To be received and placed on file:

This Executive Council report lists items reviewed and actions taken in meetings held from October 2015 to July 2016.

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:

COMMITTEE BYLAW CHANGE
CIE bylaws now includes the Vice Provost of International Affairs as an ex-officio non-voting members. The change was unanimously approved by Executive Council.

COMMITTEE BYLAW CHANGE
The Chair introduced Planning and Budget Chair who provided an overview of the change to Planning and Budget bylaw. Council received the bylaw change and it will be voted on at the Winter Division Meeting.

COMMITTEE BYLAW CHANGE: COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATIONS (LITSC)
LITSC proposed to drop “Scholarly Communications” from their name in an effort to make the acronym and name simpler. Chair Wudka provided background to Executive Council members regarding the proposed change. Council was reminded by Vice Chair Lam that the committee and name are the result of the merge of two committees into a single one. LITSC Chair Nunney provided additional background and then Council had significant discussion regarding the name change. When polled by Chair Wudka, Council endorsed the name change (+13, - 2, Abstain 2). The endorsed change will be included in the agenda for the February 24, 2016 meeting of the Division.
DIVISION REGULATION CHANGE – PROPOSED CHANGES TO REGULATION 6 CAMPUS GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS (R6.1): Chair Wudka provided an overview of the item and opened the floor for discussion; after which, Council unanimously endorsed the regulation change.

PROPOSAL TO MODIFY R.7.4.2 TO ALLOW a MAXIMUM 19 REPEAT UNITS FROM THE CURRENT 16: Council engaged in significant discussion regarding the item and discussed the limits of the Banner system and concerns regarding the limitations of a system determining the number of units on campus. It was agreed that technology should not drive scholarly standards. In addition, there was discussion that it should be possible to modify Banner (or any other system) to restore the existing flexibility. Absent R&J’s response, as well as existing Systemwide Senate regulations, it is not apparent what the next steps should be if the Division were to move forward with this proposed modification. Council members were curious about how many students this change would affect, and if the Banner vendor could affordably make system changes. Chair Wudka mentioned the administrative limitations of Banner and the course tracking benefits for students. The issue was tabled in anticipation of additional committee responses. Council instructed the chair to discuss with the Registrar the possibility of getting an independent assessment of the costs of modifying Banner to meet the academic needs of the Campus, instead of accepting the software provider’s assurances that such modifications are not cost effective.

Executive Council reviewed the proposals to modify CNAS regulations 2.4.5 and 3.4.3. Council does not support the changes proposed as they are motivated solely by the limitations of the recently adopted Banner system. Furthermore, it is Council's position that any future proposals that follow from the Banner adoption should be accompanied by evidence that a technical solution was considered, and with a critical evaluation by Computing & Communications of the feasibility of such a technical solution. An evaluation of the impact on students and programs should also be provided.

Executive Council discussed on May 9 the need to address the issue of repeat units for students receiving a D or F in a course. Council considered 3 options:

1. To allow students to repeat at most 16 units; any course that would put a student above this number would not be allowed into the set of those that can be repeated without affecting the GPA.
2. To allow one course that may put the students above the 16 units.
3. To revise regulation 7.4.2 to allow 19 repeat units as proposed by the Banner Implementation Committee.

After some discussion, Council supported by a majority, option number one (1), which will be the current interpretation of regulation 7.4.2.

As an example: under this interpretation a student who has repeated 3 courses with 5 units, cannot repeat any course with more than 1 unit without his/her GPA being affected. If this student then gets a D in a 4-unit course, all 4 units will count towards his/her GPA.

Student advisors should be notified at the earliest possible time in order for students to become aware of this change, and make the necessary adjustments.

The Senate will be monitoring this issue and may revise its decision in the future.
PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP BYLAW CHANGE: COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY: Chair Wudka provided background regarding the item and invited discussion. After discussion, Council supported the change.

