year process to retire old debts. Much of the cost savings necessary to retire these debts occurred through temporary reductions in staff allocations and in centralizing services, such as personnel and payroll that previously were maintained in departments.

Summary of Discussion items

Faculty numbers and recruitment
Dean Yates stated that CNAS already has an excellent faculty, but it does not have enough of them. Faculty numbers within CNAS have been flat for the last ten years whereas total enrollment increased by 19%. At the time of the presentation, the estimate was that UC Riverside would need to increase faculty numbers by a net of 250 by 2020 after resignations and retirements. This number recently increased to 300. Two major barriers toward achieving this target are a shortage of quality space within the College to accommodate all new faculty, and the funds necessary to provide competitive start-up funds, or initial complements (IC). Space issues will be addressed separately, but it was obvious that the indirect cost returns, currently about $3.5M to the college were vastly short of providing IC packages of $500K to $1.1M for the 36 faculty who are being recruited during the current year.

The Committee was deeply concerned that there is not, as yet, any sustainable model to generate the necessary IC funds to meet the recruiting goals or to keep CNAS from once again plunging into debt over IC costs.

Research space
These new faculty members, and their new graduate students, will require adequate high-quality research space if their grant proposals will be competitive in the current, highly competitive environment for Federal funding. Dean Yates was forthright with the Committee about the quality and quantity of research space within the College and acknowledged that this was a disincentive to recruiting excellent new faculty members.
The Committee appreciated Dean Yates' description of efforts to renovate some existing space and to capture some “lost” space in existing buildings, but we all agreed that these efforts were at the margins and not a realistic, long-term strategy to reach the announced faculty recruiting targets.

**Graduate Student Recruiting**
Even the most optimistic assumptions about the growth of faculty numbers do not predict that the goal of increasing the graduate student population by 88% will be reached. The committee agreed with Dean Yates that the barrier to increasing the graduate student population was not finding the students, but finding the funds to support the students; she expects that this obligation will fall to the faculty. Because TA resources are allocated on the basis of undergraduate enrollment, and because graduate student enrollment will increase far more rapidly than undergraduate enrollment, then TA resources are predicted to play a diminishing role overall in the support of graduate students in the College. GSR support from central administration or CNAS funds also will be required to reach these graduate student targets, but it was not clear to what extent GSRs from College or central funds would be available.

**Extramural Funding**
Dean Yates acknowledged that the two most productive ways to triple extramural funding was through increasing the number of faculty applying for grants and to encourage and facilitate multi-investigator work groups applying for large (> $1M) grants. Dean Yates then described several new collaborative institutes that might provide such facilitation.

**Undergraduate Enrollment and Student Success**
Dean Yates and the Committee had a productive discussion about improving “student success” in the College through expanding, at least temporarily, enrollment in Freshman Year Learning Communities, and in expanding the offerings of “bottleneck” courses. This issue generated a frank discussion about whether the limitation in offering additional sections of bottleneck courses was due to a) a shortage of faculty instructors, b) a shortage of lecture rooms, or c), most critically, space for teaching laboratory sections associated with those courses.

**Realistic Budgeting**
The Committee appreciated Dean Yate’s presentation about the mismatch between how funds were allocated to the College, and how they needed to be spent. Allocations to the College for Staff and Faculty benefits are short of expenditures, so it is necessary to make up the difference from unfilled faculty FTEs. Similarly, allocations from the central administration for temporary teaching do not cover the costs for all categories of: TAs, Lecturers, and “Associates In,” and leave a deficit of nearly $900 K. Although the Dean’s instructions are to cover this deficit with unfilled faculty lines, the Committee wonders if this is practical, because the total value of unfilled faculty lines is only about $1.3 M, and there are additional demands on this resource, such as unfunded faculty and staff benefits.
Centralization of Administrative Services
Although it is clear that centralization of administrative services had contributed to cost savings, the issue of whether centralization had gone too far was discussed. Expertise about how the campus “works” has been lost within departments, and some feel that associated savings are illusory if efforts were simply transferred from staff to faculty.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that CNAS conduct a study of the utilization of space for lectures and teaching laboratories to determine the capacity of the College to admit and train students in its majors and to provide lower-division instruction, particularly in Mathematics and Physics, to undergraduates from the College of Engineering.

2. There should be no reason why the college should have to utilize unfilled faculty FTEs to pay for staff and faculty benefits. These costs are predictable and mandatory, and we recommend that these funds be allocated from the central administration to the colleges in full.

3. We recommend that the College and central administration have a frank discussion about the issue of competitive initial complements. A policy needs to be development that takes into account the expected number of hires in the STEM fields, and how the necessary IC packages will be provided on a sustainable basis. The Committee is concerned that a hiring plan has been adopted without sufficient thought to the costs of successful recruiting. The Committee is especially concerned if recruiting is attempted “on the cheap” with regard to competitive initial complement packages.

4. The Committee similarly is concerned that the faculty recruiting target is unrealistic considering the amount and quality of available space for research by those faculty and their many graduate students. Again, the Committee is concerned that faculty recruiting will be done “on the cheap” with regard to competitive allocations of research space. Compared to the institutions with which we compete for faculty, we recommend that careful, meaningful calculation be done to determine the amount of space necessary to meet the faculty recruiting targets, and that space be identified, before additional recruiting is done.

5. As with all Colleges, CNAS should publish their budget annually and the resource allocations should be transparent.

6. Finally, the Committee recommends that a “user satisfaction” survey be performed within CNAS to ensure that the recent centralization and consolidation of services still provides the faculty the same level of expertise and support as when such services were maintained in departments.
REPORT ON THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE (SOM)

Vice Chancellor of Health Affairs & Dean Olds visited the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget on April 7, 2014. We thank him for supplying detailed answers to our questions and for sharing his views.

Background

The School of Medicine (SOM) was granted preliminary accreditation in 2012 and the inaugural M.D. class matriculated in 2013.

Summary of Discussion Items

Overview (Mission and Vision)
The SOM is specifically focused on improving the health of the local community. This guiding principle has led to rather unique aspects for a school of medicine, including the student population and research mission.

Doctors predominately practice based on where they come from and where they do their training, and as a result, the SOM highly values students from the local area. This is evidenced by the population of the inaugural class, which has no out-of-state students. The educational focus of the School is on training generalists, which is not common.

In most medical schools the research mission focuses on basic science research due to their connection with specialists. The CPB thus wanted to better understand the research mission of the school. Dean Olds explained that the research mission of our SOM is broad and in addition to basic science research, translational and clinical research will also be prominent. More ambitiously, the vision is to develop an entire area of investigation that involves understanding how to implement healthcare, how to manage health care, and how to look for value in health care. This is often referred to as population based health outcomes and quality improvement research. As a result the partnering disciplines are also broader. The social sciences, including anthropology, sociology, and psychology, will form the majority of partners. They will be able to investigate important research topics that need to be address in health care. This creates an unusual platform for a medical school with a much larger research spectrum.

Dean Olds believes that in the future the money will be in managing populations well, rather than the current fee for service model. For this reason, he believes there is no need to take on the liability risks of building or buying a hospital. Instead, he would like to partner with hospitals and manage health care systems, for example the Riverside County Hospital in Moreno Valley. Loma Linda is one hospital that is considered more of a competitor; however, even there we have an agreement for primary care pediatric residency and have discussions over a joint VA program.
Joint Positions
Dean Olds stated that a big area of frustration was hiring faculty shared with other schools and colleges, which is necessary for the University to take full advantage of the SOM. He has tried for the past 4 years, without success, and stated that it typically fails due to "faculty" or “UC” rules. The committee pressed Dean Olds on this issue. The example he gave related to the attempt to agree on a joint search with CNAS. He said the deal fell apart over 9 month vs 12 month salaries (SOM requires 12 month appointments due to the nature of the medical education programs). There are a number of issues, including differences in teaching expectations, merit and promotion complications, 9 month vs 12 month salaries, etc which must be addressed. From the lengthy discussion, we gathered that there is a poor understanding (in both directions) and poor communication by all stakeholders (the SOM, CNAS, Academic Personnel, the Academic Senate, etc.). This is a problem that needs to be fixed. As the first order of business, we recommend that everyone to study the relevant sections of the APM and that the new VPAP charge the Academic Personnel Office with taking the lead in examining the issues with joint appointments.

Funding Status and Accreditation
The inclusion of $15M in the state budget allayed concerns about funding for the medical school. The money is taken off-the-top, and thus does not negatively affect rebenching allocations for the rest of the campus. The SOM is generating enough additional funds, though, e.g. clinical services, to support full costs, and campus funds have not and are not being directed to the SOM. Medical School students are given a weight of 5 in the rebenching formula. Currently the $15M currently exceeds the funds we would receive based through rebenching; however, when the student population grows, this will change. Projections indicate in 2017-18 we will have enough students to seek additional state money.

The SOM currently has preliminary accreditation from the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME), the national accrediting body for educational programs leading to the M.D. degree. All new medical schools go through a three step accreditation process: (1) preliminary, (2) provisional, and (3) full. The SOM received preliminary accreditation in 2012. The largest concern, funding, was removed after the state included $15M in its budget specifically for the school. Provisional accreditation will be considered in 2015, half-way through the inaugural class’ program. Full accreditation will be considered in 2017, when the first year’s class graduates. Dean Olds does not foresee any problems in receiving full accreditation in the prescribed timescale.

Diversity
Dean Olds highlighted that diversity is big strength of the SOM, including 20% of faculty who are from underrepresented groups, based on ethnicity. The inaugural class consists of 44% of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, as standardly defined by social and economic factors. Out of that group, 21% are self-reported as coming from underrepresented groups. In terms of gender, 52% of the medical students are women, 56% of their graduate students are women, and 60% of the biomedical science faculty is women.
Space and Buildings
Lack of space is perhaps the most pressing issue for the SOM. Additional education space is required to accommodate the planned increases in the number of students, and the lack of quality and quantity of research could limit the ability to grow and attract the best faculty. The current first year class is 50 and the SOM is approved to increase to a medical school class size of 80, or 90 when including Biomed PhD student. It is anticipated that there will be 320 medical students, including any MD/PhD students, by the end of the decade. In order to accommodate the 1st year medical class as well as those from the bio-med program, the SOM will require a lecture room capable of holding 120-150 students. They also need 5-6 conference rooms that can hold at least 12 students. Since a new medical school building is no longer on the horizon, the two short term projects are (1) complete the 1st floor of their current research building, and (2) renovate the rest of Webber. The first is “shovel-ready”, and the SOM is pushing for this to move forward first.

Buildings needed range from outpatient facilities for faculty practices, in a variety of geographic locations, e.g. Palm Desert, for faculty practices to research buildings. New buildings are unlikely to be financed through bonds, at least for the foreseeable future. A combination of public-private partnerships and philanthropy, depending on the nature of the building, will be necessary.

Clinical Faculty
Hiring clinical faculty quickly is a priority as it is key to financial stability. Originally, the clinical faculty was built up quickly to offset the lack of state funding. The contracts we sign with clinicians have minimal risk and are a reliable form of income to partially support the School. Dean Olds anticipates $15M in clinical income next year, with a margin of 10-15%, which will be used to support educational and research initiatives in the school.

Graduate Medical Education
The graduate medical education program will be of similar size of the medical program, and is an important part of the mission of the SOM. We currently have 60-70 residents staring in 3-5 year programs, and plan to grow to 300-400. We receive $135-$155K per resident per year, while they cost $70- $85K to teach. The margin is used to cover the cost of the GME residency program, so there is then a built in way to cover the program.

Development
Dean Olds explained that fund-raising for Medical Schools has a different focus from the typical alumni model that is the focus of the development office, as 85% development in medical schools comes from those that have absolutely no association with the university. Most of our funds will come from foundations, in direct connection to our mission. We have had success already with, e.g., Kaiser ($3M) for student pipeline programs and mission scholarships, First 5 ($5M) to support pediatrics medicine, and the Desert Healthcare District ($10M) to expand primary care. Philanthropy is also an important factor (currently at $1-1.5M), and it will grow as we hire more doctors and have more patients. This is another reason to grow the clinical engine.
**Undergraduate Programs**

Dean Olds reported on two important programs for undergraduate students, the Health Professions Advising Center and the Medical Scholars Program.

The Health Professions Advising Center advises students from across the campuses who are interested in pursuing careers in the health sciences, including, e.g. medicine, veterinary care, optometry, nursing, and clinical psychology. The previous incarnation was run as the premed advising center through CNAS, but was cut during the budget crisis. It has since been assumed and broadened by the SOM. This is sensible as approximately 1/3 of med school students majored in non-science files. The SOM, however, receives no funds from the campus to run this advising, which as increased by 300% over the last 2 years. The SOM is requesting campus support, and the CPB finds this to be reasonable.

The Medical Scholars Program (MSP) accepts disadvantaged students as freshman and tutors them to succeed throughout their undergraduate career. There are a total of 450 students over the 4-year program, and half of the 1st year medical students come from the MSP. MSP students are sought after by top medical schools across the country.

**Recommendations**

1. Joint appointments are critical for the campus to take full advantage of the School of Medicine; however, agreements with other units have been elusive and not all joint appointments have worked well in the past. We recommend these issues be confronted immediately by all stakeholders. There are complex issues involved, such as 9 vs. 12 month appointments, teaching expectations, and merit and promotion issues. These issues need to be solved not only for the sake of the SOM but because joint appointments are additionally crucial for the success of the School of Public Policy. As the first order of business, we recommend everyone study the relevant sections of the APM and that the new VPAP charge the Academic Personnel Office with taking the lead in examining the issues with joint appointments.

2. CPB noted some disconnect between the SOM and the rest of the campus. We recommend the Chair of the Senate meet with Dean Olds, discuss any underlying issues, and chart a course to further improve the relationship with the Divisional Senate. CPB feels that some issues discussed are due to poor communication, misinformation, and lack of understanding across the campus, rather than inherent problems.

3. Lack of the space is a major area of concern for both the education and research needs of the SOM. The campus must face space issues head-on across campus in the planning process.

4. The campus should help support the Health Sciences Advising Center.
5. The campus plans for faculty growth lack central funded positions in the School of Medicine. CPB recommends that in order to fully take advantage of the School of Medicine and fill the spaces between the SOM and the other Schools and Colleges, that the campus selection process includes strategically allocating joint positions.
REPORT ON THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, ARTS, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CHASS)

Dean Stephen Cullenberg visited the Planning and Budget Committee on April 7, 2014. The Committee thanks the Dean for his visit.

Background

The College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences encompasses 288 faculty in twenty departments. It invests heavily in one of UCR’s Strategic Plan priorities, the creative and performing arts. The Center for Ideas and Society sponsors interdisciplinary research, which is yet another key component of the 2020 plan. In addition, many CHASS faculty have won prestigious awards and grants that are prioritized by the AAU. In general, CHASS is an essential component to the university’s research profile and academic standing. In recent years it has been hit hard by the economic crisis, by cuts in staff and by faculty attrition. From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013, faculty separations outpaced hires, making it even more essential that the College succeed in its growth plan of 50 new faculty hires over the next 3 years.

Summary of Discussion Items

Vision
The Dean emphasized the College’s commitment to academic excellence and diversity. Diversity is not defined solely by ethnicity or race but by scholarly approaches ranging from scientific inquiry, to historical study, literary interpretation and creative expression. CHASS, in other words, displays, in his view, remarkable intellectual diversity.

The 2020 plan and AAU Admission
The University is slated for growth over the next few years, and the Dean expressed considerable concern about whether CHASS would get its fair share of future FTEs. This concern grew out of an administrative meeting attended by the Dean where one hypothetical strategy for AAU admission was floated. The hypothetical strategy granted CHASS only 10 new FTEs of some 200 awarded campus wide. While no one on CPB was at that meeting, from what we can gather, no one in attendance was actually proposing this as an official plan. However, the exercise does raise questions about whether the campus goal of attaining the profile of an AAU institution by 2020 is realistic. Such an unbalanced plan is unlikely to receive consensus and may be counterproductive.

Internal Distribution of Resources in CHASS
The Dean has identified six Departments in the College as centers in excellence, ones that will be heavily invested in. These are Creative Writing, Hispanic Studies, English, Philosophy, Political Science and Psychology. Selection of these six was based on faculty research, graduate program excellence, contracts and grants and good internal governance.
TA-ships and Graduate Student Support
TAs for the college are allocated according to workload. Currently, the College tries to maintain section sizes of approximately 25 students. But these students are not fully funded by the University. Three quarters of TA funding comes from the University, and the remaining quarter is derived from unfilled faculty lines within the College. Teaching Assistant-ships are the primary means by which CHASS supports its students as opposed to the lab-based disciplines which can rely more on contracts and grants. Consequently, limits on TA funding means limiting the College’s ability to meet its goal of growing its graduate student body by 20 percent. One of the problems, in the Dean’s view, is that central administration has not sufficiently prioritized the funding of TA-ships. CPB requested an accounting for TA expenses for 2012-13 so that we could compare it with campus allocations, however, we did not receive the data. Therefore, we cannot make a firm recommendation as there are some inconsistencies we were not able to resolve.

Unfilled faculty lines
The Dean depends on 50 unfilled faculty lines as a revenue source for many budget items, including lecturers, faculty and staff benefit costs, and as mentioned, TA-ships. Dependence on unfilled lines as a revenue source is not a preferred, predictable, or sustainable funding model, as noted by the Dean and the Committee.

