To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Council reports the following which were approved in lieu of the Division, as per Senate Bylaw 8.5.3:

Approved by the 2014-2015 Executive Council:

Proposed changes to College of Engineering Breadth Requirements and Regulation Change (ENR 3.2.4) to be reflected in catalog copy.

Asian Studies Major Program change.

Proposal from the Committee on Educational Policy for the Creation of Summer Session Oversight Committees.

Changes to Guidelines for Admission by Exception – Supplemental Criteria

UCR version of Senate Regulation 760
To be received and placed on file:

The Executive Council report describes the discussions and actions taken in 11 meetings held from October 13, 2014 to June 8, 2015.

Each Executive Council meeting included a report from Chair Jose Wudka on issues reviewed at Academic Council meetings, the Chancellor’s 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 Senate Standing Committees at remaining meetings as they were submitted.

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

**Bylaw/Regulation Submissions**

The Executive Council received the following Legislative requests:

- **SOBA 4.2.1 – School of Business Bylaws**: The Executive Council received the bylaws change, had no questions, and the change was forwarded to the Division for approval.

- **ENR 3.2.4 – Bourns College of Engineering Bylaws**: The Executive Council received the bylaws change, had no questions, and the change was approved in lieu of Division meeting.

- **E 4.1.1, E.4.2, E.4.4 – Graduate School of Education Bylaws**: The Executive Council received the bylaws change, had no questions, and the change was forwarded to the Division for approval.

- **Proposed Changes to Regulation 6 Campus Graduation Requirements (R6.13 & R6.14)**: The Executive Council received the regulation change, had no questions, and the change was forwarded to the Division for approval.

- **Proposed Changes to the Membership of the Committee on Committees Bylaw 8.8.2.1**: The Executive Council received the bylaws change, had no questions, and the change was forwarded to the Division for approval.
• Proposed Changes to Charge of the Committee on Preparatory Education Membership Bylaw (8.24.1): The Executive Council received the bylaws change, had no questions, and the change was forwarded to the Division for approval.

• Proposed changes to Library, Information Technology and Scholarly Communications Bylaw 8.9: The Executive reviewed the proposed change and sent it back to LITSC with comment.

• Proposed changes to Academic Freedom bylaw 8.3: Council discussed then sent the item back to AF Committee for changes regarding emphasis on balancing responsibility and protection of academic freedom.

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 APM 330: The UCR Executive Council reviewed the proposed changes to APM 330 during its November 17 meeting and offers the following suggestions and comments. Some of the reviewers were confused with the description of the duties for this series.

- The introduction notes that University and public service is optional, but this is not clearly reflected in the language in 330-4: "... engaged in any specialized research, professional activity, and University and/or public service ..." (chair emphasis).
- In addition the language in 330-10 ("... according to the following guidelines for specialized research, professional competence and activity, or University and/or public service.") does not clearly state whether excellence in any of these three categories is sufficient for advancement or whether only the last one is optional. It is important to clarify this in order to avoid any ambiguity in the evaluation criteria.

Other reviewers noted the lack of specificity in the evaluation process: what will be the mechanisms? Who will have the responsibility for carrying out the evaluation? More specifically, section 330-6 has been removed and its full content does not appear to be included in the new version. One review commented that in 330-20 there is no term of appointment for specialist above-scale, and proposes that a term of 4 years be used for that step. Some reviewers suggest that the draft be revised to ensure that the term 'terminal degree' is used consistently; noting, for example, that an MS degree may or may not have this characteristic.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to APM 080 – Medical Separation: The UCR Executive Council reviewed the proposed changes to APM 080 during its November 17 meeting. Council provided several comments (summarized below) that we hope will be included in the final version of the document.

Though this was not changed in the proposed version several reviewers noted that the language in 080:
An appointee’s inability to perform the essential assigned functions of the position or another vacant position on campus for which the appointee is qualified, with or without reasonable accommodation, due to a disability or medical condition, will constitute a good cause for separation, and an appointee may be separated after the required review is completed.

(chair emphasis), may be interpreted to allow initiating separation procedures even when appropriate accommodations might resolve the problem. At best this paragraph can be confusing. The current process presents the opportunity to clarify this section.