PROPOSED CHANGE/ADDITION TO GRADUATE DIVISION REGULATIONS (GR5-GR5.7): Chair Wudka yielded to Graduate Council Chair to present the issue to the body. Council engaged in discussion about the issue and recommended that Graduate Council take the proposal back to make revisions and clarification and then resubmit for Senate review. Graduate Council chair agreed to do so and subsequently Council supported the regulation change.

PROPOSED CNAS REGULATION CHANGES NR 2.4.5 AND NR 3.4.3: Chair Wudka provided background of the issue and opened the floor for discussion. Council discussed the issue at length and opined that curriculum changes should not be made to fit software/technology, but rather software/technology should be adjusted and tailored to suit curriculum. It is inappropriate for Banner’s limitations to drive curricular changes.

CHASS PROPOSED CHANGE TO BYLAW HS4.1: Chair Wudka yielded the floor to the CHASS Chair to introduce the issue to Council. After discussion regarding the issue, Council endorsed the change and the item will be included on the Spring Division Meeting agenda. As a result of the discussion, Council will produce a proposal to modify the Division bylaws regarding the votes of ex-officio members for future consideration.

PROPOSAL FROM THE COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY TO CHANGE APM 245 REGARDING DEPARTMENT CHAIRS: Chair Wudka presented this issue and Council discussed it; and Council supported the proposed changes. Proposal will have to go to UCOP/Academic Personnel and route through the normal systemwide Senate reviews. Chair Wudka will route his memo to Council before finalizing it.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION MEMBERSHIP BYLAW CHANGE: Chair Wudka introduced the proposal and opened the floor for discussion. Council members had no additional comments and the body received and supported the change. The item will be on the Spring 2016 Division Meeting agenda.

DIVISION REGULATION CHANGE TO R1.3.2 IN R1 GRADING SYSTEM FOR FALL 2016 IMPLEMENTATION: Chair Wudka presented the item and opened the floor for discussion. The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (R&J) had not yet commented on the item. However, Council engaged in significant discussion regarding the proposed change and whether it would discourage students from broadening their education. Council will resume discussion once the comments from R&J are received; will then send comments and suggestions to Graduate Council for consideration. The issue of Council’s role in bylaw and regulation change was briefly mentioned and discussed.

PROPOSED PROGRAM CHANGES TO CHEM112AC COURSE SERIES AND MATH 008B FOR 2016-2017 CATALOG (BCH and Neuroscience Program Changes): Chair Wudka shared that this item would be coming to Executive Council after it is reviewed by the Committee on Educational Policy; Council would then review and, if satisfied, approve in lieu of the Division. He then summarized the item and received agreement from Council members that the proposed changes could be discussed and voted
on via email, granted CEP’s review is noncontroversial, noting that as it was then the final meeting of the year and there are no more scheduled Division meetings for 2015-16, Council would act for the Division. In an Email vote Council subsequently approved both items in lieu of the Division (June 20, 2016).

PROPOSED CHANGES TO COMMITTEE ON COURSES GUIDELINES: Chair Wudka summarized the revisions and opened the floor for comments and discussion. Council engaged in a brief discussion and a motion was made and seconded to take a vote. Vote outcome was unanimously in favor of the changes. Approved. In Lieu of the Division.

GRADUATE DIVISION REGULATION CHANGE TO GR5-GR5.6: PROPOSED CHANGES TO BACKDATING POLICY AND ADDING TRANSFER COURSEWORK POLICIES: Chair Wudka asked Graduate Council Chair to present and summarize the issue to Council. Members engaged in significant discussion regarding the item and concern regarding re-granting of credit to undergraduates from a graduate course was discussed. A motion was made and seconded to vote. Vote outcome was unanimously in favor of the changes. Approved. In Lieu of the Division.