Staffing
To deal with severe cuts in funding, the College adopted a clustering model which assigns FAO’s to more than one Department. The College has lost almost 31% of its staff since FY 2010. To cope with this, administrative support was consolidated into seven clusters whereby FAO’s split their time between two Departments, and report to both Chairs. The Dean believes that overall clustering has worked adequately, but is not without its problems. It has generated an exceedingly heavy workload for staff which has lowered morale, and it has raised concerns about maintaining internal financial controls. The College has priority needs for more staff, particularly in payroll, human resources (academic personnel), and production/event management. In light of the increasingly importance assigned to securing external grants, CHASS also prioritizes the hiring of a grant writer, who could work with faculty to identify and pursue contract and grant opportunities.

Recommendations

1. The CPB requests that CHASS provide an accounting of TA funds, and a table or chart indicating budgeted vs expenditures for major categories, e.g., faculty, staff, benefits, TAs, and lecturers.

2. The College, with central administrative support, should find some way to improve faculty retention given its having suffered too many separations in recent years. When CHASS faculty receive outside offers, at times, the College’s counter-offers have not been sufficiently attractive to win the bidding war. Ironically, the problem is exacerbated by the high caliber of CHASS faculty who grab the attention of top-ranked
Departments who then attempt to lure them away from UCR. The College and its Dean need the full support of the new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost when it comes to enhancing retention packages, recognizing that salary levels must be consonant with today’s academic market forces, and counter-offers must match or exceed those of our university’s toughest competitors.

3. TA-ships support must increase, and a greater proportion of the TA funding should be shifted from temporary to permanent budgeted lines. This will help graduate advisors in allocating TA-ships by knowing ahead of time what allotments they have at their disposal. This in turn will help reduce the anxiety felt by graduate students who do not know from quarter to quarter whether they will be funded, or at what level, since not all of the graduate advisors have a predictable, annual allotment of College-based TA funds.

4. CPB agrees with the Dean that the Cluster model for staff is only a stop gap solution to a problem of an inadequate supply of personnel. The Committee endorses the College’s request for more staff support which would eventually allow CHASS to return to a model where each Department has a dedicated FAO.

5. The Committee lauds CHASS’ recent successes in increasing its awarded contracts and grants, and incentivizing the writing of proposals through such programs as the Faculty Contract and Grant Incentive and Recognition Program, launched in November 2013. It also applauds the College for its plan to increase contracts and grants by 25% each year for the next three years. At the same time, the Committee acknowledges that success (in and outside of the AAU) is measured not simply in dollar terms but by the prestige of the awards themselves. In this respect, CHASS can point to its faculty success in winning MacArthur, Guggenheim, Fulbright, Ford Foundation and American Council of Learned Society Grants and Fellowships, to name a few.

6. Finally, the committee would like to emphasize that a balanced growth plan will be necessary to achieve a profile of an AAU institution, and CHASS has an important role to play. Additionally, partnerships with the School of Medicine and School of Public Policy should be central and necessary for the campus to take full advantage of these Schools. To this end, joint positions will be crucial. We encourage CHASS to have discussions with the other units, including the Academic Personnel Office and the Academic Senate to work through the issues associated with joint appointments (e.g. merit and promotion, and teaching expectations).
BUDGET PROCESS

The Committee and Budget was largely excluded from the budget process this year. In particular, the Chancellors Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) was disbanded. In previous years, the Chair of CPB was on CBAC and the committee was invited to the campus budget hearings. CBAC was formed in an era of budget cuts, and in many ways it circumvented the normal Senate consulting process, so in principle CPB does not object to this change. However, the decision was made very late in the year and CPB was not invited to participate in the budget vision day or budget hearings. With significant key administrative changes this year, we take this as an anomaly. We were asked to submit a list of budget priorities (submitted report appended); however, formulating constructive priorities in the absence of discussions was difficult. At least a two priority items, growing graduate students and TAs, were added to the administration’s campus investment priorities as a result of CPB’s feedback. We do not know, however, how this impacted the budget allocations. We also submitted a list of budget principles (submitted report appended). We have discussed the budget process with the Chancellor and new VCPB, and are hopeful CPB will be included in the process in future years.

Additional Senate participation

There should be required Senate Participation in any advisory committee (standing or ad-hoc) convened to advise the EVC/P and/or the chancellor on budgetary issues. Senate participants will be named by the Committee on Committees.

As part of the Senate’s mission to consult with the University’s planning processes, CPB will continue to consult with academic units throughout the academic year to understand their budget proposals. However, this does not take the place of representing the Senate in formal budget presentations between the Academic Units and the EVC/P and VCPB, which we feel is crucial. Further, a set calendar for the budget process, including hear dates and decision points, should be established well in advance and made public.
BUDGET PRINCIPLES

Background

The UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget originates from the standing Order of the Regents 105.2 (d): “The Academic Senate is authorized to select a committee or committees to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget and to select a committee or committees to advise the President concerning the University budget.” We look forward to collaborating with the administration to fulfill our mission.

Guiding Principles

- **Strategic Plan.** The budgetary decisions are to be guided by goals expressed in the 2020 Plan: The Path to Preeminence. However, the feasibility and time scale to achieve the goals of the plan need to be reexamined annually based on budget limitations and critical needs must not be neglected. Resources needed to maximize the productivity of current faculty and to insure the retention of faculty must be given a high priority.

- **Integrated Planning and Budgeting.** It is essential that the integrated costs for each goal be considered. For example, the support for new faculty (research space, initial complement, staff support, retention, and support for graduate students) needs to be fully evaluated.

- **Budget Transparency & Consistency.** Transparency of campus budgets and the budget process, including discussion of determining priorities with allocations from central administration to the college, from the college to the department and from the department to individual faculty is paramount. Consistency demands that common methodology be implemented for budget requests, reporting, and accountability.

- **Collaborative Budget Process.** Administrative collaboration with the faculty via the Academic Senate must be an on-going discussion throughout each academic year.

Comments and Recommendations

1) CPB supports growth aligned with the ultimate achievement of having a profile consistent with a premier research institution, e.g. AAU institution. However, the growth should be balanced and realistic. The resources, space, and initial complement needs must be fully considered. A sustainable initial complement policy must be developed and the budgeted.

2) In order to make the growth of the graduate student population realistic and to support the research needs of faculty:
   a) Changes to graduate student non-resident tuition accounting should be made. Given that NRT remains on the campus since the funding streams model has been implemented, it should be centralized. The Graduate Division should work with

---

2 CPB Budget Principles were submitted to VCPB Anguiano on April 14, 2014
individual departments and programs to set a transparent policy as to the ideal fraction of international students.

b) Centralization of graduate student tuition for students on GSR should be evaluated. This would incentivize an increase of externally funded GSR positions, which is a step toward growing the graduate PhD population

3) Transitioning unfunded students to funded status and replacing them with non-residents is of central importance.

4) The office of undergraduate education should have a role in admissions. This has the potential to both increase the quality of our undergraduate population and increase our out-of-state population. Converting the Office of Undergraduate education an academic unit parallel to the Graduate Division should also be considered. This is the case on the majority of UC campuses.

5) A comparison of budgeted and expenditures must be made for all units. Disparities in funding for benefits need to be fixed. Increasing TA needs to align with workload should be made.

6) The campus should develop a more aggressive and positive retention policy.

7) The Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget commits to providing ongoing analysis and constructive ideas for all budget matters.
BUDGET PRIORITIES

1. **New Faculty at actual costs**
   Increasing the percentage of filled faculty positions, which is low compared to other UC schools, should be a top priority. Actual costs, including rank/step, off-scale, and benefits, of these new faculty, must be taken into account. The full costs, including graduate students, space, initial complements (priorities 2-4 below), must be allocated in parallel.

2. **Graduate Students Support & Graduate Student Success**
   The growth of the graduate student population is a key element of UCR-2020 and is intricately tied to the success of current and new faculty. Given today’s uncertain research funding environment, however, the campus needs to make additional strategic investments. In particular: (1) Additional funds should be allocated to pay the tuition portion of students on extramurally funded GSRs. This will incentivize the inclusion of more graduate students on grants, which will have the added benefit of maximizing research output and in turn lead to more and larger awards. (2) The temporary TA money for the unfunded students (not state support, but paid tuition) should be increased to fully fund TAs at the targeted FTE levels. In addition to pedagogical reasons, this is needed to relieve the workload of our graduate students to maximize their research output, shorten their time to degree, and support graduate student growth. The additional cost will go away as we replace our unfunded state students with out-of-state or state-funded students. (3) Additional fellowship funds to make recruitment packages competitive should be strategically allocated to attract the highest quality graduate students and shorten the time to degree. The recruitment of higher quality students will also maximize graduate student retention and minimize time to degree.

3. **Space**
   The lack of quality and quantity of space may be the largest hurdle to attracting top faculty and assuring their productivity. In the short term, additional funds to provide adequate space through renovations must be allocated in parallel with new faculty. In the long term, costs to provide adequate space through construction will be substantial and must be planned accordingly.

4. **Initial Complements**
   The full costs of Initial complements consistent with the recruitment of top faculty must be budgeted in parallel with new faculty. Initial complements should be fully funded centrally or should be a transparent budget line item in each college. The funding level should be based on a market rate analysis for the given field.

---

3 CPB Budget Priorities were submitted to VCPB Anguiano on May 8, 2014
5. **Undergraduate Student success**
   This includes support for students to graduate in 4 years, ease the transfer from CC, maintain diversity and support programs for a diverse student population, and online course access. Student success programs should be well balanced and not neglect the success of our students in upper division classes, and their efficacy should be regularly evaluated from all perspectives (student, faculty, and administration).

6. **Retention Support**
   Retention of our most productive faculty poses a great threat to our aspirations. Retention costs should be considered an anticipated cost of doing business. The retention process should be a strategic process and should including consideration of the costs associated with replacing existing faculty members, including initial complement. Anticipated costs should be explicitly budgeted and the process (both pre and post retention) should transparent as to not alienate current and future faculty.

7. **Strategic Software Investments**
   One-time investments, such as software to improve the budget process and reporting improvements, improvements to SARA, and the development and improvement of other campus applications such as GradSIS for enrolled students, CRAMS, as well as graduate and undergrad recruitment initiatives should not be neglected. They impact our ability to make strategic decisions, our effectiveness in recruiting, and efficiencies and productivity for students and faculty.
Committee on Planning and Budget (2013-14)

Kenneth N. Barish, Physics and Astronomy (Chair)
Bir Bhanu, Electrical Engineering (Fall quarter)
Kimberly A. Hammond, Biology
Dan Hare, Entomology
Barry K. Mishra, Area of Accounting
David S. Pion-Berlin, Political Science
Roger L. Ransom, History
Mike Vanderwood, Graduate School of Education
During the 2013-2014 academic year, the Committee on Research (COR) met on seven occasions.

The Committee reviewed and readopted the prior year’s Conflict of Interest Statement.

COR discussed the Academic Senate’s proposal to amend bylaws to prohibit administrators from serving as chairs of Senate committees. The committee found the proposal reasonable and necessary; however, requested specification in regards to “administrative position”.

The committee discussed systemwide proposed revisions to Bylaw 55. The consensus of the committee was opposed to allowing non-Senate faculty to vote on Senate faculty merit and promotions at the department level.

COR reviewed and discussed the systemwide proposed revisions to APM 025, 670 and 671. The committee requested clarification on some of the points raised in the proposal.

The committee reviewed the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan and chose not to opine.

COR reviewed the proposed changes to the Compendium. There were several concerns raised and the committee conveyed their concerns in their response to the Senate Chair.

The committee reviewed the President’s Policy on Copyright and Fair Use and had no concerns with the proposed changes.

COR met with Russ Vernon from EH&S regarding lab safety requirements.

The committee reviewed the Portfolio Review Group Cycle 1 Report. While the committee was supportive of the report process, they requested more information on how the reviewers were selected.

Professor Dana Simmons agreed to serve as COR’s representative on the Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication ad hoc committee which has been charged with assisting in the implementation of the library strategic plan.

COR’s primary activity was to administer intramural grant competitions. COR worked to clarify the wording of the Call for the intramural research grant programs it manages and to make the on-line application process clearer and less onerous. In preparation for receipt and distribution of grants, COR discussed allowable expenses and exception requests for all COR grants.

Research grant applications received for 2014-2015 funding included: 330 Omnibus (188 Travel Only and 142 Research and Travel), 54 COR, and 35 Regents.

Of the 188 Omnibus Travel Only applications, there were 11 applicants who received Regents or COR Fellowship funds over $5,000, which disqualified them from also receiving an Omnibus award. The committee awarded 177 Omnibus Travel Only awards at the level requested up to a maximum of $1,300, resulting in a total of $226,881.
Of the 142 Omnibus Research and Travel applications, there were 8 applicants who received Regents or COR Fellowship funds over $5,000, which disqualified them from also receiving an Omnibus award. The committee awarded 134 Omnibus Research and Travel awards at varying levels from $1,300 to $1,800 based on the score the proposal received, resulting in a total of $220,100.

Omnibus awards were made to 311 faculty (177 Travel Only and 134 Research and Travel Awards). The total allocation was $446,981 ($226,881 Travel Only and $220,100 Research and Travel Awards).

Committee on Research (COR) Grants were awarded to 27 faculty. There were six $9,000 awards; seven $7,500 awards; nine $4,500 awards; and five $2,250 awards for a total allocation of $158,250. 14 of the 27 awards funded (or 52%) were awarded to Associate Professors. COR Fellowships are intended to assist faculty to develop new research projects that could be funded extramurally. All tenured members of the Academic Senate are eligible to apply.

Regents Faculty Fellowships and Faculty Development Awards were awarded to 17 faculty. There were three $9,000 awards; seven $6,000 awards; and seven $4,000 awards for a total allocation of $97,000. All Assistant Professors are eligible for this award. The Vice Chancellor for Research graciously supplemented the Academic Senate Regents Fellowship budget of $67,015 by adding an additional $30,000 of funding from his own budget so that COR was able to fund six additional Regents Fellowships.

Total Research funds awarded for 2014-15 was $702,231. Following several years of declining funding, two years ago COR was allocated an increase of 20% of available funds as compared to previous years. The committee thanks Senate Chair Wudka for continuing to make the increase to research funds a priority in his overall Senate budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Allen, Chair
Heidi Brayman Hackel
David Cocker
Mohsen El Hafsi
Gail Hanson
Marsha Ing
Rebecca Kugel
Leonard Nunney
Khaleel Razak
Amit Roy Chowdhury
Dana Simmons
Of the 142 Omnibus Research and Travel applications, there were 8 applicants who received Regents or COR Fellowship funds over $5,000, which disqualified them from also receiving an Omnibus award. The committee awarded 134 Omnibus Research and Travel awards at varying levels from $1,300 to $1,800 based on the score the proposal received, resulting in a total of $220,100.

Omnibus awards were made to 311 faculty (177 Travel Only and 134 Research and Travel Awards). The total allocation was $446,981 ($226,881 Travel Only and $220,100 Research and Travel Awards).

Committee on Research (COR) Grants were awarded to 27 faculty. There were six $9,000 awards; seven $7,500 awards; nine $4,500 awards; and five $2,250 awards for a total allocation of $158,250. 14 of the 27 awards funded (or 52%) were awarded to Associate Professors. COR Fellowships are intended to assist faculty to develop new research projects that could be funded extramurally. All tenured members of the Academic Senate are eligible to apply.

Regents Faculty Fellowships and Faculty Development Awards were awarded to 17 faculty. There were three $9,000 awards; seven $6,000 awards; and seven $4,000 awards for a total allocation of $97,000. All Assistant Professors are eligible for this award. The Vice Chancellor for Research graciously supplemented the Academic Senate Regents Fellowship budget of $67,015 by adding an additional $30,000 of funding from his own budget so that COR was able to fund six additional Regents Fellowships.

Total Research funds awarded for 2014-15 was $702,231. Following several years of declining funding, two years ago COR was allocated an increase of 20% of available funds as compared to previous years. The committee thanks Senate Chair Wudka for continuing to make the increase to research funds a priority in his overall Senate budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Allen, Chair
Heidi Brayman Hackel
David Cocker
Mohsen El Hafsi
Gail Hanson
Marsha Ing
Rebecca Kugel
Leonard Nunney
Khaleel Razak
Amit Roy Chowdhury
Dana Simmons
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The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction conducted its work via email and telephone. Following is a summary of Committee activities from May 1, 2014 to August 31, 2014.

In keeping with the charge to review legislation submitted for adoption, the Committee considered the Regulations, Bylaws, and Policies below:

- The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction considered the proposed bylaw change for the Graduate School of Education and found the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate. At the same time, it found the underlined text in E4.2 to suggest that Extension is one of the credential programs, which seems unlikely. The Committee suggested the language be amended so extension representative is additional to the credential program representatives.

- The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction considered the proposed bylaw change for the School of Business Administration and found the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate.

- The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction considered the campus policy review of the request to use a working title for the Lecturer with Security of Employment Series. The Committee found the proposed use of the terms 'Teaching Professor' etc. to be consistent with Senate rules and bylaws. At the same time, it found the proposed use awkward and possibly misleading, and recommended that the University consider instead adopting other possible terms such as 'docent' or 'Senate lecturer'.