The first paragraph of 080-0 refers to a 'reasonable period of leave defined on a case-by-case basis'. Here it would be appropriate to clarify who has the authority to determine the length of such period. It is unclear whether the first paragraph of 080-10 also requires the employee to be notified of the initiation of a separation review (prior to the provisions of 080-10.b), should that action be taken. Council's recommendation is that the employee be kept informed of the actions being taken throughout the process from its inception. Paragraph 080-10.d allows for 15 business days for the response form the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. This short period will be problematic, especially during the summer months; it is also a much shorter period that the ones allowed for other steps. Council recommends this period be augmented to 30 calendar days.

Paragraph 080-20.b. (1) should specify whether the 30 day period listed therein refers to calendar or business days.

Systemwide Final Review of the Proposed Changes to APM 190 Appendix A-2:

During its October 27, 2014 meeting the UCR Executive Council reviewed the final version of proposed changes to Appendix A-2 of section 190 of the Academic Personnel Manual. Though many of the division’s committees were asked to opine, the time constraints allowed but one committee to submit a report. Below I provide a summary of all comments provided:

- Section D.1.a: There is a 15 day hard deadline replacing 'reasonable timeframe', yet a few lines below 'reasonable timeframe' reappears. Also, this 15-day deadline does not specify whether the 15 day period refers to calendar or business days;
- Sections I, III.F.3: The new language in principle allows chancellors to delay action indefinitely;
- The LDO acronym should be defined before its used;
- The policy appears inconsistent when detailing the types of report the alleged violators receive: sometimes it is a summary, sometimes a full report.
- When there are multiple people who allegedly violated the policy, what assurances are there that the reports provided to each of them respect the privacy of the others

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revision of APM 133, 210, 220 and 760 (carried over from 13/14): At its December 8, 2014 meeting the Executive Council of the Riverside Division Academic Senate discussed the proposed revisions to APM 133-17-g-j; 210-1-c & d; APM 220-18-b; and APM 760-30-a. While the Executive Council was generally supportive of all the proposed revisions, it had these concerns and recommendations to contribute to the Academic Council:
On APM 133-17-g-j (Stop the Clock), the Council approves of the proposed changes and feels the expansion of permissible reasons to stop the clock due to exceptional personal circumstances beyond a faculty member’s control is relevant and useful. A few members expressed a desire for more specificity around the language of medical health leaves and bereavement of “close family” members, as these may be interpreted too expansively and potentially abused. A suggestion from Academic Personnel was to create and disseminate to stop-the-clock applicants a form specifically for medical specialists to complete in order to assure compliance with undue hardship requirements. Another recommendation was to retain a better historical documentation system of approvals and disapprovals across the system to establish familiar precedents and examples for future case considerations.

On APM 220-18-b (Professor Series), all were supportive.

On APM 210-1-c & d (Diversity Evaluation), the Executive Council recognizes the need for revision and hopes that the policy revisions will encourage diversity awareness in teaching, research, and service. The Senate Committee reports and some members of the Executive Council recognized the historical need for the UCOP policy revisions as an attempt to address national and systemwide inequities, and speculated that further revisions would be needed in the future. Faculty Welfare showed concern for how to uniformly apply the policy across all disciplines, while Academic Personnel had concerns about the difficulty of adequately assigning the ambiguous phrase “the same weight” to a candidate’s contributions promoting equal opportunity and diversity, as it therefore necessarily references comparable parameters in other research disciplines. One member expressed a concern with academic freedom, considered absolutely fundamental as an issue raised by the original, 2005 version of this clause -- and an issue which both attempted modifications of that version are attempts to address, but do so poorly and needs to be addressed more effectively.

Most agreed that the UC San Diego revision proposal was even more confusing and vague in its attempts to “over-correct” the move from “encouragement” to “evaluation” and enforcement, and expressed general concerns over implementation.

Therefore, returning to the UCOP proposal for amended Section 210-1-d’s second paragraph, the Executive Council suggested these minor edits:

The University of California is committed to excellence and equity in every facet of its mission. Contributions in teaching, research and other creative work, professional activity, and University and public service that promote equal opportunity and diversity are to be encouraged, and evaluated in the same way during Academic Personnel actions as any other contributions in these areas. They should be given the same weight in the evaluation of the candidate’s qualifications during Academic Personnel actions as any other contributions in these areas. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including efforts to advance research, teaching, equitable access to education, and public service that addresses the needs of California’s diverse population. Mentoring and advising of diverse students or faculty members are to be encouraged and given due recognition in the teaching or service categories of the Academic Personnel process.
On APM 760-30-a (Family Accommodations for Childbearing and Childrearing), while the Executive Council recognizes that these language revisions represent guiding principles only, a few members worried that some of the language around the addition of a new child could now be applied too broadly, such as with new teenage children. The Committee also briefly considered including possible language for new family members who would “add additional responsibilities” for the faculty member for more precision.