GRADUATE DIVISION REGULATION UPDATE – SNC GRADING R1.3 IN R1 GRADING SYSTEM: Chair Wudka summarized the item and opened the floor for discussion. After discussion Council agreed that a grammatical typo is to be corrected and granted the correction, a motion was made and seconded to vote. Typo corrections:

From: R1.3.2 Graduate students may not use undergraduate or graduate courses taken on an S/NC basis to complete their master’s or PhD degree requirements, unless the course is only offered on an S/NC basis. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

To: Graduate students may not use undergraduate or graduate courses taken on an S/NC basis to complete their master’s or PhD degree requirements, unless the course only is offered on an S/NC basis. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

And

From: ... Graduate students may not use undergraduate or graduate courses taken on an S/NC basis to complete their master’s or PhD degree requirements, unless the course is only offered on an S/NC basis. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

To: ... Graduate students may not use undergraduate or graduate courses taken on an S/NC basis to complete their master’s or PhD degree requirements, unless the course only is offered on an S/NC basis. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

Approved. In Lieu of the Division.

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 FINAL REVIEW OF PRESIDENT’S REVISED POLICY ON SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT
Comments were received from Charges, Privilege and Tenure, International Education, Faculty Welfare, and CODEO. There was discussion regarding the policy, its revised language, as well as, the committee responses received. There was discussion that faculty are required to do annual Sexual Harassment policy training probably as a result of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).
SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF PROPOSED REVISION TO SR417 AND SR621
Comments were received from Educational Policy, Preparatory Education, Undergraduate Admissions. There was discussion regarding the revisions and the committee responses received.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF SB140 UCAAD
Comments were received from CODEO and Faculty welfare. There was discussion regarding the change to UCAADE: University Committee Affirmative Action Diversity and Equity. Chair Wudka mentioned that CAP would be given the opportunity opine.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM: GUIDING PRINCIPLES - SEARCH WAIVERS FOR ACADEMIC APPOINTEES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: Chair Wudka provided an overview of the issue; this was followed by discussion by the body; during which Faculty Welfare Chair addressed requests for clarification regarding retention pertaining to non-Senate faculty. Council engaged in significant discussion regarding the issue and spoke to individual committee responses in preparation for UCR’s response to Systemwide.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM: REPORT FROM THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND ACADEMIC SENATE
Chair Wudka provided an overview of the issue and introduced the P&T Chair. Council engaged in significant discussion regarding the issue and spoke to individual committee responses in preparation for UCR’s response to Systemwide.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM – SECOND SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW: PROPOSED REVISION TO APM 360, LIBRARIAN SERIES AND APM 210-4, INSTRUCTIONS TO REVIEW COMMITTEES: Chair Wudka provided an overview of the item and of the proposed changes, then opened the floor for discussion. Council had no additional comments.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW ITEM – APM POLICY SECTIONS 278, 210-6, 279, 112 AND NEW APM 350: Chair Wudka presented the issued and opened the floor for Council discussion. Chair Wudka mentioned noticing the deletion of Affirmative Action search and Senate involvement in APM 278.16.b-Change of series of appointees to other titles. Council agreed this is perhaps an error, but that it should be included in the division’s response to Systemwide. SOM Chair spoke about a committee of various UC medical school faculty who reviewed APM 278; this committee, as well as the SOM Executive Committee felt that clarifications should be made to these proposed revised sections of the APM. These are detailed in the SOM response that will be attached to the division response. R&J member mentioned that additional clarification is also needed regarding hiring and the evaluation of Clinical Associates. Council continued significant discussion of the item and Chair Wudka will summarize and provide responses to systemwide by the deadline.

Campus Level & Miscellaneous Review Items

ESTABLISHMENT OF ENDOWED CHAIRS: Executive Council supported the establishment of four Endowed Founder’s Chairs in Chemistry to honor George K. Helmkamp, Harry W. Johnson, Jr., Donald T. Sawyer, and Hartland H. Schmidt.
DISCUSSION OF THE OCTOBER 27 SPECIAL DIVISION MEETING REGARDING THE SENATE MOVE TO HINDERAKER HALL: Council discussed and exchanged perspectives on the move and how the discussion at the Special Division Meeting should be organized. Chair Wudka offered to list and provide to Executive Council prior to the Special Division Meeting a summary list of the sentiments shared with him via email and letter.