Z. Ran, Chair
P. Keller
P. Gorecki, Secretary Parliamentarian
To be received and placed on file:

Between May 1, 2014 and August 31, 2014, the Committee on Scholarships and Honors selected Professor Allen Mills (Department of Physics and Astronomy), Professor Jingsong Zhang (Department of Chemistry), Alina Escalera (Department of Physics and Astronomy) and Michael Turcios (Department of Media and Cultural Studies and Department of French) as the recipients of the 2013-2014 Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Research and Creative Achievement. The Chancellor presented the awards at the May 27, 2014 meeting of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

The Committee on Scholarships and Honors received a request from the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Deans of Colleges with undergraduate programs to review the criteria for the Deans Honors List. The proposed bylaw change would change the requirements for the Deans Honors List to a minimum of 15 enrolled units, of which 12 or more are graded with a GPA of 3.5 or higher, with no grade of NC or I (incomplete). The committee agreed with the changes suggested by the Vice Provost and Deans and submitted a formal proposal to the Division.

J. Eichler, Chair
R. Budasz
J. Guenther
J. Jang
Y. Li
D. Morikis
K. Sweeny
I. Wheeldon
The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions met twice during the period of May 1 to August 31, 2014. Chancellor Wilcox attended the Committee’s May 28, 2014 meeting and the Committee provided him with an overview of their charge and policy issues discussed by the Committee throughout the academic year.

The Committee continued discussions on developing a holistic review process for UCR. The Committee reviewed criteria that could be utilized to measure student’s applications for admission and developed a process for a pilot holistic review program based on the Committee’s review of a selection of applications from across the colleges.

No further substantive decisions or actions were taken during the time period of May 1 to August 31, 2014.

Kathryn DeFea, Chair
Eddie Comeaux
Juliette Levy
Bahram Mobasher
Marko Princevac
Wendy Saltzman
Christiane Weirauch
Jim Sandoval, Ex Officio
Christian Kaufman, ASUCR Representative
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Since the 2013-2014 Academic Year Annual Report to the Riverside Division and time period of May 1 to August 31, 2014, the Committee reviewed and approved proposals for the Fall 14 UNEX term in July 2014 by email. Between the time period of May 1 to August 31 the Committee examined and approved 143 courses and instructors in the X300-400 series and 7 courses in the X1-200 series.

No further substantive decisions or actions were taken during the remainder of the time period.

Guanshui (Alex) Xu, Chair  
Indridi Indridason  
Suk-Won (Thomas) Kim  
Michel Lapidus  
Wenwan Zhong  
Susan Zieger  
Quincy Villanueva, ASUCR Representative  
Aaron Olcersv, GSA Representative
To be received and placed on file:
The Executive Committee of the College of Engineering met 10 times during the 2013-14 academic year.

1. **Course proposals**
   - New - 30
   - Changes - 19
   - Restore - 1
   - Deletions - 18

2. **Programs**
   - The Executive Committee received:
     - Computer Science & Engineering undergraduate requirements change
     - Electrical Engineering undergraduate program change
     - Bioengineering undergraduate program change

3. **Regulations and Bylaws**
   - The Executive Committee received:
     - Proposed amendment for Bylaw 55
     - Systemwide review: APM 025, 670 and 671
     - Proposed revisions to the UC system-wide sexual harassment policies outlined in APM-035, Appendices A-1 & A-2
     - Review of Revised Self Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Program Policy
     - Proposed Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition
     - Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session
     - Revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors
     - Senate Review of UCR Libraries Strategic Plan
     - Systemwide review of revised proposal to amend senate bylaw 55
     - Proposed change to the bylaws of the Riverside Division
     - Proposed changes to APM 190
     - System-wide Review of Proposed Revisions to the Compendium
     - Proposed Policy on Copyright and Fair Use
     - Proposed change to Bylaw 8.1.1
     - Campus Off-Scale Policy

4. **Student Petitions** – No student petitions were presented.

5. **Degrees awarded**
   - 36 B.S. end of Fall 2013
   - 34 B.S. end of Winter 2014
   - 301 B.S. end of Spring 2014
   - 26 B.S. end of Summer 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honors at Graduation</th>
<th>Honors</th>
<th>High Honors</th>
<th>Highest Honors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter 2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | Students on Probation and Subject to Dismissal |
   | Fall 2013 | Winter 2014 | Spring 2014 |
   | Academic Probation | 201 | 274 | 245 |
   | Dismissal      | 56  | 40  | 40  |

6. **Other**
   - “Electrical Engineering Department” name change to “Electrical and Computer Engineering Department”

**2013-14 Executive Committee:**

- Akula Venkatram, Chair
- Guanshui Xu
- Neal Young*
- Jianzhong Wu
- Hyle Park
- Shekdon Tan**
- Masaru Rao
- Natalie Berner, Student Representative
- Reza Abbaschian, Dean, *Ex officio*
- Mark Matsumoto, Associate Dean, *Ex officio*
- Chinya Ravishankar, Associate Dean, *Ex officio*
- Rod Smith, Manager, Student Affairs
- Eilene Montoya, Staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>CHANGE</th>
<th>RESTORE</th>
<th>DELETE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIEN 001</td>
<td>BIEN 101</td>
<td>ENVE 140</td>
<td>HNPG 020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEN 175C</td>
<td>BIEN 175A</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEN 010</td>
<td>BIEN 175B</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEN 101</td>
<td>CS 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 033F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIEN 167</td>
<td>CS 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 033G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE 136</td>
<td>CS 120A</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEE 137</td>
<td>CS 141</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 004</td>
<td>CS179E</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 041G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE 155</td>
<td>CS 179G</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 041J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME 144</td>
<td>CS 179I</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 150</td>
<td>CS 141</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 043E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 151</td>
<td>EE 110A</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 043G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 152</td>
<td>EE 117</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 043I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 153</td>
<td>EE 120A</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 154</td>
<td>EE 144</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 037F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 155</td>
<td>EE 145</td>
<td></td>
<td>HNPG 037J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 156</td>
<td>ENVE 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 157</td>
<td>ENVE 121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 158</td>
<td>ENVE 133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 159</td>
<td>ME 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191A</td>
<td>ME 145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCDC 191M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Venkatram</td>
<td>Park</td>
<td>Wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/19/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/26/14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/19/14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Nosang Myung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/19/14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neal Young on sabbatical Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 – Marek Chrobak was CSE representative in his absence. Sheldon Tan resigned for Spring quarter and Amit Roy-Chowdhury was his replacement.

X = present    A = Absent
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences met 9 times during the 2013-14 academic year.

1. **Course Proposals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New courses</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New E-Z segments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Majors**

   The Faculty approved the following new majors: NONE

   The Executive Committee approved changes in the following majors: Art; Art History; Asian Studies; Economics/Administrative Studies; Languages & Literatures/Germanic Studies; Liberal Studies; and Women’s Studies.

   The Executive Committee approved major-change criteria: NONE

3. **Minors**

   The Faculty approved the following new minors: Science Fiction and Technoculture Studies

   The Executive Committee approved changes in the following minors: Languages & Literatures/Arabic Studies; Languages & Literatures/Chinese Studies; Languages & Literatures/Classics Studies; Languages & Literatures/French Studies; Languages & Literatures/Germanic Studies; Languages & Literatures/Italian Studies; Languages & Literatures/Japanese Studies; Languages & Literatures/Korean Studies; Languages & Literatures/Russian Studies; Languages & Literatures/Southeast Asian Studies; and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Intersexual, and Transgender Studies.

   The Executive Committee approved a program minor name change: NONE

4. **Program Reviews**

   The Faculty reviewed and approved the Proposed Changes in the Riverside Washington Academic Internship Program (UCDC).

   The Executive Committee approved a Department Name Change:
   a. Department of Theatre to Department of Theater, Film & Digital Production
   b. Department of Women’s Studies to Department of Gender & Sexualities Studies

   The Faculty approved the following new programs: NONE

5. **Regulations and Bylaws**

   The committee approved the following new College regulation: NONE
   The committee approved the following new College bylaw: NONE

   The committee approved the following College regulation changes: NONE
   The committee approved the following College bylaw changes: HSR2.7.1.1—Enrollment on a Satisfactory/No Credit Basis.
Campus
The committee approved the Proposed Changes to the Bylaws of the Riverside Division—Bylaw 8.1.1—Appointment and Tenure.

6. Student Petitions
1—Request for a posthumous degree was reviewed and awarded a Certificate of Attendance. The student did not meet the minimum requirements for a posthumous degree.
13— Grade Disputes
1—Degree Deferral for one year

7. Scholarship Decisions
Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>End of Session</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>end of Summer Session 2013</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>end of Fall Quarter 2013</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>end of Winter Quarter 2014</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>end of Spring Quarter 2014</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>end of Winter Quarter 2014</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Students/Academic Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restored to good standing</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to dismissal</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinstated/readmitted</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Honors at Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cum Laude</th>
<th>Magna Cum Laude</th>
<th>Summa Cum Laude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session 2013</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Quarter 2013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Quarter 2014</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter 2014</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Erica Edwards, Chair (2013-14)

2013-14 Executive Committee:

Erica Edwards, English, Chair
Taradas Bandyopadhyay, Economics
Sabine Doran, Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages
Marta Hernandez Salvan, Latin American Studies
Tamara Ho, Women’s Studies
Covadonga Lamar-Prieto, Linguistics
Chandra Reynolds, Psychology
Leonora Saavedra, Music
Jan Stets, Sociology
Jason Weems, History of Art

Ex Officio:

Peter Graham, Associate Dean ex-officio
Shaun Bowler, Associate Dean ex-officio
Katherine Kinney, Associate Dean ex-officio
Stephen Cullenberg, Dean ex-officio
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences met 5 times during the 2013-2014 academic year.

1. Course Proposals

    New Courses: 23  
    Course Revisions: 26  
    Course Deletions 19  
    Course Restored: 0  
    New E-Z Segments 0  
    Professional courses: 10-NEW  
    Cross-listings 4  
    21-CHANGED

2. Majors

    New departmental majors approved:  
    NONE  
    New interdepartmental majors approved:  
    NONE  
    Moratorium of majors approved:  
    NONE

    Changes to existing major requirements approved:  
    ○ Biochemistry  
    ○ Environmental Science  
    ○ Molecular Biology  
    ○ Physics  
    ○ UCDC

3. Minors

    New minors approved:  
    NONE  
    Changes to existing minor requirements approved:  
    NONE

4. Regulations and Bylaws

   College

    The Committee approved the following new College regulation:  
    NONE  
    The Committee approved the following new College bylaw:  
    NONE  
    The Committee approved the following College regulation changes:  
    NONE  
    The Committee approved the following College bylaw changes:  
    NONE
Campus

The Committee approved the following divisional regulation changes:

- APM 025
- APM 035

The Committee approved the following divisional bylaw changes:

- Bylaw 8.1.1-Appointment and Tenure
- Bylaw 55

The Committee did not approve the following divisional regulation changes: NONE
The Committee did not approve the following divisional regulation change: NONE

5. Other
None

6. Scholarship Decisions

A. Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Summer 2013</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Summer 2013</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Fall 2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Fall 2013</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Winter 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Winter 2014</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A. degrees end of Spring 2014</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. degrees end of Spring 2014</td>
<td>601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Students on Probation and Subject to Dismissal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Winter 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation &amp; Continued Probation</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to Dismissal</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cont'd Subject to Dismissal</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissed</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013-2014 Executive Committee Members:

Gillian Wilson, Chair
Stephen Spindler, Biochemistry
Daphne Fairbairn, Biology
Thomas Girke, Botany/Plant Sciences
Eric Chronister, Chemistry
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education met formally eight times during 2013-2014 AY.

Degrees and credentials awarded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credential Name</th>
<th>Subject/Emphasis</th>
<th>Univ. Intern</th>
<th>Preliminary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Specialist</td>
<td>Mild/Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate/Severe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCLAD Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Subject</td>
<td>Biological Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundational Math</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foundational</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GeoScience</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World Languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M.Ed General Education Teaching Emphasis 32

Non-degree Teaching Credential Program Completers 42

Subtotals 74

M.Ed. 2013 - 2014 17

MA 2013- 2014 7

Ph.D. 2013 - 2014 12

Subtotals 36

Total 110
2013-2014  
GSOE Selected Highlights:

- Professor John Levin continues to serve as Faculty Chair during FY 2013/14.
- Professor Lee Swanson agreed to serve as the Associate Dean during FY 2014/15.
- Successful recruitment of Professor Keith Widaman, Distinguished Professor in Educational Psychology.
- Successful recruitment of Professor Rita Kohli, Assistant Professor in Education Society and Culture
- Successful recruitment of Dean and Professor Thomas M. Smith.
- Professor Robert Ream, Associate Professor, granted temporary leave for second consecutive year to take on responsibilities at the Spencer Foundation in Chicago.
- Robert Wolfer served as the President of the UCR Staff Assembly during FY 2013/14 and was elected to serve as Secretary for the Council of University of California Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) during FY 2014/15.
- Professor Melanie Sperling, Professor, developed hybrid (online) course initiative for M.Ed. program. Course is being offered during Fall 2014.
- Professor and Previous Interim Dean Doug Mitchell collaboratively with the School of Public Policy and School of Medicine will be hosting the Child Well Being Initiative Conference at UCR in Fall 2014.
- Professor Luciana Dar was awarded the Haynes Foundation Faculty Fellowship for FY 2013/14.
- Professor Jan Blacher received the B.F. Skinner Lecture Award from the Association for Behavior Analysis International.
- GSOE had considerable representation at the 2014 American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Meeting, with faculty and graduate students presenting over 20 papers.

Executive Committee Members, 2013-2014:

John S. Levin, Chair  
John Wills  
Eddie Comeaux  
Mike Vanderwood  
Lee Swanson  

Doug Mitchell, Dean, *ex officio*  
Maritza Rodriguez, Director, Teacher Education, *ex officio*
The Executive Committee of the School of Business Administration met three times during the 2013-2014 academic year and conducted electronic meeting on numerous occasions.

1. Scholarship Decisions
   A. Degrees Awarded
      
      **Master of Business Administration**
      
      | Quarter                  | Degrees Awarded |
      |--------------------------|-----------------|
      | Summer Session 2013      | 1               |
      | Fall Quarter 2013        | 3               |
      | Winter Quarter 2014      | 7               |
      | Spring Quarter 2014      | 85              |
      | **Total**                | **96**          |

      **Master of Business Administration, Flex MBA**
      
      | Quarter 2014             | Degrees Awarded |
      |--------------------------|-----------------|
      | Spring Quarter 2014      | 1               |

      **Master of Professional Accountancy**
      
      | Quarter 2014             | Degrees Awarded |
      |--------------------------|-----------------|
      | Spring Quarter 2014      | 41              |

      **Master of Finance**
      
      | Quarter 2014             | Degrees Awarded |
      |--------------------------|-----------------|
      | Spring Quarter 2014      | 25              |

      **Master of Arts, Management**
      
      | Quarter 2013             | Degrees Awarded |
      |--------------------------|-----------------|
      | Fall Quarter 2013        | 5               |

      **Bachelor of Science in Business Administration**
      
      | Quarter                  | Degrees Awarded |
      |--------------------------|-----------------|
      | Summer Session 2013      | 153             |
      | Fall Quarter 2013        | 46              |
      | Winter Quarter 2014      | 75              |
      | Spring Quarter 2014      | 369             |
      | **Total**                | **643**         |

   B. Students on Probation, 2013-2014
      **Master of Business Administration**
      
      | Category                    | Students |
      |------------------------------|----------|
      | Subject to dismissal         | 7        |
      | Dismissed                    | 1        |

      **Master of Business Administration, Flex MBA**
      
      | Category                    | Students |
      |------------------------------|----------|
      | Subject to dismissal         | 5        |
      | Dismissed                    | 0        |
2. Courses and Curriculum

A. Courses: Management
   i. New courses  6
      1. Management:
         a. MGT 214 Corporate Strategy
         b. MGT 400 A
         c. MGT 400 B
         d. MGT 400 C
         e. MGT 400 D
         f. MGT 400 E

   2. Business Administration: 0

   ii. Course revisions
      1. Management: 2
         a. MGT 404
         b. MGT 222 Strategic Organization Change

      2. Business Administration: 1
         a. BUS 146 Advanced Topics in Management and Decision Making

   iii. Course deletions
      1. Management: 0

      2. Business Administration: 0
2013-14 Executive Committee

Elected Members:  Barry Mishra (Chair) 2013-2015
                 Peter Chung (FIN) 2013-2015
                 Elaine Wong (MGT) 2013-2015
                 Mohsen El Hafsi (OSCM) 2014-2016
                 Ted Mock (A&IS) 2013-2015
                 Jorge Silva Risso (MARK) 2013-2015
                 Yunzeng Wang (Dean - ex-officio member)
                 Rami Zwick (Associate Dean – non-voting ex-officio member)

Barry Mishra, for the Executive Committee
The School of Medicine Executive Committee conducted 8 formal meetings during the 2013-2014 academic year. Additional business was conducted via email and other electronic means. The following items were considered (many on multiple occasions):