Systemwide Review of the Proposed Revision to Senate Regulation 682: The UCR Executive Council discussed the proposed changes to SR682 during its January 12 meeting. It was Council's opinion that the proposed change will be useful to the campuses. There is, however, an ambiguity in the language that must be corrected before the proposal is adopted: the proposed change states that "... the Graduate Council may set the terms and deadline formal advancing to candidacy ..." (chair emphasis), which allows the Graduate Council not to set terms or deadlines at all. We suggest replacing the modification by

In the case of the Master’s degree, the Graduate Council shall set the terms and deadline for formal advancement to candidacy in anticipation of the conferring of the degree.

(emphasis added for clarity).

Systemwide Review of the Proposed New UC Policy on Open Access: The Executive Council reviewed the President's policy on Open Access during its January 12 meeting. The Council discussed the reviews from various committees and was generally supportive. There were, however, a few suggestions we hope will be useful in improving the policy. The Graduate Council suggests changing the default archival setting to a moratorium, instead immediate open access. The advantages of this are that it allows authors a last point of review in case they are uncertain of the constraints imposed by the journal. It would also provide a safeguard for documents that are not obviously included or excluded from the policy, such as student theses, and which might also be constrained by mandatory moratoria by the publishers. There were also questions about the rationale for including in the policy members of the University who are not compensated by the UC. On a similar vein there were questions for including non-permanent employees for whom, should they change employment, the policy would not be enforceable. There were several questions raised about the possibility of errors and their potential consequences (e.g. what if an article is submitted for open access in contradiction with the policy of the publishing journal?). It was recognized that the corresponding answers do not belong in the policy text, yet we consider it important for the University to provide support for any authors that might have queries about the policy, and to use these to create and maintain a searchable FAQ database.

Systemwide Review of Doctoral Student Support Proposals and Recommendations: During its November 17 meeting the UCR Executive Council discussed the Doctoral Student Support Proposals and Recommendations. The reviewers had a variety of comments and suggestions that are summarized below. There was full recognition of the importance of improving the current way of charging the NRT and of the need to ensure that all graduate students receive a transparent description of the support package being offered when they are accepted to
any UC program. There was also general agreement that improving the diversity of the graduate population at the UC is a goal the University should actively pursue, though there was also consensus that the details of this last effort need to be fleshed out before they can be fully evaluated. There was much less support for the idea of a system-wide work opportunity portal. The reviewers were concerned about the need, the effectiveness and the scope of the project as well as the manner in which it would mesh, without duplication, with existing campus efforts. Additional points were raised during the discussion and review:

- Having recognized the advantages of a more enlightened NRT policy it would be necessary to have a full evaluation of the fiscal consequences of any particular change; excluding contracts and grants would be a welcome first step. One reviewing committee specifically suggested the elimination of NRT for all first-year graduate students.

- Providing transparent multi-year offers to graduate students throughout the system should also be linked to student milestones as they move towards their graduate or professional degree; this can provide intermediate goals and added motivation for them to complete the program. It was noted, however, that any such requirement must take into account the needs of students in different programs and campuses, so that any specific requirements for such offers should be decided locally.

- The professional development portal received several criticisms. On the area of academic development it was felt that the program itself would provide more useful information and guidance. It was recognized that a large number of students do not follow this path and do require advice when moving into other fields or into non-academic jobs, still the proposed portal was not thought to be the best solution for this challenge. Some reviewers suggested instead that the goals of this proposal should be better met by strengthening of the programs at the campus' career centers, allocating resources to ensure graduate students have funds to attend conferences, and maintaining a database of alumni who can assist students in their transition to the workforce. It was also unclear to some reviewers the extent to which the proposed site would enrich existing resources. One reviewing committee opined that, were the professional development site to be implemented, the third of the options presented should be preferred.

- The diversity proposals, while addressing a recognized need, will require more details. Using the CSU graduates as diverse source of graduate students is a good idea, but it requires the collaboration of the CSU system and articulation of goals between the UC and CSU. It was also pointed out that some of the proposals depend on the mentoring of faculty during the summer, a time traditionally used to advance research programs; these proposals would be more equitable and more attractive if they included incentives for faculty, such as teaching relief during the academic year.