1) Appointment of Medical school admissions committee
2) Appointments to the Medical Student Progress and Promotions Committee
3) Policy in regard to make up exams
4) Policy in regard to staff hiring practices
5) Enforcement of Executive Committee recommendations and reporting to committee
6) Proposed changes to APM in regard to conflict of commitment
7) Proposed changes to APM in regard to health sciences compensation plan
8) Revisions to self-supporting graduate professional degree programs
9) SOM student grievance procedure
10) Proposed changes to APM, section 035 (sexual harassment), appendices A-1 and A-2
11) MOU for handling of senate academic personnel cases for Division of Clinical Sciences
12) Proposal to use same committee for non-senate appointments in Division of Clinical Sciences
13) Presidential policy in regard to professional degree supplementary tuition
14) Concerns about UC health care options
15) Clarification of process for Search for SOM Executive dean. How will the faculty be involved?
16) Quality of the personnel files being put together for clinical appointments
17) Vote on new chair of clinical appointments committee
18) Response to UCR libraries Strategic Plan
19) Potential conditional admissions program for the SOM
20) Appointment of graduate advisory committee and proposed Director of program
21) Proposed revision to Senate Bylaw 55
22) Proposed changes to CAP bylaws
23) Review of proposed changes to bylaws of Riverside Division
24) Proposed changes to whistleblower protection
25) Proposed changes to President’s updated policy on copyright and fair use
26) Proposed changes to campus policy on off scale salaries
27) Discussion of potential policy re applicants to medical school who have DACA (Deferred action for childhood arrivals) status
28) Election of Vice chair for 2014-015 year
29) Proposal for Early admission program for the medical school
30) Appointment of chair of medical education committee and duties moving forward
31) Mechanisms to facilitate vertical and horizontal coordination within the integrated medical curriculum and concomitant definition of the role of block, longitudinal course, and expert theme coordinators
32) SOM Health sciences compensation plan
33) Volunteer faculty appointments
34) Conflict of interest statement for FEC
35) Student appeals
36) Approval of best practice guidelines for interaction with social media
37) Revision of SOM bylaws
38) Proposed joint administrative-senate committee for summer session
39) Election procedure for new non-senate clinical faculty representatives to FEC

Ameae Walker, Chair
Paul Lyons, Vice Chair
Devin Binder
Monica Carson
Iryna Ethell
David Lo
Christian Lytle
Neal Schiller
Emma Wilson
Mahendr Kochar (non senate clinical)
Emma Simmons (non-senate clinical)
Phyllis Guze ex officio
G Richard Olds ex officio
THE GRADUATE DIVISION AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE COLLEGES
REPORT TO THE DIVISION
DECEMBER 2, 2014

To be received and placed on file:

Reports of Degrees Awarded - Winter 2014

Bourns College of Engineering
Bachelor of Science: ........................................................ 34

College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Bachelor of Arts: ............................................................... 328
Bachelor of Science: ...................................................... 35

College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
Bachelor of Arts: ........................................................... 10
Bachelor of Science: ...................................................... 107

School of Business Administration
Bachelor of Science: ....................................................... 75

Report of Degrees Awarded – Spring 2014

Bourns College of Engineering
Bachelor of Science: ...................................................... 301

College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences
Bachelor of Arts: ............................................................ 1287
Bachelor of Science: ...................................................... 112

College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
Bachelor of Arts: ............................................................ 30
Bachelor of Science: ...................................................... 601

School of Business Administration
Bachelor of Science: ....................................................... 369

Graduate Division
Master of Arts: ............................................................. 48
Master of Business Administration: ................................. 86
Master of Education: ..................................................... 8
Master of Finance: .......................................................... 25
Master of Fine Arts: ....................................................... 31
Master of Professional Accountancy: ............................... 41
Master of Science: .......................................................... 62
Doctor of Philosophy: ...................................................... 77
Report of Degrees Awarded – Summer 2014

Graduate Division
Master of Arts: .................................................................12
Master of Business Administration: .................................1
Master of Education: ..........................................................32
Master of Fine Arts: .............................................................4
Master of Science: ...............................................................19
Doctor of Philosophy: .........................................................54

The names of the candidates are filed in the official records of the Office of the Registrar.

P Keller, Acting Secretary-Parliamentarian
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate
To be received and placed on file:
The Committee on Courses has approved the following courses.

### Undergraduate Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>ARBC 105</td>
<td>Media Arabic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUS 170</td>
<td>Financial Statement Valuation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 004</td>
<td>Nanotechnology: Science, Applications and Future</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 145</td>
<td>Robotic Planning and Kinematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 155</td>
<td>Power System Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENGL 198 I</td>
<td>Individual Internship in English</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 19 W V</td>
<td>The Historian’s Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME 144</td>
<td>Introduction to Robotics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME 145</td>
<td>Robotic Planning and Kinematics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MUS 111</td>
<td>Music Resources and References</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NASC 189</td>
<td>Reading and Analysis of Scientific Articles (1)</td>
<td>BCH 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBPL 197</td>
<td>Research for Undergraduates</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 171</td>
<td>Technical Production</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 172</td>
<td>Design in Production</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 173</td>
<td>Management and Directing in Production</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 174</td>
<td>Writing/Dramaturgy in Production</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 175</td>
<td>Fabrication in Production</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCDC 191 E</td>
<td>Seminar in International Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delete</td>
<td>THEA 070</td>
<td>Living Theatre</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 141</td>
<td>Drafting and Rendering for Theatre, Film, and Television</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 143</td>
<td>Scene Painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>BCH 189</td>
<td>Advanced Analysis of Biochemical Methods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>BUS 149</td>
<td>Advanced Topics in Management and Decision-Making</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 117</td>
<td>Electromagnetics II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 144</td>
<td>Introduction to Robotics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>FREN 009 A</td>
<td>French for Reading Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREN 009 B</td>
<td>French for Reading Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREN 109 A</td>
<td>Main Currents in French Literature: Middle Ages and Renaissance</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREN 109 B</td>
<td>Main Currents in French Literature: Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREN 109 C</td>
<td>Main Currents in French Literature: Nineteenth Century</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FREN 109 D</td>
<td>Main Currents in French Literature: Twentieth Century</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 099 W</td>
<td>The Historian’s Workshop</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 191 (E-Z)</td>
<td>Seminar in History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 197</td>
<td>Research for Undergraduates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIST 199</td>
<td>Senior Research</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NASC 188</td>
<td>Introduction to Oral Presentations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PBPL 198 I</td>
<td>Individual Internship in Public Policy</td>
<td>1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THEA 170</td>
<td>Performance in Production</td>
<td>1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UCDC 191 M</td>
<td>Seminar in Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Professional Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>MATH 401</td>
<td>Professional Development in Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>BCH 209</td>
<td>Ribonucleic Acid (RNA) Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMDB 209</td>
<td>Ribonucleic Acid (RNA) Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EE 233</td>
<td>Optimal Control and Estimation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN 209</td>
<td>Ribonucleic Acid (RNA) Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEN 234</td>
<td>Statistical Genomics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME 236</td>
<td>State and Parameter Estimation Theory</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME 237</td>
<td>Nonlinear Systems and Control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME 238</td>
<td>Linear Multivariable Control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ME 239</td>
<td>Optimal Control</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DELETE ANTH 200 C Core Theory in Anthropology (4)
HIST 250 New Directions in Historical Research (4)

CHANGE ANTH 200 A Core Theory in Anthropology (4)
ANTH 200 B Core Theory in Anthropology (4)
BPSC 234 Statistical Genomics (4)
CHEM 211 D Spectrometry in Organic Structure Analysis (3) CHEM 216A
CHEM 211 E Advanced Organic Reactions (3) CHEM 210
CHEM 216 Physical Organic Chemistry (3) CHEM 216B
CHEM 245 Chemistry and Physics of Aerosols (3)
EE 211 Adaptive Signal Processing (4)
EE 236 State and Parameter Estimation Theory (4)
EE 237 Nonlinear Systems and Control (4)
EE 238 Linear Multivariable Control (4)
EE 239 Optimal Control (4)
EE 245 Advanced Robotics (4)
ENSC 245 Chemistry and Physics of Aerosols (3) SWSC 245
ENTX 245 Chemistry and Physics of Aerosols (3)
ME 220 Optimal Control and Estimation (4)
ME 222 Advanced Robotics (4)
MGT 212 Application of Behavioral Economics to Management, Decision-Making, and Policy (4)
MSE 225 A Spectrometry in Organic Structure Analysis (3)
MSE 245 A Advanced Organic Reactions (3)
MUS 293 Composition Practicum (1)
RLST 200 A Religion, Politics, and Public Discourse (4)
RLST 200 B Representations, Interpretations, and Critical Histories (4)
RLST 200 C Religions in Contact (4)
SOC 232 Proseminar in Sociology (2)

EXTENSION COURSES:
Course Approvals
MGT X105.11 Supervised Training

Instructor Approvals
EDUC X80 An Introduction to Early Childhood Studies- Child Growth and Development, Rebecca Carreon-Bailey, B.A.
EDUC X80 An Introduction to Early Childhood Studies- Child Growth and Development, Laura Gordillo, M.A.
EDUC X81 Role of Home, School and Community in Early Childhood Education, Bertha Barajas, M.A.
EDUC X81.92 Teaching in a Diverse Society, Ansina Green, M.A.
EDUC X81.92S Ando en Una Sociedad Diversa, Yecencia Cardenas, M.A.
EDUC X82 Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum in Early Childhood Education, Bertha Barajas, M.A.
EDUC X82 Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum in Early Childhood Education, Christopher Lawrence, M.Ed.
EDUC X82.31 Advanced Child Growth and Development (Age 8 through Adolescence), Patricia Fernandez, M.A.
EDUC X83.01 Observation and Assessment of Children’s Behavior, Melissa Holcombe, M.Ed.
EDUC X85 Supervising Adults within Early Childhood Educational Settings, Bertha Barajas, M.A.
EDUC X88.AS Seminario en Administracion, Parte A, Bertha Barajas, M.A.
EDUC X88.BS Seminario en Administracion, Parte B, Bertha Barajas, M.A.
EDUC X147 Effective Use of Computer Based Technology: An Integrated Approach for the Classroom, Level I Technology, Sherri Kemp, Ed.D.
EDUC X147 Effective Use of Computer Based Technology: An Integrated Approach for the Classroom, Level I Technology, Brian Patterson, M.A.
EDUC X148 Effective Use of Advance Computer-Based Technology: An Integrated Approach for the Classroom- Level II, Brian Patterson, M.A.
To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Courses has approved requests to allow the following instructors to teach upper division courses as indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Jaquez</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANTH 118</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Tuchman-Rosta</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANTH 136</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Placentia</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANTH 162</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Placentia</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANTH 180</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Topalovic</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANTH 105</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Miller</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>ANTH 158</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Turner</td>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>AHS 112</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Arvidson</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>BCH 100</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chung</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>MGT 228</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chung</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>MGT 247</td>
<td>W'15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ehnes-Zepeda</td>
<td>Cell Biology and Neuroscience</td>
<td>CBNS 165</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. McDaniel</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CS 120B</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. McDaniel</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CS 122A</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Izbicki</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CS 100</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Izbicki</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CS 100</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Izbicki</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CS 100</td>
<td>W'15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Izbicki</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>CS 100</td>
<td>S'15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neighbors</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>GEO 157</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Aiyar</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 105B</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Aiyar</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 178</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bhattacharjee</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 155</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Urrutia</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 153</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Singhania</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 181</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Kurzfeld</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 160</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Gabrovski</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 135</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Levine</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 103</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Esfahani</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 105</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Khanom</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 101</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Khanom</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 101</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Panda</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 107</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Panda</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 107</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Abubaker</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 135</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Raihan</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 105A</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Sarshar</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 124</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Kong</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 162</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Pan</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>ECON 130</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Jackson-Boothby</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 109</td>
<td>W'15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Jahner</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 110</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Branch</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 282A</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Nguyen</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 238</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Stein</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 175</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Cramer</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 110</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Terrill</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 176</td>
<td>W'15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. McHenry</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 288</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Walker</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUC 285M</td>
<td>F'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Antinora</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>ENGL 117B</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Camacho</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 108E</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Camacho</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 123</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Villalpando</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 161</td>
<td>SS'14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>LIMITS OF AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sepulveda</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 183 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Vines</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 141A SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hwang</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 160 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Arevalo</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>ETST 146 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Neighbors</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>GEO 157 F'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hellwig</td>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>LWSO 100 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Hellwig</td>
<td>Law and Society</td>
<td>LWSO 193 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Strong</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MATH 131 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Barber</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MATH 120 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Dinsmore</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>ME 120 W'15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Propst</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MUS 140 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. McVey</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 111 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Walker</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 121V SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Gin</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 124 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Johnson</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 113 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Murphey</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 121O SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Wonderly</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 165 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Ryan</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 134 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Tam</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 164 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Bachman</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 117 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. Bachman</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>PHIL 130 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Colbern</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 108 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Motameni</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 152 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Silva</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 173S SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Williams</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 160 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Grimes</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 182 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Skulley</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 148S SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Esparza</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 158 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Esparza</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 159 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Kono</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 111 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. McCahon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 168 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Prellberg</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 112 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Khan</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 150S SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Nelson</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 146 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ross</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 167 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Boushee</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 143 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Warino</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 164 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Crespo</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 124 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Brown</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 129 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Brown</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 169 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Cauchon</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 139 F'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Mannies</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>POSC 112 F'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Marcelo</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 152 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Nicolaides</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 160 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dias</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 134 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hicks</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 178 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Morse</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 150 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Morse</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 178 S'15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Larson</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 175 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. McCoy</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 142 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Miller</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PSYC 179 F'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Townsend</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>RLST 175 F'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Gerstenberger</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 142 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Suh</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 158 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Schwarz</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 122 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Apkarian</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 151 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cathcart</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 129 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cathcart</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 130 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTRUCTOR</td>
<td>DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>LIMITS OF AUTHORIZATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Drucker</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 149  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Love</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 143  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Curwin</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 150  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Curwin</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 159  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Dunn</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 168  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. McTaggart</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 154  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Radojcic</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>SOC 140  SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Grant</td>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>SEAS 136 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Rawal</td>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>SEAS 167 SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Cacho</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>STAT 100A SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Hui</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>STAT 100A SS'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To be received and placed on file:

In the fall of 2013, 54% of UCR’s entering freshmen had satisfied the Entry-Level Writing Requirement before registering as full-time students. The biggest factor in this improvement over previous years had to do with UCR’s evolving admissions policy. A growing number of freshmen (30% in Fall 2013) are coming to UCR with AP credits that place them in English 1B or 1C. (See the attached graph documenting this pattern over recent years.)

The remaining 46% (1943 students) placed in Entry-Level Writing courses. The great majority made good progress once they arrived at UCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 ELWR Students: Initial Placement</th>
<th>ELWR Not Satisfied by Spring 2014 (listed according to initial placement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>English 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “not satisfied” numbers do not tell the whole story. Of the 1560 students who placed into English Writing 4, only eight (one half of one percent) were required to leave UCR at the end of the year solely for failure to satisfy the requirement. Of the 107 students initially placed in English 4 who did not satisfy the ELWR by the spring 2014 quarter, 61 were academically dismissed or left the university due to impending dismissal because of their overall academic records. Four students withdrew voluntarily from the university. The colleges granted an additional quarter to satisfy the ELWR to fourteen students. Twenty students satisfied the ELWR during the summer 2014 quarter. The remaining eight students were dismissed because they had not passed the ELWR.

The overall record of the ESL group (those in Basic Writing 3) is also much better than the “not satisfied” numbers indicate. A total of 384 entering freshmen initially placed in Basic Writing 3. Since they were “off the clock” for up to their first three quarters of residence, no students among those placed in Basic Writing 3 in the fall of 2013 were required to leave UCR solely for failure to satisfy the ELWR. 202 students satisfied the ELWR during their first year of residence. Of the remaining 182 Basic Writing 3 students, 147 continue to make progress in satisfying the ELWR. Thirty-five students have been academically dismissed or have left the university due to impending dismissal because of their overall academic records (15 AR* or F1 visa status).

**Update on Fall 2012 Basic Writing 3 Students**

We have a more complete picture of BW 3 students’ progress when we look at the two-year records of students who placed in the ESL course when they entered UCR in the fall of 2012. Of the 262 entering freshmen who were placed in Basic Writing 3 that year, 129 students satisfied the ELWR during their first year of residence. Sixty-five students satisfied the ELWR during their second year of residence. Of the remaining 73 Basic Writing 3 students, 47 students were academically dismissed or left the university due to impending dismissal on the basis of their overall records (23 AR or F1 visa status). Eight students withdrew from the university. Only ten students (approximately 4%) in the group that
started in BW 3 in Fall 2012 were eventually required to leave UCR solely for failure to satisfy the ELWR (8 AR students and one with F1 visa status).

*AR is an Enrollment Management designation meaning Permanent Alien Resident.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPT</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR FIRST NAME</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR DEGREE</th>
<th>TYPE OF APPROVAL</th>
<th>APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTM</td>
<td>X80</td>
<td>Hospitality and Tourism Management</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Carreon-Bailey</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X80</td>
<td>An Introduction to Early Childhood Studies -- Child Growth and Development</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Gordillo</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X81</td>
<td>Role of Home, School and Community in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Culton</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X81.92</td>
<td>Teaching in a Diverse Society</td>
<td>Ansina</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X81.92S</td>
<td>Enseñando en una Sociedad Diversa</td>
<td>Yecenia</td>
<td>Cardenas</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X82</td>
<td>Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Barajas</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X82</td>
<td>Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X82.31</td>
<td>Advanced Child Growth and Development</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Fernandez</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X83.01</td>
<td>Observation and Assessment of Children’s Behavior</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Holcombe</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X85</td>
<td>Supervising Adults Within Early Childhood Educational Settings</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Barajas</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X88.AS</td>
<td>Seminario en Administración, n y Supervisión; n de Centros de Educación; n Infantil, Parte A</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Barajas</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X88.BS</td>
<td>Seminario en Administración, n y Supervisión; n de Centros de Educación; n Infantil, Parte B</td>
<td>Bertha</td>
<td>Barajas</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X105.11</td>
<td>Supervised Training</td>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>Kemp</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/17/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X147</td>
<td>Effective Use of Computer-Based Technology: An Integrated Approach for the Classroom, Level I Technology</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X148</td>
<td>Effective Use of Advance Computer-Based Technology: An Integrated Approach for the Classroom - Level II</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/01/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.2</td>
<td>Grades TK-2: Common Core Addition and Subtraction</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.2</td>
<td>Grades TK-2: Common Core Addition and Subtraction</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.3</td>
<td>Grades TK-2: Using Appropriate Tools Strategically</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.3</td>
<td>Grades TK-2: Using Appropriate Tools Strategically</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.4</td>
<td>Grades 3-5: Common Core Multiplication and Division</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.5</td>
<td>Grades 3-5: Common Core Multiplication and Division</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.6</td>
<td>Grades 6-8: Common Core Statistics</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.6</td>
<td>Grades 6-8: Common Core Statistics</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.7</td>
<td>Grades 6-8: Common Core Ratios and Proportional Relationships to Functions</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.7</td>
<td>Grades 6-8: Common Core Ratios and Proportional Relationships to Functions</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.8</td>
<td>High School: Common Core Transformational Geometry</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.8</td>
<td>High School: Common Core Transformational Geometry</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.9</td>
<td>High School: Integrating Common Core Algebra and Geometry</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X305.9</td>
<td>High School: Integrating Common Core Algebra and Geometry</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Kukuruda</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.02</td>
<td>DS Classroom/Laboratory Management and Safety</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.03</td>
<td>DS Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.04</td>
<td>DS Assessing Student Learning</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.08</td>
<td>DS Career Technical Education Core for Single/Multiple Subject Teachers</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.08</td>
<td>Career Technical Education Core for Single/Multiple Subject Teachers</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X309.18</td>
<td>Vocational Education Foundations (Level II)</td>
<td>Kit</td>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X313.34A</td>
<td>Financial Aid Planning for Higher Education</td>
<td>Francisca</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X313.35B</td>
<td>The College Counseling Process</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X313.37</td>
<td>College Admissions Procedures</td>
<td>Francisca</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X313.38</td>
<td>Professional and Ethical Issues in the College Application Process</td>
<td>Francisca</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X313.39</td>
<td>Practicum in Counseling College-Bound Students</td>
<td>Francisca</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X313.44</td>
<td>Analysis and Application of Effective Career Counseling Strategies</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR FIRST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR DEGREE</td>
<td>TYPE OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X321.13</td>
<td>Role of Home, School and Community in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Ramona Godfrey</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X321.32</td>
<td>Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>Ramona Godfrey</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X321.61</td>
<td>Health, Nutrition and Safety in Early Childhood</td>
<td>Ramona Godfrey</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X321.67</td>
<td>Strategies for Reporting Child Abuse in Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.33</td>
<td>Teaching English through Technology</td>
<td>Bryan Fox</td>
<td>M.A., Applied Ling</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.33</td>
<td>Teaching English through Technology</td>
<td>Kristina Rigden</td>
<td>M.A. Teaching</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.33</td>
<td>Teaching English through Technology</td>
<td>Monica Rocha</td>
<td>M.A. TESOL and VI</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.33</td>
<td>Teaching English through Technology</td>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.34</td>
<td>Methods &amp; Techniques for Teaching ESL: Student Teaching</td>
<td>Stephen Burns</td>
<td>M.A. English Com</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.34</td>
<td>Methods &amp; Techniques for Teaching ESL: Student Teaching</td>
<td>Debra Poortenga</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.34</td>
<td>Methods &amp; Techniques for Teaching ESL: Student Teaching</td>
<td>Carol Wright</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.35</td>
<td>Effective Use of Games in the ESL Classroom</td>
<td>Estella Hernandez</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.35</td>
<td>Effective Use of Games in the ESL Classroom</td>
<td>Tammy Johnson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.35</td>
<td>Effective Use of Games in the ESL Classroom</td>
<td>Monica Rocha</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.45A</td>
<td>Core Concepts of TEFL</td>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.45A</td>
<td>Core Concepts of TEFL</td>
<td>Jennifer Vallely</td>
<td>M.A. Education/TEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.46C</td>
<td>Teaching EFL Speaking</td>
<td>Jennifer Vallely</td>
<td>M.A. Education/TEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.46D</td>
<td>Teaching EFL Listening</td>
<td>Jennifer Vallely</td>
<td>M.A. Education/TEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.46C</td>
<td>Teaching EFL Listening</td>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57A</td>
<td>TESOL Reading Methodologies</td>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57A</td>
<td>TESOL Reading Methodologies: Theory and Practice</td>
<td>Tammy Johnson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57A</td>
<td>TESOL Reading Methodologies</td>
<td>Debra Poortenga</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57B</td>
<td>TESOL Writing Methodologies</td>
<td>Reza Bahrami</td>
<td>PhD in Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57B</td>
<td>TESOL Writing Methodologies</td>
<td>William Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57B</td>
<td>TESOL Writing Methodologies</td>
<td>Stephen Burns</td>
<td>M.A. English Com</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57B</td>
<td>TESOL Writing Methodologies</td>
<td>Christine Tsai-Taing</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.57B</td>
<td>TESOL Writing Methodologies</td>
<td>Carol Wright</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.61</td>
<td>TESOL Vocabulary Methodologies</td>
<td>Stephen Burns</td>
<td>M.A. English Com</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.61</td>
<td>TESOL Vocabulary Methodologies</td>
<td>Monica Rocha</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62A</td>
<td>TESOL Conversation Methodologies</td>
<td>Reza Bahrami</td>
<td>PhD in Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62A</td>
<td>TESOL Conversation Methodologies</td>
<td>Tammy Johnson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62A</td>
<td>TESOL Conversation Methodologies</td>
<td>Debra Poortenga</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62A</td>
<td>TESOL Conversation Methodologies</td>
<td>Carol Wright</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62B</td>
<td>TESOL Listening Methodologies</td>
<td>Reza Bahrami</td>
<td>PhD in Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62B</td>
<td>TESOL Listening Methodologies</td>
<td>Tammy Johnson</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62B</td>
<td>TESOL Listening Methodologies</td>
<td>Debra Poortenga</td>
<td>B.A., M.A.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62B</td>
<td>TESOL Listening Methodologies</td>
<td>Stephen Burns</td>
<td>M.A. English Com</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62C</td>
<td>TESOL Pronunciation Methodologies</td>
<td>Jennifer Vallely</td>
<td>M.A. Education/TEI</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X326.62C</td>
<td>TESOL Pronunciation Methodologies</td>
<td>Regina Richards</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X329.60</td>
<td>Language Based Learning Differences: Helping Students who Struggle</td>
<td>Doris Dredd-Lee</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X329.60</td>
<td>Language Based Learning Differences: Helping Students who Struggle</td>
<td>Jane Adelizzi</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X330.27</td>
<td>Principles of Educational Therapy</td>
<td>Jone Bycel</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR FIRST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR DEGREE</td>
<td>TYPE OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X345</td>
<td>Nutrition and Physical Activity Training and Assessment for Early Care and Education Facilities</td>
<td>Silvia</td>
<td>Villasenor</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X347.3</td>
<td>Effective Use of Technology Resources to Reflect Learning Theory and Curriculum Design</td>
<td>Sherri</td>
<td>Kemp</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.1</td>
<td>Orientation to PPS School Counseling</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.12</td>
<td>History and Practices of School Counseling</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.13</td>
<td>Guidance Instruction and Advocacy</td>
<td>Kymberly</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.14</td>
<td>Academic Development</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.16</td>
<td>Personal and Social Development</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.16</td>
<td>Personal and Social Development</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.17</td>
<td>Individual Counseling</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.18</td>
<td>Group Counseling and Facilitation</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.21</td>
<td>Professionalism, Ethics and Legal Mandates in School Counseling</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.21</td>
<td>Professionalism, Ethics and Legal Mandates in School Counseling</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.23</td>
<td>Development and Organization of Prevention Programs for School and Community</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.23</td>
<td>Development and Organization of Prevention Programs for School and Community</td>
<td>Kymberly</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.5</td>
<td>Personal, Social Interaction Relationships in a Multi-Cultural Society</td>
<td>Belinda</td>
<td>Bettis</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.5</td>
<td>Personal, Social Interaction Relationships in a Multi-Cultural Society</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.6</td>
<td>Methods of Assessment and Evaluations</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.7</td>
<td>Legal Mandates and Professional Ethics in Pupil Personnel Services</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Haynes</td>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.70</td>
<td>Legal Mandates and Professional Ethics in Personnel Services</td>
<td>Cherylyn</td>
<td>Adame</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X388.9</td>
<td>School Safety and Violence Prevention</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LING</td>
<td>X402</td>
<td>Introduction to Linguistics’</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSCI</td>
<td>X403</td>
<td>Introduction to Science</td>
<td>Wendi</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X403.C</td>
<td>Teaching iyengar Yoga Postures, C: Inverted Poses</td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Cleve</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWT</td>
<td>X407.1</td>
<td>Fiction of Place</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Dunlap</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWT</td>
<td>X407.1</td>
<td>Fiction of Place</td>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Bachman</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X407.5</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Writing</td>
<td>Reza</td>
<td>Bahrami</td>
<td>PhD in Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X407.5</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Writing</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X407.5</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Writing</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Lochrie</td>
<td>M.F.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X407.5</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Writing</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Tsai-Taing</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X408.15</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction- Enhancing Pedagogical Skills</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X408.18</td>
<td>Teaching Special Populations</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X409</td>
<td>Leadership Principles and Practices</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>X410.1</td>
<td>Mammal Tracking in the East Mojave</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Lowery</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>X410.1</td>
<td>Mammal Tracking in the East Mojave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X410.2</td>
<td>Improving Students’ Analytical Writing</td>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td>Cote</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X410.2</td>
<td>Improving Students’ Analytical Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X410.59</td>
<td>Understanding the broad instructional practices to teaching with the Common Core State Standards Standards. Deconstructing the standards into components such as communication, collaboration, rigor, tasks, project-based learning, assessment, lesson planning and real-life application opportunities.</td>
<td>LaTrice</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X410.59</td>
<td>English Composition and Sentence Structure</td>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Bowley</td>
<td>M.A., in Education</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X410.59</td>
<td>English Composition and Sentence Structure</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X410.678</td>
<td>Introduction to Shakespeare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X410.7</td>
<td>Procurement and Subcontract Management</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td>BA, MS, and certifi*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X410.8</td>
<td>Current Issues and Case Studies in Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>Rickey</td>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X410.82</td>
<td>Purchasing and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>Rickey</td>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X410.82</td>
<td>Purchasing and Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>Timothy</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>MPA, BA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR FIRST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR DEGREE</td>
<td>TYPE OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X410.85</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of Purchasing</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Torres</td>
<td>BA, MS, and certifi*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X410.86</td>
<td>Logistics &amp; Supply Chain Management</td>
<td>Rickey</td>
<td>Slaughter</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X413</td>
<td>Hospital-Based Case Management</td>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>B.S.N</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X413</td>
<td>Hospital-Based Case Management</td>
<td>Tonya</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X413.1</td>
<td>Medical Case Management in the Field</td>
<td>Tonya</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X413.2</td>
<td>Job Analysis by the Field Case Manager</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>DeLima</td>
<td>M.S.W., L.C.S.W.</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X414</td>
<td>Effective Case Management: Connecting to the Community</td>
<td>Christa</td>
<td>Banton</td>
<td>Ed.D., M.S., BCPC</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X414</td>
<td>Effective Case Management: Connecting to the Community</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>DeLima</td>
<td>M.S.W., L.C.S.W.</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X414</td>
<td>Effective Case Management: Connecting to the Community</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Wilhite</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X415.15</td>
<td>Financial Coverage and Benefits Systems in Case Management</td>
<td>Christa</td>
<td>Banton</td>
<td>Ed.D., M.S., BCPC</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X415.15</td>
<td>Financial Coverage and Benefits Systems in Case Management</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Asbury</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X418</td>
<td>Effective Case Management: Connecting to Client</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>DeLima</td>
<td>M.S.W., L.C.S.W.</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X418</td>
<td>Effective Case Management: Connecting to Client</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Wilhite</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X418</td>
<td>Effective Case Management: Connecting to Client</td>
<td>Christa</td>
<td>Banton</td>
<td>Ed.D., M.S., BCPC</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X421</td>
<td>Introduction to the Common Core State Standards</td>
<td>LaTrice</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUR</td>
<td>X421.3</td>
<td>Legal Strategies of Community Planning</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>Owens</td>
<td>J.D</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X421.8</td>
<td>Management in a Common Core Classroom</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X421.8</td>
<td>Management in a Common Core Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>X422.91</td>
<td>Microsoft Excel Advanced</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Epps</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X424</td>
<td>Technical Writing Seminar</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Guignard</td>
<td>MS, BA</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.01</td>
<td>Frameworks &amp; Methods for TESOL</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.01</td>
<td>Frameworks &amp; Methods for TESOL</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>M.A., Applied Ling</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.01</td>
<td>Frameworks &amp; Methods for TESOL</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>X425.01</td>
<td>Classic American Literature</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>McIntosh</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.02</td>
<td>Language Development &amp; Acquisition</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>MA, MS</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.02</td>
<td>Language Development &amp; Acquisition</td>
<td>Estella</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.02</td>
<td>Language Development &amp; Acquisition</td>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.02</td>
<td>Language Development and Acquisition</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Petzar</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.03B</td>
<td>Grammar Methodologies for ESL/EFL Teachers, B</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>M.A. English Com</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X425.03B</td>
<td>Grammar Methodologies for ESL/EFL Teachers, B</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>MA, BA</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X426.1</td>
<td>Language and Language Development</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Petzar</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X426.54</td>
<td>Culture and Diversity in Bilingual Settings</td>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Vilchez</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X426.9</td>
<td>CTEL Portfolio</td>
<td>Lilian</td>
<td>Jezik</td>
<td>M.A., M.S., BCLAD</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.01</td>
<td>Evaluating the Potential of a new or Existing Business</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>MS, BS</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.03</td>
<td>Financing Your Business</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Cescolini</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.61</td>
<td>Overview of Fiduciary Management</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.61</td>
<td>Overview of Fiduciary Management</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>J.D., LL.M.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.62</td>
<td>Practical Applications of Accounting for the Professional Fiduciary</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.62</td>
<td>Practical Applications of Accounting for the Professional Fiduciary</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>J.D., LL.M.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.63</td>
<td>Introduction to Conservatorships of the Person and Estate</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.63</td>
<td>Introduction to Conservatorships of the Person and Estate</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>J.D., LL.M.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.64</td>
<td>Management of Estate Assets</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.66</td>
<td>Professional Fiduciary Business Practices</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.66</td>
<td>Professional Fiduciary Business Practices</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>J.D., LL.M.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.71</td>
<td>Decedents' Estates Practices and Procedures</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR FIRST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR DEGREE</td>
<td>TYPE OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.71</td>
<td>Decedent’s Estate Practices and Procedures</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>J.D., LL.M.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.72</td>
<td>Trust Administration and Procedure</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X427.72</td>
<td>Trust Administration and Procedure</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
<td>J.D., LL.M.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X428.16</td>
<td>Cost Accounting</td>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>Barrios</td>
<td>MS Human Resource</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X429.23</td>
<td>Internal Auditing: Operational and Management</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Sloan</td>
<td>M.B.A., B.S.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X431.2</td>
<td>Report Writing for the Legal Nurse Consultant</td>
<td>Karen Phillips</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>RN,JD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>X433.6</td>
<td>Ethics for the Legal Professional</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>M.A., J.D.,</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>X435</td>
<td>Civil Litigation and Procedures</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>M.A., J.D.,</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>X437.1</td>
<td>Contract Law</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>X437.1</td>
<td>Contract Law</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Brock</td>
<td>MA, JD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>X438</td>
<td>Probate Practices and Procedures</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X448</td>
<td>Introduction to Legal Nurse Consulting</td>
<td>Karen Phillips</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>RN, JD</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X448.5</td>
<td>Establishing and Organizing a Practice as a Legal Nurse Consultant</td>
<td>Jerelyn</td>
<td>Weiss</td>
<td>R.N., M.S., FNP,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>X450</td>
<td>Content and Methods of Teaching Advanced Placement Statistics</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Levine-Wissing</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X450.15</td>
<td>Curriculum Theory and Methods: Content Specific Pedagogy for Secondary</td>
<td>Vanessa</td>
<td>Bowley</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X450.15</td>
<td>Curriculum Theory and Methods: Content Specific Pedagogy for Secondary</td>
<td>LaTrice</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X450.8</td>
<td>Performance Appraisal and Evaluation</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Scott Young</td>
<td>DBA,CFP,PHR, BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERT</td>
<td>X451</td>
<td>Programming JavaScript Applications for ArcGIS</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Master in Applied</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERT</td>
<td>X451</td>
<td>Programming JavaScript Applications for ArcGIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X452.1</td>
<td>Human Resources Management</td>
<td>Kathy Ann</td>
<td>MacDougal</td>
<td>MBA, BS</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>X455.01</td>
<td>Blueprint Reading: Construction Drawings for the Building Trades</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Tavaglione</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X455.1</td>
<td>Exceptionality in Early Childhood: Characteristics of Young Children</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X455.11</td>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education: Role of Family in Early Childhood</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>X455.12</td>
<td>Early Childhood Special Education: Assessment and Intervention/</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>X460.9</td>
<td>Geology of the Basin and Range Province</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Garrison</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>X460.9</td>
<td>Geology of the Basin and Range Province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRWT</td>
<td>X462.2</td>
<td>Writing Fantasy Fiction</td>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Noone</td>
<td>M.A., Ph.D. (in</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.30</td>
<td>Principles of Special Events Management</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>MS Arts, B.A.,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.30</td>
<td>Principles of Special Events Management</td>
<td>Rey</td>
<td>O’Day</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.32</td>
<td>Event Design and Technology</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>MS Arts, B.A.,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.35</td>
<td>Corporate Event Management</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>MS Arts, B.A.,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.36</td>
<td>Events Fundraising and Sponsorship</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>MS Arts, B.A.,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.38</td>
<td>Marketing an Event Business</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>MS Arts, B.A.,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X463.42</td>
<td>Developing and Managing your Business</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Conrad</td>
<td>MS Arts, B.A.,</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X465.1</td>
<td>Forensic Approaches to Blunt Force and Firearm Injuries</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSC</td>
<td>X465.01</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Examiner Training: Pediatrics</td>
<td>Cari</td>
<td>Caruso</td>
<td>A.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X468.1</td>
<td>Financial Reporting</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X468.1</td>
<td>Financial Reporting</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Stoll</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X468.5</td>
<td>Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>Manuel</td>
<td>Barrios</td>
<td>MS Human Resour</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X468.5</td>
<td>Managerial Accounting</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Cescolini</td>
<td>M.S., B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.02</td>
<td>Communicating Effectively</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.03</td>
<td>Understanding Your Role as Supervisor</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.04</td>
<td>Moving Through Change: What’s In it For Me?</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPT</td>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR FIRST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR LAST NAME</td>
<td>INSTRUCTOR DEGREE</td>
<td>TYPE OF APPROVAL</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.05</td>
<td>Delegation Skills and Managing Team Performance</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.06</td>
<td>Project and Process Management for Maximum Results</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.07</td>
<td>Building High Performance Teams</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.08</td>
<td>Coaching and Mentoring: Developing Employees and Getting Results</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.09</td>
<td>Understanding, Motivating, and Managing Others</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.1</td>
<td>Leadership Principles and Practices-Supervision and Teambuilding</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Cescolini</td>
<td>MAM, BA, MA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.11</td>
<td>Managing Differences and Resolving Conflicts</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X469.12</td>
<td>Managing Differences Through Workplace Inclusion</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>X470</td>
<td>Supervised Student Teaching</td>
<td>Peggy</td>
<td>Cleve</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.39</td>
<td>Project Scheduling and Risk Management</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>MS Engineering, B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.41</td>
<td>Project Management Essentials</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kadlec</td>
<td>BS, BA, MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.41</td>
<td>Project Management Essentials</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>MacDougall</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.43</td>
<td>Project Management Applications</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Kadlec</td>
<td>BS, BA, MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X470.47</td>
<td>Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X471.2</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Construction Costs, Estimating and Budgeting</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Tavaglione</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X471.6</td>
<td>Construction Project Planning, Scheduling and Control Systems</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Tavaglione</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X473.4</td>
<td>Lean Principles and Practice</td>
<td>Salvador</td>
<td>Cardiel</td>
<td>M.B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X475</td>
<td>Marketing Principles and Practice</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Paquette</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X476</td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Paquette</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X477.3</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>Eva Marie</td>
<td>Beisner</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X477.3</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Paquette</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X477.3</td>
<td>Principles of Accounting</td>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Stoll</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X478.5</td>
<td>Business Writing</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>BA, MA, MBA</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO</td>
<td>X481.1</td>
<td>Introduction to Astronomy for Educators</td>
<td>Wendi</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X489.25</td>
<td>Advanced Design Collaterals</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X489.25</td>
<td>Advanced Design Collaterals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X489.25</td>
<td>Advanced Design Collaterals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X489.26</td>
<td>Epub Publishing with Adobe InDesign</td>
<td>Zachary</td>
<td>Meyers</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>X489.26</td>
<td>Epub Publishing with Adobe InDesign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X499.1</td>
<td>Understanding the American Workplace</td>
<td>Bronwyn</td>
<td>Jenkins-Deas</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X499.11</td>
<td>Supervised Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10/27/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT</td>
<td>X499.11</td>
<td>Supervised Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>07/23/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes first time approval for Instructor
**Denotes Instructor has previously been approved but has not yet taught; therefore, there are no evaluations
Graduate School of Education
Report to the Riverside Division
December 2014