**Systemwide Review of the Proposed Revisions to SBL 128.D.2 (Vice Chairs):** Executive Council discussed the proposed revision of Senate Bylaw 128 during its April 13 meeting. Council recognized the virtue of the proposed changes and supports the modifications without further comments.
Systemwide Review of the Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence: Executive Council discussed the revised version of the Presidential Policy on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence. Council supports the policy and had no further comments.

Systemwide Review of Pilot Program to Accept Equity for Access to University Facilities and Services: Executive Council reviewed the draft guidelines for the PPAEAUFS (Pilot Program to Accept Equity for Access to University Facilities and Services). There were various concerns about this program voiced both by Council and by the reviewing committees. Council generally felt that this is a proposal whose impact is difficult to gauge without detailed expertise in these financial matters, lacking these (or a thorough non-technical explanation of the program) it is difficult to provide a careful analysis. Because of this most of the concerns raised were on the general aspects of the proposal.

Among the concerns raised, Council wishes to highlight the following:

- The program does not require the companies being included to be financially viable. More specifically, the proposal does not include mechanisms for ensuring that the equity being offered by the company is fairly appraised; absent this the exchange for services is not appropriate. Any campus offering services or facilities should only consider a cash exchange even if it is at discounted rates for a company built from university-based technology or intellectual property (section IV.C.1).
- Without clear implementation procedures there are no guarantees that this program would not divert resources from the core mission of the university.
- There were strong doubts that sufficient safeguards could be created to avoid possible conflict of interest situations.
- Absence of criteria for identifying acceptable investments and acceptable risks.
- The program should include an evaluation plan, spelling-out both criteria and schedule.
- The draft does not ensure sufficient safeguards against bias and undue influence.
- There is insufficient local oversight: the DCM should be complemented by a group of faculty, extramural venture capital and industry representatives.
- There are no provisions for covering the expenses associated with creating the DCM position.
- The procedures through which the CIO would purchase shares in a program involved in this pilot appear overly complex.
- The proposal should make it abundantly clear that revenues will remain at the campus of origin.

The UCR Division welcomes the opportunity to comment on this program, whose effects on the UC may be deep and permanent.

Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to APM-360, Librarian Series and APM-210-4: The UCR Executive Council discussed the proposed changes to APM 210 and 360 during its April 27 meeting. Council supports the changes that we believe are important to ensure equitable treatment of Librarians. The only suggestion we have is that the criteria for accelerated, or off-cycle, actions be clarified.
Systemwide Review of Proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 182 - University Committee on International Education: The UCR Executive Council discussed the proposed changes for the University Committee on International Education (SB 182) during its April 27 meeting. Council was generally supportive of the proposed changes, but there were concerns connected with the proposed reporting requirements that will be included under B.2 which are unspecified, and appear overly broad. In addition, and in view of its expanded scope, we suggest that the relation between UCIE and appropriate divisional committees be clarified. Finally, we suggest that the committee's title be changed to reflect its expanded activities. In this direction we offer "University Committee on International Engagement".

Systemwide Review of Proposed Changes to APM 080 – Medical Separation: The UCR Executive Council reviewed the proposed changes to APM 080 during its November 17 meeting. Council provided several comments (summarized below) that we hope will be included in the final version of the document. Though this was not changed in the proposed version several reviewers noted that the language in 080:

> An appointee’s inability to perform the essential assigned functions of the position or another vacant position on campus for which the appointee is qualified, with or without reasonable accommodation, due to a disability or medical condition, will constitute a good cause for separation, and an appointee may be separated after the required review is completed.

(chair emphasis), may be interpreted to allow initiating separation procedures even when appropriate accommodations might resolve the problem. At best this paragraph can be confusing. The current process presents the opportunity to clarify this section. The first paragraph of 080-0 refers to a 'reasonable period of leave defined on a case-by-case basis. Here it would be appropriate to clarify who has the authority to determine the length of such period. It is unclear whether the first paragraph of 080-10 also requires the employee to be notified of the initiation of a separation review (prior to the provisions of 080-10.b), should that action be taken. Council's recommendation is that the employee be kept informed of the actions being taken throughout the process from its inception. Paragraph 080-10.d allows for 15 business days for the response form the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. This short period will be problematic, especially during the summer months; it is also a much shorter period that the ones allowed for other steps. Council recommends this period be augmented to 30 calendar days. Paragraph 080-20.b. (1) should specify whether the 30 day period listed therein refers to calendar or business days.