To Be Adopted:
Proposed Changes to Charge of the Committee on Graduate School of Education
(By Laws E4.1.1., E.4.2.. E.4.4.)

PRESENT
E4.1
There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty, ex officio; the Dean of the school, ex officio; a Faculty member from each Area Group as provided in E4.1.1 and Director of Teacher Education, ex officio. No member is eligible for immediate reelection (except as an ex officio member), but he/she becomes eligible after one year of non-service. The Chair and secretary of the Faculty occupy corresponding offices in the Executive Committee. (Am 25 Jan 72)(Am 25 May 00)(Am May 2005) (Am 29 May 12)

E4.1.1. The elected faculty membership shall consist of four persons elected at large from the Graduate School of Education who will represent each Area Group. (Am 25 Jan 72)(Am May 2005) (Am 29 May 12)

E4.2. There shall be a standing teacher education committee consisting of one representative from each teacher credential program; two other Faculty; the Director of Teacher Education, ex officio; the Dean of the Graduate School of Education, ex officio; and, when possible, one graduate student representative selected by the Graduate Student Association of GSOE, without voting rights. The Chair shall have the right to ask for a closed meeting, excluding student member, under certain circumstances, including but not limited to discussions of personnel matters, and of students when student privacy is a concern. The duty of the committee is to advise on the operation of teaching credential programs.(En 25 Jan 72)(Am may 2005) (Am 29 May 12)

PROPOSED
E4.1
There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty, ex officio; the Dean of the school, ex officio; a Faculty member from each Area Group as provided in E4.1.1 and Director of Teacher Education, ex officio. No member is eligible for immediate reelection (except as an ex officio member), but he/she becomes eligible after one year of non-service. The Chair and secretary of the Faculty occupy corresponding offices in the Executive Committee. (Am 25 Jan 72)(Am 25 May 00)(Am May 2005) (Am 29 May 12)

E4.1.1. The elected faculty membership shall consist of one representative from each Area Group, elected at large from the Graduate School of Education who will represent each Area Group. (Am 25 Jan 72)(Am May 2005) (Am 29 May 12)

E4.2. There shall be a standing teacher education committee consisting of one representative from each Graduate School of Education teacher credential program, including one representative from UCR Extension; two other Faculty; the Director of Teacher Education, ex officio; the Dean of the Graduate School of Education, ex officio; and, when possible, one graduate student representative selected by the Graduate Student Association of GSOE, without voting rights. The Chair shall have the right to ask for a closed meeting, excluding student member, under certain circumstances, including but not limited to discussions of personnel matters, and of students when student privacy is a concern. The duty of the committee is to advise on the operation of teaching credential programs.(En 25 Jan 72)(Am may 2005) (Am 29 May 12)

E. 4.3 No change

E. 4.3 No change
E.4.4. There shall be a standing M.Ed. advisory committee consisting of two Faculty members, the Director of Teacher Education who shall be the M.Ed. graduate advisor, ex officio, and the Dean of the Graduate School of Education, ex officio. The duty of this committee is to advise on the operation of the M.Ed graduate degree program. (En May 5, 2005)

E4.4. There shall be a standing M.Ed. and Education Minor advisory committee consisting of at least two Faculty members, the Director of Teacher Education who shall be the M.Ed. graduate advisor, ex officio, and the Dean of the Graduate School of Education, ex officio. The duty of this committee is to advise on the operation of the M.Ed graduate degree program and to have oversight over the Education Minor. (En May 5, 2005)

Statement of Purpose and Effect:
These changes reflect (a) the intent of including a representative from each of the Area groups within the GSOE for the Executive committee, in contrast to a limit in number where not all Area groups have representation; (b) the relationship between the GSOE and Teacher credential programs within University Extension and GSOE’s interest in including a representative from this area on a committee that addresses Teacher Education; and (c) the development and establishment of an undergraduate minor in Education and the need to have a committee with oversight over this curricular area.

The result of these changes will include: (a) adding one member or more to the Executive committee; (b) adding one member to the Teacher Education Committee; and (c) adding a new function to the M.Ed committee, that is oversight for the Education Minor.

Because our committee appointments are made in Spring quarter but do not take effect until September 1, this change will be realized on September 1, 2015.

Approved by the GSOE Executive Committee: May 13, 2014
Submitted by: JOHN S. LEVIN, CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, GSOE

Section below is for Senate use only

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: June 2, 2014
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Proposed Changes to SOBA Bylaw 4.2 and 4.2.1

PRESENT

SOBA4.2 The School of Business Administration academic programs shall be guided by two Standing Committees: the Undergraduate and the Master level committees. (En 5 May 77) (Am Feb. 15, 2011) (Am Feb 19 2013)

PROPOSED

SOBA4.2 The School of Business Administration academic programs shall be guided by two Standing Committees: the Undergraduate and the Master level committees. The duty of the academic program committees is to oversee the relevant curricula. This includes developing, monitoring, evaluating and revising the substance and delivery of the curricula of degree programs and to assess the impact of the curricula on learning. The academic program committees guide the design and implementation of the School of Business’ Assurance of Learning program as defined by AACSB

SOBA4.2.1 The members of the School of Business Administration academic programs committees will be appointed by the Executive Committee and shall have representation in all academic areas as defined in 4.1.1. The Dean of the School of Business Administration will be an ex officio member of the committees. (En 5 May 77) (Am Feb. 15, 2011) (Am Feb 19 2013)

SOBA 4.2.1 The members of the School of Business Administration academic programs committees will be appointed by the Executive Committee and shall have representation in all academic areas as defined in 4.1.1. The Dean of the School of Business Administration will be an ex officio member of the committees. In addition, the Executive Committee can appoint other non-voting members to the committees as needed

Justification:

SOBA4.2 – The duties of the School’s academic programs committees (the Undergraduate and the Master level committees) were not previously defined. The proposed change define the duties and in particular will help us with the AACSB accreditation but demonstrating that the Assurance of Learning program at SoBA is institutionalized and would be carried out in a systematic and ongoing fashion.

SOBA 4.2.1 – The proposed change would provide the flexibility to the executive committee to appoint other (non-voting) members to the School’s academic programs committees as needed. Examples for potential members are the directors of the programs (MPAc. MFin, etc) and/or students representatives.
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Introduction

Student-initiated courses have been held on UC campuses since the 1960s, and today, at least six campuses in the UC system have a program through which students can initiate, develop, and facilitate a for-credit seminar or project. At UCR, at least two student groups have pursued this type of activity with the aid of a structured program before the pilot launch of student-initiated R’Courses in Spring of 2014. Since several UC campuses successfully offer student-initiated and facilitated courses and the UCR pilot program has demonstrated feasibility and student interest, the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) is proposing a formal program modeled after those at other UC campuses to ensure the quality of the educational experience for students and facilitators, increase the variety of seminar topics available for students, and encourage student engagement through group learning experiences.

Student-Initiated Courses on Other UC Campuses

Table 1 shows key characteristics of the programs at UCI, UCB, UCLA, UCD, UCSC, UCSB and UCSD. The models differ in their degree of centralization and structure. UCB has decentralized control of the courses almost completely to the faculty and departments. UCI, UCLA, and UCD provide more structure for facilitator training and faculty mentorship. UCSC offers courses through their Education for Sustainable Living Program (ESLP), in which students can earn academic credit for participating in student-led sections of a broad course on sustainability. UCD and UCSB have offered student-led courses through their ESLP chapters, and recently both campuses have developed initiatives to broaden the scope of student-led courses.

R’Courses Program Overview

The objective of R’Courses is to provide an opportunity for undergraduate students at UCR to develop and facilitate courses on topics that highlight their expertise and that their peers can take for credit. The main challenge is soliciting, developing, and delivering a course in a time frame that accommodates a student’s limited tenure at UCR, and yet incorporates proper oversight to ensure a quality educational experience for enrolled students that is worthy of academic credit. For new regular courses, a full faculty review requires approvals from the program/department, college/school executive committee, and the Committee on Courses (COC)--a process that can take as long as year. Along with the time needed to solicit proposals and deliver the course, the duration of the regular process can be prohibitively long for an undergraduate student.

R’Courses address this challenge with an abbreviated review process that is augmented by faculty oversight and training of the student instructor, referred to as the facilitator. The complete
program, from the solicitation for new courses to the completion of the facilitator’s course will occur within 3 regular academic quarters: for example, for courses offered in Spring quarter, the solicitation and selection of proposals occurs in the Fall, course development and facilitator training occurs in the Winter, and course delivery occurs in the Spring. Similar three-quarter cycles apply to courses offered in the Fall and Winter quarters. Responsibility for the operation of the program, selecting the proposals, and ensuring that the courses offered satisfy UCR’s educational standards rests with departmental leadership and with a Governing Board (described below). This Board will ensure that the facilitator is adequately trained as an instructor. A faculty mentor will assist the Board by working directly with the facilitator in developing the syllabus, providing meaningful resources, and grading student work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year Founded</th>
<th>Units &amp; Grading Scheme</th>
<th>Courses Offered Each Term</th>
<th>Credit for Enrolled Students</th>
<th>Credit for Facilitator (when taught)</th>
<th>Course Funding</th>
<th>Facilitator Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| UC Irvine | UTeach  | 2007         | 1 unit Pass/No Pass    | 15-20 (spring quarter only) | 1 Unit University Studies 7 | 2 Units University Studies 197 C | Funded by Academic Affairs through ASUCI.                                       | Fall: University Studies 197A for 2 units (letter grade)  
Winter: University Studies 197B for 2 units (P/NP only—12 student cap)  
Spring: University Studies 197C (1 hour weekly meetings) for 2 units (P/NP only) |
<p>| UC Berkeley | DeCal  | 1965         | 1-4 units S/NC        | 190                       | Housed in departments under 98/198 for student | Housed in the faculty advisor’s department as Special | Facilitators can apply for an Education Enhancement Fund grant, through the Optional workshops and education class through The Undergraduate Course Facilitator |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Proposal Requirements</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Los Angeles</td>
<td>Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (USIE)</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1 unit Pass/No Pass</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Housed in departments - 88S</td>
<td>Housed in departments - 188S</td>
<td>Not available. Students can make copies in Undergraduate Education office or Faculty sponsor’s department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>Student Facilitated Courses</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Variable units Pass/No Pass</td>
<td>Initial proposal from dept—then departments can offer courses independent</td>
<td>Housed in departments - 199FB</td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitators must pass 199FA with same faculty prior to offering the course and take 199FB during the course. Faculty must be present in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Program Details</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Additional Requirements</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Education for Sustainable Living Program (ESLP)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2 or 5 units</td>
<td>Graded</td>
<td>10 (spring quarter only)</td>
<td>College 8: either 61 (2 units) or 161 (5 units)</td>
<td>Through Campus Sustainability Fund (all courses relate to sustainability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Santa Barbara</td>
<td>ESLP</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4 units</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC San Diego</td>
<td>Office of Academic Affairs: Student Initiated Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A goal for 2014-2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R’Courses Governing Board and Senate Oversight

The R’Courses Governing Board is charged with providing direction and oversight for the program. The Academic Senate delegates to this Board the responsibility for setting the educational standards for R’Courses and for ensuring that these standards are maintained. To support the program, this Board will solicit, review, and select proposals for R’Course offerings. This includes establishing a recruitment program with informational sessions at popular student venues. It also has responsibility for training the facilitators, and it will coordinate this activity and course preparation with the facilitator’s faculty mentor. If the educational quality of the course is substandard, the Board has the authority to intervene and terminate a course prior to the beginning of the quarter of instruction if corrective measures are not possible. The Governing Board will work with the Office of Undergraduate Education staff to publicize R’Courses, provide training sessions for facilitators and ensure program resources are available. The Board will meet at least once during each regular academic quarter. At these meetings the board will: assess outcomes from the previous quarter; assess instructor readiness and provide final approval for courses to be delivered in the next quarter; review and select courses to be offered two quarters hence, and review the training program to be offered next quarter for instructors of these courses.

Given the primary role in curriculum oversight, Senate representation on the Governing Board is crucial. The Governing Board’s membership is composed of at least three members of the Academic Senate, one undergraduate student, and two ex-officio members from the administration. The faculty from the Academic Senate have voting privileges, and the rest of the membership is nonvoting. The Committee on Committees will appoint the three faculty and designate which of the three members from the Academic Senate is the Board’s Chair. It is highly recommended that at least one of the appointees is a former faculty mentor for an R’Course, and at least one is a former member of either COC or CEP. The Academic Senate will appoint the student representative according to the standard process for student appointments. The two ex-officio members are the Assistant Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and the Coordinator of Educational Initiatives. The primary role of the ex-officio members is to coordinate resources with the Office of Undergraduate Education. All appointments are for one year with the expectation that the faculty appointments will be renewed for a total term of three years. Additional non-voting staff can be appointed by the VPUE if workload or expertise warrants it.

Official Senate oversight will be provided by the COC and CEP, and to enable this mandate, these committees will receive an annual report from the Governing Board on the status of the program. If concerns arise, the COC will provide feedback. At the completion of the program’s fourth year, the CEP will conduct an internal review with the objective of determining if this program meets the academic standards of the Senate and provides a worthwhile experience to the students. During this initial period, the program should solicit feedback on the quality of the
program from students who take R’Courses, the facilitators, and the mentors. At the time of the 
review, this information will be provided to the CEP.