Systemwide Final Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy Section 210-1-d, Review and Appraisal Committees: Executive Council discussed the final version of the modified APM 210-d. There was general support for the modifications, though some reviewers were concerned about the possibility that they might lead to interpreting diversity activities as a 4th leg in the evaluation of personnel files. It was recognized that the usefulness of the proposed changes would depend on the implementation by the AP office and CAP.

Systemwide Final Review of the UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use: Riverside opted to not opine. No suggestions were received.
Campus Level & Miscellaneous Review Items:

Name Change: School of Medicine Dean’s Conference Room: Executive Council reviewed the proposal connected with naming the Dean's Conference Room at the UCR School of Medicine and the creation of a scholarship fund through an anonymous donation. A majority of Council members voted to support the proposal (18 in favor, 2 against, no abstentions). However, Council was disturbed by the lack of consultation in the naming of the facility. The administration's policy requires (per a recommendation in 2004 from the Committee on Academic Personnel) that there be College/Unit consultation, with review by the faculty group with whom the named facility is to be associated. In addition, the policy also specifies that the Chair of the Division should be included in a naming committee convened to review proposals of this type. In this case, it appears that the committee has not yet been convened and Council has the expectation that this will be processed with full adherence to existing policy. In case of anonymous donations Council would also appreciate being reassured that the administration has verified that the donor and the conditions for the donation are consistent with the campus expectations of moral standing and ethics.

Review of the Suggested Changes to R’Courses Guidelines: Executive Council requested that the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) revisit the issue of student led courses (’R courses) and provide recommendations for the manner in which these courses should be regulated.

Review of the Proposal to Create Two Summer Session Oversight Committees
In March 2014, Executive Council reviewed a proposal by CEP to develop two Summer Session Oversight Committees. The intent was for these new committees to replace the existing Summer Session Steering committee with the responsibilities of the latter being divided between the new committees according to whether they represent academic or administrative (resource) issues. At that time Council suggests a number of changes to the proposal, which were forwarded to CEP. The suggestions included; 1) that the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education be added as an ex-officio member of the Administrative Committee, 2) that there exists the potential for disconnect between the two committees and the recommendation that a senate body be used as a bridge. Suggestions included inclusion of the Vice-Chair of the Division sitting on both committees, and 3) that a mechanism be added to ensure regular meetings of both committees, perhaps even set a minimum number of meetings (e.g. once a quarter). In October 2014 Executive Council received a revised proposal indicating the reluctance of the committee to incorporate the changes suggested by Council. CEP Chair Baerenklau explained that there were in fact several aspects of “bridging” between the two committees, albeit the “bridges” were of administrative staff rather than Senate faculty. Chair Baerenklau further explained that the work of the administrative committee lacked the type of functions typically of concern to senate faculty. Council determined that it supports the creation of two committees i.e. “splitting” the existing Summer Session Steering Committee. There was however continued concern about the membership of the committees and the lack of a “senate bridge”. After significant discussion it was determined that CEP would be asked to consider that the Vice-Chair of the Division be a member on both the Academic and the Administrative committees and the Vice-Chair (CEP representative) of the Academic Committee be included as a member of the Administrative Committee. There was also suggestion that as a matter of housekeeping, the title of “Associate Dean” be modified since not every college has Associate Deans. Chair Baerenklau will review the suggestions with the Committee on Educational Policy and will report back to Executive Council.

Endowed Chair Proposals
At its December 8, 2014 meeting, the Executive Council of the Riverside Division considered several proposals to establish Endowed Chairs. During discussion, Executive Council commented that Endowed Chairs and Presidential Chairs should be viewed as opportunities to expand the diversity of the faculty on the Riverside campus. In addition, there was considerable concern that the Policy for Establishment of Endowed Chairs was not consistently followed and the documentation provided for Senate review was lacking. Specifically, we request each future proposal include a letter of support (recommendation) from the faculty of the affected department(s), a full background story of the donor and discussion of term limits and/or end dates.

Review of the Proposal to Establish the Neal A. and Rochelle A. Campbell Presidential Chair for Innovation in Science Education in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences: The Proposal was reviewed and supported by the Committees on Academic Personnel, Educational Policy and Planning and Budget (attached). Executive Council endorses the recommendations of the Committees.

Review of the Proposal to Establish an Endowed Dean’s Chair in the UCR School of Medicine: The reviewing Senate Committees, including Planning and Budget, Academic Personnel and Educational Policy, support this endeavor in principle and understands that it is useful to have some administrative commitment in place for future potential “donor stewardship.” However none of the Committees submit approval of the proposal at this time for several primary reasons.

The reviewing Committees and Executive Council as a whole felt that given the requirement for a possible and tenuous 2015 or 2016 real estate sale that can fluctuate with the market and only a 2013 dated formal appraisal that recommends further land assessment for toxins and environmental effects of excavation, the proposal is premature. Planning and Budget encourages resubmission of the proposal once the exact value of the land has been determined or after the real estate has been sold.

Additionally, there is no guarantee the sale will garner the total amount required for an Endowed Dean’s Chair, and should it not reach that amount, there needs to be additional language about what distribution of available funds percentages will be prioritized and how so as stipulated by the donors. There is some concern that there is a disproportional investment in SOM at the expense of UCR as a whole. The clause stating “balance of the proceeds will be distributed in consultation with Mark Ruben, if possible, or if not, added to the Endowed Chair or Fund in the School of Medicine” seems problematic. CAP suggests the balance of proceeds exceeding Mark Ruben’s proportional share of the land sale be equitably distributed to each of the priorities set by Mr. Ruben. The use of excess funds is explicitly stated in the Sweeney agreement; similar clarity is desired for the agreement with Ruben.

The proposal also needs to require annual reporting, which is a standard requirement, and must include additional language on the Chair’s term dates.
Finally, and perhaps even most importantly, in UCR’s Roles and Responsibilities, Procedures and Policies for the Establishment, Administration and Appointment of Endowed Chairs and Professorships, the procedures manual requires that “included in the proposal packet should be input from relevant Dean, Department Chair and Faculty regarding 1) Identifying faculty FTE, 2) Consultation with (recommendation provided) the faculty of the affected departments, 3) Is prepared to address academic senate committee questions regarding the proposed chair and its place in the unit’s long-term plan.” The SOM Executive Committee was not aware of any consultation with the relevant department chair(s) and/or faculty, and no recommendation by such was included in this proposal. While the same lack of faculty consultation appeared in the recent Phyllis Guze naming proposal by SOM, this faculty consultation is of especially crucial import since there exists the appearance of a conflict of interest in the current SOM Dean’s proposal to establish an Endowed Dean’s Chair in SOM with little description of intended usage of funds, etc.

Review of the Proposal to Establish A Maimonides Endowed Chair in Jewish Studies: The Committees on Academic Personnel, Educational Policy and Planning and Budget all support the proposal. The Executive Council too supported approval of the naming of this Endowed Chair on the condition of specific revisions to the proposal justification. The Council was delighted to see the collective effort of the nearly thirty donors in this endeavor. We understand the importance of community outreach in struggles against anti-Semitism and intolerance. However, we must ask for several deletions and additions to the justification of the proposal. First, we believe that the statement, “UCR is the only UC campus that does not have an endowed chair in Jewish Studies,” is factually incorrect. Secondly, we must ask for revision or deletion of the two bullet points “Bring a stronger focus and energy to Judaism on campus, enabling Jewish students to find renewed pride in their heritage and for others to better understand the religion,” and “Help to support existing programs such as Hillel, to create a friendly non-threatening space for students to discuss and practice Judaism,” the former because it can be construed as supporting the proselytizing of one religion over others and the latter because we cannot specify support of particular Organization programming such as Hillel.

Because the goal of Endowed Chairs is to support and encourage scholarship and innovation in knowledge production, we suggest frontloading the justification points about a world-class Jewish Studies scholar and the support for research and instruction, rather than listing them last. Because the Endowed Chairship applies to academic research on religion and theology, CAP also asks for the addition (under Section II of the Initial Request for Approval to Name/Establish an Endowed Chair) of a statement asserting the intellectual independence of the Chair’s scholarly activities be assured. It was also noted that the proposal needs to require annual reports and include term limits. Finally, we recommend that the proposal specifically
requests or seeks the additional $500,000 Presidential Chairs matching incentive offered by Janet Napolitano’s designation of $50 million toward encouragement for such ends.

**Review of the Proposal to Establish The Logistics Team Presidential Chair in Supply Chain Management:** Neither the Committee on Academic Personnel, nor the Committee on Planning and Budget approved the proposal. CAP felt that the request may be premature since the aggregate $500,000 donation will not be secured until 2018, therefore possibly making the additional Presidential Matching incentive difficult to secure at this time and given that a total $1 million is required for an Endowed Faculty Chair. CAP, Educational Policy and Planning and Budget also suggested adding more language to explicate and broaden the scope of the research activities of the Endowed Chair, as it was not clear or explicitly stated what these might entail. This would be important to ensure that the Chair’s research activities have intellectual autonomy without an expectation of scholarly production focused on the economic interests of the firm funding the Endowment.