Facilitator Proposals

Student proposals should include enough information so that the Governing Board can assess the 
quality of the course content, its uniqueness relative to other offerings at UCR, and the potential 
of the student as a facilitator. Student facilitators must maintain at least a 3.0 GPA throughout the 
three-quarter R’Courses cycle. The course plan in this document includes a syllabus with course 
and learning objectives, proposed activities, assignments and readings, and the assessment 
criteria. Students preparing a proposal will be instructed to review the COC General Rules and 
Policies Governing Courses of Instruction (http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/8/Guidelines%202010-11%20final.pdf), particularly Appendix 
1A- Minimum Hours Per Week Per Unit and Appendix 1B, to justify the workload and assigned 
units.

Each student applicant also must identify a faculty mentor who will assist him/her with 
developing the course and with training. After reviewing the proposal, the faculty mentor must 
sign a mentor agreement if they approve the concept and are willing to assist the facilitator by 
fulfilling the terms outlined in the agreement. The mentor will also be the instructor of record for 
the courses enrolled in and offered by the facilitator. This activity can be included in the faculty 
member’s merit and promotion file as an Undergraduate Mentorship experience.

Legal and Ethical Liability

Undergraduates involved in research at UCR are required to sign a waiver/release form on safety 
issues and the same procedures would be followed for students facilitating A similar procedure 
will be used with the facilitators in R’Courses. Instruction on ethical conduct and relevant 
university policy will be incorporated in the Winter training program. Final responsibility for the 
course resides with the faculty mentor and the university. Clarification and disclaimers regarding 
these issues will be provided to the students in the course information.

Proposed Credit and Training Structure for R’Courses at UCR

Each R’Course will be designated as a 198 course for independent study in the home department 
of the faculty mentor. The R’Course proposal will require approval from both the faculty mentor 
and the Chair of the hosting department. Each department housing an R’Course will need to 
complete a new course proposal the first time an R’Course is offered (all subsequent offerings of 
the same course will not require Governing Board approval). These initial 198 courses should be 
approved as S/NC with variable topics. If for some reason, the Governing Board concludes after 
reviewing the course that the content is better aligned with another program and a faculty mentor 
in that program is not available, approvals from the alternative department, the mentor, and the 
COC are required. These courses will be offered for credit utilizing the S/NC grading system to
matriculated undergraduate students at UCR for 1 unit, consistent with the COC guidelines for determining unit count. Students will be limited to no more than two R’Courses per year and no more than eight during their undergraduate careers. R’Courses will count against the campus limit on S/NC unit accumulation at the time of graduation, as well as any other college or program limits on S/NC enrollment or credit. Units accumulated through R’Courses cannot fulfill major requirements.

The facilitators with successful proposals will participate in a regular 190 course with their faculty mentor to develop the course syllabus and materials (1-4 units, either graded or S/NC as determined by faculty mentor), as well as five mandatory workshops, each one lasting two hours, during the Winter quarter to provide core training in instructional techniques, course development, and course management. An outline of the syllabus for these workshops is in Appendix 1. At this time, the facilitators should be developing their course content and consulting on a regular basis with their faculty mentors. Toward the end of the Winter quarter, each facilitator will be required to rehearse a lesson with the other facilitators during one of the mandatory workshops. The Governing Board will be responsible for organizing the workshops and practice sessions and finding workshop instructors. Course development and facilitator training must be completed with final approval from the Governing Board by the beginning of week 10 of the Winter quarter. The Governing Board will be responsible for organizing the workshops and practice sessions and finding workshop instructors. Course development and facilitator training must be completed with final approval from the Governing Board by the beginning of week 10 of the Winter quarter. Facilitators will also have the option to enroll in the 190 course with the same faculty mentor again when they deliver the course during the Spring quarter. One requirement of the 190 credits/facilitator workshops will be for the facilitator to submit self-assessments at the end of the Winter and Spring quarters. Facilitators are limited to developing one R’Course per year.

The faculty mentor will be the instructor of record for both the facilitator’s training 190 and the 198 course associated with the facilitator, and will have final responsibility for the grades issued for these courses. UCR’s registrar, Bracken Dailey, has assured that there should be no problem fitting R’Courses into the existing structure after approval of a designated course number by the Committee on Courses. Funding for this program should be minimal, and the source of this support will come from Undergraduate Education Awards and/or ASUCR. Initially, we expect 10-15 of these courses will be offered each year.

For the 2014-2015 academic year, the proposed scheduling cycle is outlined below in Table 2. In 2015-2016, we would continue the same cycle, while adding a call for proposals in the Spring of 2015, course development and training during Fall, and course delivery during the Winter quarter of 2016. Given the success and demand of the program (as determined by the R’Course Governing Board), an additional call for proposals could be added in the Winter of 2016, with course development and training during Spring, and course delivery during Fall of 2016.
Table 2: R’Courses scheduling cycle.

Fall Quarter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>R’Courses Board</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Faculty Mentor</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Publicize program with Scotmail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25 for Scotmail, $25 in copies for promotional material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>announcements and information sessions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Orientation meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare proposal and identify faculty mentor. Acquire required approvals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organize and schedule training workshops for Winter quarter. Meet with the workshop instructors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete review and approve facilitator’s proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline to submit proposal to Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Process and review proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Announce successful proposals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
information to selected facilitators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Ceremony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After Spring Quarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results from the Pilot R’Courses**
A student-initiated seminar on gardening was offered during the Winter quarter of 2013 at UCR, and nine R’Courses were piloted in Spring of 2014. A summary of these pilot courses is provided in table 2, and a sample proposal/syllabus from one course (Issues in Disney: Race, Gender, and Sexuality) is included in Appendix 3. Feedback received from facilitators, students, and faculty has been very positive overall; representative comments are provided below.

Table 3: Summary of Spring 2014 pilot R’Courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th># Students</th>
<th>Student Facilitator(s)</th>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Day/Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Faculty Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Transgression and the State</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Joseph Montoya</td>
<td>WMST190</td>
<td>76W</td>
<td>R/4:10-5:30</td>
<td>INTN 2043</td>
<td>Jane Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Dead and Our Underlying Culture</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Colette King</td>
<td>ENGL190</td>
<td>28V</td>
<td>W/4:00-6:00</td>
<td>Surge 308</td>
<td>Sherryl Vint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues in Disney: Race, Gender and Sexuality</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Michael Turcios</td>
<td>ETST190</td>
<td>90C</td>
<td>T/1:10-3:00</td>
<td>INTN 4043</td>
<td>Amalia Cabezas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolution</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Shreyas Doshi</td>
<td>POSC190</td>
<td>27L</td>
<td>T/4:00-6:00</td>
<td>Watkins 1117</td>
<td>John Laursen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Politics in U.S. Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Armando Saldana, Rebecca Park</td>
<td>CHFY198i</td>
<td>59C</td>
<td>W/11:10-12</td>
<td>HMNSS 1502</td>
<td>Geoff Cohen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are Powerful 001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kareem Aref, Christopher Sanchez</td>
<td>SOC 190</td>
<td>84C</td>
<td>WF/11:10-12</td>
<td>ASUCR Senate</td>
<td>Christopher Chase-Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indie Cinema and Aesthetic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Geneveive Newman</td>
<td>MCS 190</td>
<td>41H</td>
<td>M/2:30-4:30</td>
<td>INTS 3154</td>
<td>Keith Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Garden Seminar: Implications of</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Nancy Ocon, Natalie Soto, Pavan Rami,</td>
<td>WMST190</td>
<td>83H</td>
<td>R/11:10-2:00</td>
<td>INTN 2043</td>
<td>Tamara Ho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments from student facilitators:

“The opportunity to share and create ideas with fellow students is quite special. Discussion is the most fruitful mode of creating ideas with other students.”

“I think the students’ eagerness and interest to learn about the subject was the biggest strengths of the class. I also think the syllabus was what really helped the class throughout the quarter because in each class I already knew what we had planned and so did the students.”

“My faculty mentor helped me a lot with the foundation of the class and how it should be structured. I believe this is what really helped the class to be taken seriously by the students and helped the class run smoothly throughout the quarter.”

“The discussion style seminar is best to come up collaboratively with ideas.”

Advice for future facilitators: “Don’t try to be a professor, you are a facilitator of discussion . . . we are all learning from each other as undergraduates at UCR.”

Comments from student participants:

“I really enjoyed the course and I think these courses allow students to take classes on subject matter that they're actually interested in.” (From Business and Politics)

“The student instructor was helpful, and genuinely interested in teaching this course.” (Walking Dead)

“Students who have similar other course requirements are instructing students get the chance to grow and become real intellectuals.” (Disney)

“It was accessible and I felt encourages to be open and share my ideas because the facilitator is an undergrad student like me.” (Gender Transgression)

“Really interesting (therefore motivating) material for the class.” (Indie Cinema)
Overall Pilot Evaluation:

Staff from Undergraduate Education visited each of the 9 R’Courses during the last week of each course to conduct surveys (with 81 respondents). The governing board met at the end of the semester to debrief, hear from a student facilitator, and discuss some of the results from the surveys and SIS data. The following points highlight the conversation in this meeting.

Successes:

- Student interest and participation (111 students enrolled in 9 courses)
- Strong proposals with clear objectives and activities made stronger with affirming and critical feedback from the governing board (majority of participants could articulate course objectives)
- Diversity of participants (2.87 cumulative GPA; 95% non-honors participation)
- Some good models for faculty mentoring (meeting weekly or regular email communication)
- Facilitator workshops incorporating discussion strategies, readings on democratic education, writing prompt and rubric training, etc.
- Positive course evaluations (students felt the syllabus and objectives were clear)

Challenges:

- Grading Basis: Of the 111 students, 69 S/NC (62%), 41 had no grade type specified (37%), 1 letter grade (1%)
- Registration Process: Not streamlined—some able to register online, some had to email the advisors
- Weight on Facilitators: Facilitators poured a great deal of academic time and energy into the courses with no additional units given
- Student Participation: In some cases, student participants did not prioritize the course work (because it was S/NC, because it was 1 or 2 units, or because it was a fellow student)
- Faculty/department involvement: Variable—in some cases there was great collaboration, in others the expectations were unclear
- Number of units: Unclear whether courses could/should be 1 or 2 units
• Attendance at Facilitator workshops: Most facilitators attended at least one and followed up on the information if they could not attend. But since they were scheduled late, there were many class conflicts.

Recommendations:

• Create a new course number to differentiate from the 190 series AND/OR . . .

• Clarify registration process: require students to go through department advisors for registration and to sign a waiver allowing the advisor to change their grading basis to S/NC

• Orientation for faculty and advisors

• Hold mandatory information session before each course in which the registration/grading policies are clarified with students

• Facilitator training course

• Clarify expectations with departments and faculty regarding regular meetings

• Impose a maximum number of R’Course units students can take

• Clarify the annual R’Course cycle (see Table 2 for the full proposed cycle)
Appendix 1: Sample Syllabus for Training Workshop

Democratic Pedagogy: Developing R’Courses

Winter 2015

Location and Time TBA

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed to support the R’Courses process of student-facilitated learning by providing a space for student facilitators to discuss pedagogical theory and practice, and to prepare meaningful resources and discussions. Throughout the quarter, we will examine the ways in which we can be create significant learning experiences for ourselves and for other student learners. We will:

- Critically analyze both historical and contemporary pedagogical theory and practice
- Define and clarify the role of the effective facilitator
- Learn how to create successful educational experiences through innovative course design and for diverse learners

As we explore different pedagogical concepts and learning models, we will begin to formulate what, to us, constitute exceptional teaching and learning experiences. Throughout the quarter, you will experiment with the design and implementation of different educational experiences. Within this process, you will also have the opportunity to practice your facilitation skills and receive supportive and honest feedback from other members of the course.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

At the end of the term, participants will:

Develop Significant Learning Experiences for Undergraduates

- by creating a course syllabus and accompanying lesson plans that effectively meet the needs of a diverse group of students with different learning styles and life experiences
- by utilizing course assessment tools to facilitate reflection on how to improve teaching and/or course design
- by receiving and providing supportive, constructive, and sometimes challenging feedback
- by growing and practicing flexible and dynamic facilitation skills to navigate, observe, and attend to often complex group dynamics within a university classroom.
Develop a Teaching Portfolio

- by highlighting and documenting course development and professional development
- by preparing a dossier of materials for future professional and intellectual use.

READING AND RECOMMENDED TEXTS

This course will include selections from the following texts (available on iLearn):


CONTACT INFORMATION

Course facilitator: TBA

Facilitator office:

Facilitator phone and email:

Facilitator office hours: TBA

The facilitator will coordinate closely with the faculty mentors for each course, and these workshops are a key component of earning the 1 unit of credit offered through a 190 course in the sponsoring department. Please feel free to email or call to make an appointment to meet.

EXPLANATION OF CLASS PARTICIPATION

(EXCERPT FROM PRESKILL AND BROOKFIELD’S, *DISCUSSION AS A WAY OF TEACHING*)

Participating in discussion does not necessarily mean talking a lot or showing off what you know or what you have studied. Good discussion participation involves people trying to build on and synthesize comments from others, and showing appreciation for others’ contributions. It also involves inviting others to say more about what they are thinking. Some of the most helpful things you can do are call for a quiet interlude, bring a new resource to the classroom, or post an observation online. So there are multiple ways quieter learners can participate. Active listening will be foundational for engaged teaching and learning.
Below are some specific behavioral examples of good participation in discussion:

- Ask a question or make a comment that shows you are interested in what another person says
- Ask a question or make a comment that encourages another person to elaborate on something they have already said
- Bring in a resource (a reading, web link, video) not covered in the syllabus but adds new information/perspectives to our learning
- Make a comment that underscores the link between two people's contributions & make this link explicit in your comment
- Use body language (in only a slightly exaggerated way) to show interest in what different speakers are saying
- Contribute something that builds on, or springs from, what someone else has said. Be explicit about the way you are building on the other person's thoughts – this can be done online
- When you think it's appropriate, ask the group for a moment's silence to slow the pace of conversation to give you, and others time to think
- Make a comment that at least partly paraphrases a point someone has already made
- Make a summary observation that takes into account several people's contributions & that touches on a recurring theme in the discussion (online if you like)
- Ask a cause and effect question - for example, "can you explain why you think it's true that if these things are in place such and such a thing will occur?"
- Find a way to express gratitude/appreciation for the enlightenment you have gained from the discussion. Try to be specific about what it was that helped you understand something better. Again this can be done online if this suits you better.

COURSE COMPONENTS, ASSESSMENT IN THE COURSE, AND GRADING

All written materials and the Seminar Presentation will receive qualitative written feedback. The course facilitator will provide an evaluation to the instructor of record for the 190 in which each student facilitator is enrolled, detailing the student facilitator’s completion of the required elements. To offer the R’Course in the Spring, students must successfully complete all FIVE components of the course listed below:

1. Attend all 5 workshops.

2. Turn in all written assignments (Syllabus components, Reflections, Course Evaluations and Assessments).

3. Complete one classroom observation.

4. Deliver one pilot lesson.

5. Submit the Final Course Portfolio, which includes:
• Assessments (Course Intake Form, Mid-semester and Final Evaluations)
• Final syllabus with Course Plan Calendar
• Lesson plans
• Reflections
• CV or Teaching Resume (highly recommended for those seeking teaching jobs or applying to graduate school, but optional)

LATE ASSIGNMENTS

Generally, late assignments will not be accepted. All written assignments are to be turned in via email, iLearn, or in person by the specified due date (normally before class begins on Wednesdays). If you have a problem turning in an assignment on time, please contact me immediately.

WINTER 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Workshop Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 1 | Introduction to Democratic Education  
Classroom Culture and Diverse Learning Styles |
| Week 3 | Inclusive Education  
HR, logistics, and training—diversity, mental health, etc. |
| Week 5 | Course Design and Objectives  
Assessment, Prompts, and Writing |
| Week 7 | Lesson Planning  
Facilitating Discussions  
(Classroom Observation and Reflection) |
| Week 9 | Pilot Lessons  
Evaluation |
Appendix 2: Sample Proposal and Syllabus from Spring 2014

**R'Course Proposal Form**

Proposals are due on Friday, March 14, 2014 by email to nancy.kameya@ucr.edu.

The course proposal form must be completed jointly by the student facilitator(s) and instructor(s) of record. The department is responsible for the academic quality of the course, assigning the course title and number (e.g., 190 Independent Study), and providing necessary resources (e.g., classroom space). The instructor of record is responsible for assigning students’ grades at the end of the quarter. To prepare your R'Course proposal, please review the provided checklists for student facilitator, faculty, and department chair.

Please answer all questions (1-6) on the form, and please note that a well-written syllabus should address the first four questions. The worksheet to determine unit value is enclosed in this application packet.

**Submission Instructions:** The sponsoring department should keep the original signed form and provide a copy to the student facilitator(s), instructor(s) of record, and the Office of Undergraduate Education (email to nancy.kameya@ucr.edu).

All fields must be completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Submitted:</td>
<td>March 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term to be offered:</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus department:</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Title:</td>
<td>Issues in Disney: Race, Gender, and Sexuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units (1 to 2):</td>
<td>2 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Facilitator Name(s):</td>
<td>Michael Turclos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Facilitator Email Address(es):</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michael.turclos@email.ucr.edu">michael.turclos@email.ucr.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor of Record (Faculty Member):</td>
<td>Dr. Amalia Cabezas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor of Record Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amalia.cabezas@email.ucr.edu">amalia.cabezas@email.ucr.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please answer the following six questions and indicate the page number where the answers can be found in your syllabus (don’t forget to attach a copy of your syllabus).