**Review of the Proposal to Establish the Wilbur W. Mayhew Endowed Chair in Geo-Ecology:** Executive Council was enthusiastic about the establishment of this Endowed Chair and particularly pleased to see that it has received such robust support from the anonymous donor and that the naming of the Chair honors a founding faculty member who was instrumental in helping to found the UC Natural Reserve System. The Committees on Academic Personnel and Educational Policy supported the Chair. However, because of the ambiguity of the anonymous donor and donation process, the Committee on Planning and Budget and Executive Council requests a letter of endorsement from the Mayhew family. At a minimum, Council members suggested requesting an explanation of the relationship between the Geo Ecology Institute and the UC Natural Reserve System. The Committee on Planning and Budget requested clarification on why a Chairship is being developed within the Geo-Ecology Institute instead of within the NRS. Executive Council also suggested a statement be added to the proposal regarding the delegation of the Endowed Chair to the CNAS Dean’s Office, in the event that this Institute wanes in the future. During its January 26 meeting Executive Council reviewed the proposal to create the W. Mayhew Endowed Chair in Geo-Ecology. A majority of Executive Council voted to approve the proposal (+14-2-4).

**Review of the Proposal to Establish the Givaudan Citrus Variety Collection Endowed Chair:** Executive Council reviewed the proposal to create the Givaudan Citrus Variety Collection Endowed Chair and during its June 8 meeting voted unanimously to approve the proposal. Council noted that the proposal’s subject matter is well aligned with the ANR mission, and recommends that, for faculty recipients, the FTE utilized should be an OR FTE with the minimal IR fraction required for Academic Senate membership.
Request by Undergraduate Admissions for Executive Council to Endorse its memo to Chancellor Wilcox, re: Proposed Automatic Admissions Appeal Process

Executive Council reviewed the response from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee (UAC) to the proposal "Improving the Admission Rate of Specific Under-Represented Populations". While Executive Council was sensitive to the goals of the proposed policy, it considered that the “auto appeal” process would have undesirable consequences that include the undermining of the current admission process; Council therefore supported the UAC memorandum.

Council opined that for UCR the goals of the proposed policy would be better met through outreach efforts that would improve the yield rate of top applicants. Council also supports a more holistic approach to reviewing applicants to ensure our diversity goals are met.

Campus Review of Student Proposal for Gender Studies Breadth Requirement

Updates by Chair Wudka

The Senate is in receipt of a student proposal to modify the breadth requirements at UCR so that all students take at least one gender-related course before they graduate. The submission was initially reviewed by the Committee on Educational Policy, who agreed that the proposal merits full senate review. The proposal was subsequently forwarded to several standing senate committees, including CODEO and the College Executive Committees who all support the idea of the proposal. There was, however, considerable concern about the number of course options presented and a variety of points in need of clarification – both technical and substantive. It was also clarified that this was separate from the Ethnicity Studies requirement.

Executive Council recommended that Chair Wudka adopt the recommendation from the Committee on Educational Policy and create an ad hoc committee tasked with providing an in-depth analysis of the proposal and additionally consider expanding the Ethnic Studies requirement. The ad hoc committee should have members from CEP, CODEO and faculty college and student representatives. The work of the ad hoc committee should be complete by the end of the calendar year.

Request from CNAS faculty for Review of CNAS Teaching Policy

There were several requests that the Senate review the draft proposed Teaching Policy in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, with some CNAS faculty asking if it was within the authority of the Dean to institute such a policy. Chair Wudka advised that the Dean is granted this type of authority in APM 015.

Executive Council reviewed and discussed the committee responses and the concern that the Senate embarked upon review of a document which is so clearly a very rough draft proposal. Council urged Chair Wudka to provide the collected comments to the Dean of CNAS as well as a summary of concerns discussed at Executive Council. In addition, Council suggested that the material forwarded to the Dean include a request that the Senate be involved in a more formal review process once the details of the CNAS proposal have been documented. Memo of concerns and suggestions was sent to Dean Yates.
Request from PEVC for Executive Council & Senate Input/Consult on Discussion to Merge CHASS and CNAS: Over the last two weeks eleven of the Senate’s 28 standing committees discussed the draft pre-proposal for the merging of the colleges of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences and Natural and Agricultural Sciences. In parallel with these discussions the Senate polled the faculty, asking whether they would support such an action. The merging was then discussed by Executive Council at its January 26 meeting.