1. What is the nature of the subject matter or content of the course? Include a weekly schedule that shows topics, readings and assignments for each week.

2. What are the key learning objectives (i.e., what do you hope students will learn by participating in and completing the course)?

3. What are the methods of instruction (e.g., lecture, discussion, collaborative learning, etc.)?

4. How will student performance be evaluated? What will students be required to do to pass the class, and how much weight will each requirement have toward the final grade?

5. How will the instructor of record supervise the student course facilitator(s)?

6. Has the student facilitator consulted with the appropriate department staff person to verify any required department procedures or necessary resources?

Signatures: My signature below acknowledges my responsibility for this course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENT COURSE FACILITATOR(S)</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTOR(S) OF RECORD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amelia L. Cabezas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT CHAIR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/10/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R'Course Proposal Questions and Reflection

1. The course is designed to educate students of the issues with race, gender, and sexuality in Disney films. The course has been structured in three categories (please refer to page 4 of syllabus for weekly schedule): race gender, and sexuality. Students will read secondary texts that will complement the material for the week. For instance, Week 2 is based on the erasure of historical narratives and sanitization of historical accounts, and in order to comprehend that topic, students will read an article that addresses the Disney film The Princess and the Frog. Selected clips from that film and Song of the South will be screened and students will make a connection between the readings and the visual material. Furthermore, the student facilitator will lecture during the first 30 minute of the course—to provide a foundational background—and introduce theories and other related subjects.

2. Because watching a Disney film has become a passive visual experience, some spectators do not see the large picture of the issues presented by Disney. For this course, I would like students to identify key concepts such as race, gender, and sexuality and relate them to the course material. In addition, the students should be able to articulate the terms and grasp an understanding of them. This will become evident when they apply such terms—and various others that will be introduced throughout the quarter—in their weekly discussions and response papers. In addition, I aim for students to develop critical thinking skills by honing their skill in applying theoretical material to other cultural texts. For instance, at the conclusion of the course, students should be able to apply their critical thinking skills by corroborating their analysis with scholarship and other material that would supplement their arguments. In order to successfully apply critical thinking skills, students should be able to thoroughly analyze academic scholarship, visual texts, and other academic material. Finally, students will learn why it is important to study race, gender, and sexuality in Disney films. One of the primary reasons is because marginal cultures may not identity with the cultural works produced by dominant systems, thus it is important to explore why such works may negatively influence stereotypes and form of prejudices. (The course objectives are located on page 1 of the syllabus under Course Objectives).

3. Since R'Course is student-lead, I have designed the seminar as a democratic learning style. The method of instruction will be in the form of a seminar because students will have valuable input in their education (refer to page 1 of Syllabus under Course Description). In order for this method of instructor to function, one of the required assignments asks for students to select a week that interests them to cover the topic, and pose two discussion questions (refer to page 2 of syllabus under Required Assignments). By having students produce two questions, they are being afforded with the opportunity to lead the seminar and take charge of their discussions. In the first few minutes of the course, the student facilitator will briefly lecture in order to provide some background on the material, introduce theoretical material, and also set-up the discussion if necessary. However, the seminar style will allow students to lead their own discussions and ensure they are successful at compromising and leading a healthy dialogue that is academically enriching.

4. The success of students in the seminar will be evaluated by their overall accumulation of points. The grading system consists of earning points for their on-time assignments. Students
who are on time will receive a point per week, leading to 10 possible points for the quarter. Discussion questions will be 10 points total for the week they present their questions to the class and lead a successful seminar. Weekly one page double-spaced reflections are worth 10 points each; based on the quality of their responses, they may earn a maximum of 10 points for the assignment. And finally, a final three page paper will worth a possible 100 points. (The grading basis is available on page 3 and the assignments are located on Page 2).

5. Student facilitator will meet with Instructor of Record periodically and discuss points to evaluate the course as it progresses over the quarter. Student facilitator has created a Weekly Evaluation form that will be submitted at the end of the week to the Instructor of record as a tool of keeping a written record of the course progress. (Please refer to attached document entitled Weekly Evaluation Form). Student facilitator will also meet with the R'Course board to further discuss additional support, improvements for the program, and among many other forms of feedback. The Weekly Evaluation Form will allow Student Facilitator and Instructor of Record to target areas for improvement based on the reflections, and monitor how students are engaging with the content. For support and evaluation, there will be instances in which the Instructor of Record will observe the course and provide feedback and resources to improve method of instruction. In addition, Student Facilitator has created a Final Course Evaluation that will be of great use in evaluating supervision and the quality of the course. Furthermore, the Final Course Evaluation will allow the R'Course board to consider a few things based on the feedback provided by students. (Please refer to attached document entitled Student Final Course Evaluation).

6. Student facilitator has consulted with appropriate staff in order to ensure support for the course being offered in the Spring 2014. If additional needs are required, student facilitator can immediately identify the individuals who will provide that support such as Dr. Amalia Cabezas and Dr. Dylan Rodriguez, and communicate concerns to them. In addition, the R'Course board will extend necessary and appropriate support. Most of the resources are reading materials, and those are available on the Dropbox site for the course.
WORKSHEET TO CALCULATE WORKLOAD AND RESULTANT UNIT VALUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-class time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing papers</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 hours = 1 unit

6 hours = 2 units

Unit Value: 2 Units

This form is not required by the Academic Senate but may be required by departments.
Ethnic Studies 190:  
Issues in Disney: Race, Gender, and Sexuality

Facilitator: Michael Turcios  
Email: michael.turcios@email.ucr.edu
Seminar Time: Tuesdays, 1 p.m. – 3 p.m.  
Office Hours: by appointment
Seminar Location: Ethnic Studies Department Seminar Room
Instructor of Record: Dr. Amalia Cabezas

Course Description:
This seminar investigates the problematic characteristics in Disney films by analytically examining how the intersectionalities of race, gender, and sexuality are portrayed in those popular cultural works. To thoroughly comprehend the effects of Disney on consumers and spectators, this course will analyze Disney films as a source of misrepresentations that functions to create its own sanitized culture and fragmented historical accounts. Supported by theoretical material in the fields of race, gender, and sexuality, this seminar will employ an array of theories, secondary texts, and visual material to produce thought-provoking questions that will expose the lack of racial diversity, gender inequality, and differences of sexuality in Disney films. By analyzing Disney cultural productions, the course will examine the historical issues of the aforementioned intersectionalities in relation to the identification processes of spectators (particularly that of children of color).

This seminar meets weekly for two hours. The course is designed in the style of democratic learning—meaning that all students are active participants by leading discussions and shaping the structure of the week. Students will be afforded the opportunity to initiate discussion for the week by proposing questions to the class. In the first 30 minute of the seminar, the facilitator will lecture on theoretical material complementing the topic for the week. In addition, the scholarship conducted by other scholars well-known in their respective fields will be included in the lecture in the first half-hour of the course. The rest of the time will be seminar style in which students are expected to contribute as part of their Attendance and Participation grade, and lead the discussion based on the assigned reading and screened material for the week.

Course Objectives:
• Throughout the duration of the seminar, students will identify key concepts (e.g. race, gender, and sexuality) related to the course material and readings, and critically apply the terms to weekly discussions and response papers.
• Students will apply critical thinking skills to analyze race, gender and sexuality inequality in Disney cultural works by providing examples corroborated with academic scholarship.
• By the conclusion of the course, students will have developed analytical strategies to analyze visual texts, readings, and apply learned theoretical material to content outside the course.
• Students will articulate the importance of analyzing race, gender, and sexuality in Disney productions and their effects on marginal cultures: migrants, children, non-heteronormative identities, and people of color.

It will become evident that students will have acquired the course objectives by incorporating learned material into the discussions and supporting their 1 page responses—and final paper—
with the content explored in the course. Throughout the progression of the quarter, students will develop a rhetoric appropriate to the field of Ethnic Studies.

**Reading Material:**
All texts are available as PDF files on the Dropbox link provided via email: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/ddkikfnzq4x4ddv/eW1mP7b5S29 In order to successfully participate in the seminar and engage in stimulating dialogues, students are responsible for reading assigned material for the week before coming to class. In addition, for those interested in developing their analytical skills and enhancing their knowledge, supplementary suggested reading material is provided on Dropbox. It is important for students to familiarize themselves with the reading and engage with the material as it will significantly correspond to the topic of the week, and therefore become crucial for answering the prompt question for the weekly responses (see assignment section for additional information). For assigned reading materials, please refer to the weekly course schedule.

**Visual Material:**
Selected visual *extraits* will be screened during the seminar in order to supplement the discussion pertinent to our study for the week. In order to comprehend the context in which the clips are presented, students should have familiarized themselves with the reading assignment. Basing a discussion on the visual material and failing to incorporate the assigned reading will disrupt the flow of the seminar and produce responses that are unsupported by scholarship. Screened visual material may include documentary clips and Disney animated scenes that directly support the topic for the week.

**Required Assignments:**
*Weekly Response Paper:* Students must submit a one-page, double spaced, response paper with proper page citations from the reading, responding to the prompt for the week (refer to course schedule for prompt). Material discussed in the seminar may be incorporated, provided that students appropriately credit source(s). The quality of the work will be graded on a scale of 1 - 10. Please refer to weekly course schedule for dates of submission.

*Discussion Questions:* Students will select a week from the course schedule from which they will produce two well-thought out questions that are open-ended and present them to the class in order to generate the discussion for the week. This is an opportunity for students to bring into discussion any questions not raised in the reading, introduce additional scholarship not yet explored, or resort to other creative forms of stimulating a discussion that engages all students. Discussion questions may address any content, provided that they are appropriate for scholarly discussion.

*Final Paper:* As the final project for the seminar, students will submit a three page, double-spaced paper that follows the MLA format. Students will need to support their findings with the material employed in the seminar and answer one of the following prompts below. Final paper is scheduled for submission on June 3rd, at the last meeting of the seminar. Student will thoroughly answer one of the following prompts:
1. Based on the material learned in class, how is Disney transforming the representations of race, gender and sexuality in its contemporary animated features? Are these representations obscured from public view?

2. What other Disney alternatives are available as pedagogical tools? Are those cultural productions conflicted when it comes to representing race, gender, and sexuality?

3. How can one propose to change the Disney model of race, gender, and sexuality? What methods would need to be considered, and what would be the potential complications resulting from such changes?

Grading Basis:
The final grade for this course will be based on a point system that will allow students to monitor their progress throughout the quarter. Please consult with Facilitator in order to discuss progress in the course. Grades and scores will not be sent via email.

Attendance and Active Participation: 1 point per week = 10 points total.
Discussion Questions: 10 points for assigned week = 10 points total.
Weekly 1 Page Reflections (8): 10 possible points per response= 80 possible points total.
Final Paper: 100 possible points= 100 possible points total.

Total possible points: 200

Course Policies
• This is a seminar style course. Please read the assigned material before arriving to the seminar and actively engage in discussion.
• Unprepared students should not attend the seminar if they have not read material and/or are not prepared to engage in active participation.
• Electronics are permitted provided that the apparatus is for the sole use of seminar purposes such as: assessing the reading material and referring to response paper from the previous week.
• Arriving to the seminar more than 15 minutes late will earn the student a .5 out of 1 point in the Attendance and Participation grade for the week. An absence does not earn a student the point for the week. Please be aware that this seminar meets weekly, more than two absences will affect the final course grade.
• Absences can only be excused under certain critical circumstances, which will require verifiable documentation.
• Please do not bring guests to the seminar; only those enrolled are allowed to attend.
• Verify your UCR-issued email accounts before coming to the seminar for important updates and announcements.
• Late work will not be accepted. No work via email is to be sent to facilitator. I will not send scores/grades via email. Please set-up an appointment to meet with me.
• I reserve the right to modify material for the week under reasonable circumstances. Students will be notified of changes in advance.
University Policies

- Develop your own original work in the discussion and properly cite scholars in MLA format when employing their works and ideas. Acquaint yourself with the UCR policy on academic dishonesty, plagiarism, and cheating: http://www.conduct.ucr.edu/learnPolicies/Pages/AcademicIntegrity.aspx.
- Students who require special services should communicate with course facilitator in order to make appropriate accommodations ahead of time.

Course Schedule:

Week 1 (April 1st): Introduction to Seminar and Disney’s Pedagogy
Reading: Bell, Haas, and Sells’ “Introduction: Walt’s in the Movies” in From Mouse to Mermaid: The Politics of Film, Gender, and Culture.
Clips: “Mickey Mouse Monopoly: Disney, Childhood & Corporate Power” and “How TV Affects the Brains of Young Children”
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: How can theories of race, gender, and sexuality support the fact that film and television affect marginal groups?

Week 2 (April 8th): Sanitizing History and Effacing Historical Narratives
Clips: Harve Foster and Wilfred Jackson’s Song of the South (1946), Ron Clements and John Musker’s The Princess and the Frog (2009) and “Texas Rewriting History in School Curriculum”
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: Provide an example of a film that problematizes the rewriting/sanitizing of history. Highlight two examples in your film selection that supports your statement.

Week 3 (April 15th): Race, Capitalism, and Consumption
Clips: “Mickey Mouse Goes to Haiti”
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: Reflect on Disney’s capitalist ventures and their effects on racial minorities in the United States and in Third World nations.

Week 4 (April 22nd): Children of Color React to Disney
Clips: Rob Minkoff and Roger Aller’s The Lion King (1994), “Inside the AC360 Doll Study,” and “Subconscious Racial Bias in Children”
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: How do the misrepresentations of race in Disney films affect children’s communication in relation to other races? Provide at least two concrete examples.

Week 5 (April 29th): Construction of Masculinity in Animation
Clips: Kirk Wise and Gary Trousdale’s Beauty and the Beast (1991) and “Tough Guise: Violence, Media & the Crisis in Masculinity”
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: Are the dynamics of masculinity construction in Disney films pressuring young boys and girls to conform to societal expectations of masculine behavior?

Week 6 (May 6th): Feminist Voices
Reading: Laura Sell’s “Where do the Mermaids Stand?” Voice and Body in The Little Mermaid” in From Mouse to Mermaid: The Politics of Film, Gender, and Culture.
Clips: Ron Clements and John Musker’s The Little Mermaid (1989) and “Disney Cartoons and Gender Representations”
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: Despite the new wave of Disney films “empowering” women, why is there a continued lack of feminist discourse?

Week 7 (May 13th): Race and Gender Beyond Disney
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: Is there a non-Disney film that follows the Disney model that misrepresents racial minorities and their performed gender roles?

Week 8 (May 20th): Hidden Sexualities
Clips: Selected scenes from: Aladdin, The Lion King, and The Little Mermaid
Assignment: 1 double-page response due next week: Is Disney conflicted with its support for the gay community? Consider its implicit support on LGBTQ and their subversion of the topic.

Week 9 (May 27th): Intersectionalities of Race, Gender, and Sexuality (Students Selection)
Reading: Students recommend and select reading
Clips: Students recommend screening material
Assignment: Students continue working on their final paper due at the beginning of the seminar week 10 (June 3rd).

Week 10 (June 3rd): Post-Disney Cultural Alternatives
Reading: In lieu of reading, work on paper due today.
Clips: Guest speaker on The Guardian Princesses
Course conclusion discussion on Disney and learned content.
Weekly Evaluation Form
Form to be completed by Facilitator and utilized as an assessment tool for Instructor of Record and R'Course Board.

Facilitator: ________________________________
Course Title: ______________________________
Week and Topic: ____________________________

<p>| Course Observations:                      |
| Students receptive to content, participation in seminar, time management, course content, etc. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Reflections: |
| Monitor strengths and target areas for improvement by next session. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Comments: ________________________________
______________________________
______________________________
Addendum

A. My interest in teaching the Disney course is inspired by the fact that I am working on a senior thesis, mentored by Dr. Amalia Cabezas, in which I examine Disneyland in Anaheim, California as being synonymous with America. This relationship between the theme park and America is grounded by the fact that Disneyland constructs its own border and commodifies culture. As a result of this research (which launched in the Spring of 2013), I have read a substantial amount of articles that touch on the main topics of the course: Race, Gender, and Sexuality.

B. Attached to this application is my curriculum vitae. I have presented at numerous conferences and presented various projects. I hope the committee takes into consideration my presentations and hope it demonstrates that I have diversified my areas of interests and that my competencies in public speaking will allows me to teach a group of individuals.

C. My interests in offering this course lies on the fact that Disney needs to be challenged for its misrepresentations, but I also seek to teach because this is an opportunity for me to develop my teaching skills since I will be furthering my education in graduate school in the Fall of 2014. I would like to begin finding my own teaching format and find a balance between lecture and seminar.

D. For the past two years (Winter quarters 2013 and 2014), I have served as a co-instructor for a seminar with Housing, Dining, and Residential Services. In the Leadership Seminar, I taught candidates (for those in the process of becoming Student Staff members) theories and other important material. Others tasks included assigning homework, leading discussions, grading assignments, and evaluating each candidate at the end of the seminar. My experiences can assist the R'Course program, and I can provide valuable feedback to strengthen the launch of the official program next academic year. If you would like to further inquire about my facilitation skills, I have designated Elizabeth Hagen, Resident Director, as a reference to speak on my behalf: elizabeth.hagen@ucr.edu

Reviewed by Executive Council:  
April 14, 2014  
October 7, 2014  
November 17, 2014