The reviewing committees (including Executive Council) and faculty respondents indicated strong misgivings about proceeding with the merger. Without denying the importance of the motivating factors, many of the comments received indicated that these problems can be addressed by less disruptive changes; and, ultimately, that the reasoning presented did not provide a compelling justification for this action. In particular, Executive Council is unable to support the proposal.

There were also specific concerns voiced by the reviewing committees. These include skepticism that some of the current issues within CNAS would be fixed by this action, and a worry that they might even be exacerbated. There were also concerns that CHASS faculty would be disadvantaged within the new college, that a centralized college administration would lead to further staff reductions, would result in further separation of students from their departments and programs, and that separating agriculture from the new college would negatively impact some areas of collaborative research.

A summary of the responses by the reviewing committees follow (the full responses are attached).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Favor</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstentions</th>
<th>No responses/absences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budget</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition the CHASS and SoM Executive Committees were unanimously against the proposal, the SoBA Executive Committee was unanimously in favor, and the merger received little support in the CNAS Executive Committee.

The faculty poll was also negative, with 61% of respondents opposing or strongly opposing the merger, and 25% supporting or strongly supporting the action. Many of the faculty comments provided with the poll mirror those of the committees (detailed poll results and faculty comments are also attached). It is worth noting the very high participation rate of the faculty in both CNAS and CHASS, this indicates the significance of the results and the
importance the faculty gave to this issue. It should also be noted that the degree of support for the proposed campus reorganization varied between CHASS and CNAS: 34% respondents from CHASS supported the merger and 52% opposed, while the corresponding numbers for CNAS were 18% and 70% respectively.

Some of the reviewers were positive about the idea of creating a College of Arts and Sciences, though not in the form presented in the pre-proposal. It is also worth emphasizing that some of the concerns expressed would be addressed by adopting a modified administrative structure where divisional deans would have budgetary authority that cannot be rescinded by the dean.

where divisional deans would have budgetary authority that cannot be rescinded by the dean.

**Review of Revised School of Medicine Health Sciences Compensation Plan:** The Executive Council reviewed and forwarded to VPAP Walker the supportive memos and votes from the Committees on Academic Personnel and Faculty Welfare.

**Senate review of proposed changes to the Target of Excellence Program:** Executive Council discussed the Target of Excellence Program (TOE) during its February 9 meeting. The various review committees were generally supportive of the proposed policy but there were several suggestions that, if included, we believe would clarify the scope and procedures.

Concerning the description of the program Executive Council suggested:

- Generalizing the language and process to indicate how programs, institutes, centers can submit TOE proposals.
- Procedures should indicate that schools as well as departments can submit TOE proposals.
- Adding a description of the funding sources for this program (for example, will the TOE FTE come from positions allocated to the colleges and schools, or from a central FTE pool kept for this program, and which the deans can request? Will startup funds come from college/school or campus funds? Etc.)
- Strengthening the diversity language by replacing, in the first paragraph, "…including those adding to campus diversity, who would..." by "…including those who will enhance campus diversity, and who would …". In addition, the scope of this phrase also merits clarification: will this be part of the criteria for a candidate to qualify to a TOE position?

Concerning the application procedure Executive Council made the following additional suggestions:

- In step 1 we suggest adding explicitly that the submission to the dean should include the voting results from the department/program
- In step 3 we suggest tightening the language by replacing "… informal consultation with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the PEVC and Chancellor takes place." by " … informal consultation takes place with the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), the PEVC and Chancellor."
Council also suggested that the originating department be notified of the results of this consultation.

Another point that merits clarification is whether candidates will be expected to visit the campus and give a seminar. If yes, then the point at which this can be arranged should be specified (e.g. after step 3 is completed successfully); if no, then a rationale for this deviation from standard practices should be provided. Executive Council also suggested that the policy includes procedures for the case of spousal hires connected with TOE proposals. Finally, we suggest specifying any connection of the TOE program might have with the Presidents Postdoctoral Fellowship Program.

**FTE Transfer Requests:** The Executive Council reviewed and commented on four FTE transfers.

---

**Respectfully submitted by,**
Jose Wudka, Chair, (Physics & Astronomy)
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### 2014-2015 Executive Council Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Division Officers</th>
<th>Standing Committee Chairs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/27/2014</td>
<td>Jose Wudka (Physics), Chair</td>
<td>Mike Allen (Plant Pathology &amp; Microbiology), Research (COR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</table>

*Full attendance record for this meeting is unavailable.*
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