DISCUSSION REGARDING CLUSTER HIRES: Council discussed the Cluster Hire process and the commission of a survey regarding cluster hires was proposed. Council appointed a subcommittee to draft and manage the survey. The survey was circulated to Senate faculty in early 2106.

DISCUSSION REGARDING STUDENT RELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES: MESSAGE TO ALL SENATE FACULTY: Currently there is not policy that requires that faculty accommodate student absences; though there is a statement from Senate Chair and PEVC that encourages accommodation in consideration of external circumstances that are important to a student’s overall educational experience and are consistent with the University’s mission to serve students. The Council reviewed the language of this statement and consensus was voiced that the current statement is sufficient and that the same consideration and notice should be afforded to faculty. Chair Wudka mentioned that the Committee on Faculty Welfare would be asked to look at a statement regarding absences of faculty for religious and other accommodations.

REVIEW OF REQUEST FOR COMMENT REGARDING FEDERAL TRADE COMMISION RULING
The Committee on Research was asked for comment regarding an FTC ruling against a UCR faculty member, but did not opine as they indicated they needed additional information in order to opine fully. The Executive Council discussed the need for the University to be as involved with faculty after an issue regarding regulation arises as it is prior to and when the idea or work of a faculty member is receiving good press. The Executive Council agreed to move forward with requesting Faculty Welfare review the issue, request documents, and request relevant testimony in order to get closer to a comment or opinion for consideration by Executive Council in order to provide it to Systemwide and to develop and infrastructure so that a faculty member is not exposed to fines, etc. without support and backing of the University.

There was also discussion regarding UCR-RED providing clarification as this issue presents research and conflict of interest issues, as well as, ownership and business equity. Also discussed was the possibility of broadening the charge and purview of the Committee on Research in consideration of this issue. In connection with this Council re-emphasized that faculty should be made aware that the Campus Counsel and all University attorneys represent the interest of the University.

SENATE SURVEY REGARDING CLUSTER HIRES
Profs. Venkatram and Gauvain provided an update regarding the progress of the Cluster Hire survey. The Senate declined the Provost’s request to contribute questions to the survey. The Executive Council agreed to run survey by campus IRB experts as a matter of due diligence. Executive Council reviewed the survey before it was sent out.

REVIEW OF DISRUPTIVE STUDENT POLICY
Educational Policy revised this policy per the request of the Executive Council under previous reviews and iterations and this revision is being provided as a recommendation to Undergraduate Education only
as the policy belongs to the Administration. Executive Council had no further comments or concerns and charged Chair Wudka with sending it forward.

ABC: ACTIVITY BASED COSTING DISCUSSION: Council robustly discussed concerns and perspective regarding ABC and were reminded that ABC is a required exercise under the BFI: Budget Framework Implementation (budget agreement between UC and the State).

CHANGES TO iEVAL (COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM AT UCR): Chair Wudka shared that Graduate Council and the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed a request from VPUE Brint regarding changing the current iEval system, included replacing the 5-point scale with a 7-point scale. The chair also noted that no formal proposal had been received. Chair Wudka then opened the floor for Council member comments that may be of help to VPUE in considering changes to the system. These included:

- Research indicates that a 7-point scale is unreliable.
- Consider the review and overhaul of the evaluation system/mechanism across the board.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM - REGISTRAR’S ROLE ON THE COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY: CEP chair expressed the committee’s response to this item. There were no questions or comments.

CHANCELLOR KIM WILCOX AND PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR PAUL D’ANIERI: Council hosted the Chancellor and Provost for a free form Q&A regarding campus hiring, space, infrastructure, and staffing level issues.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM: BANNER CHANGE MANAGEMENT
CEP and Courses were consulted on this issue and responses from both committees were discussed by Council. There was also discussion regarding concerns about different departments having various names for major concentrations, as well as concerns whether the changes reflect the way courses are weighted. Chair Wudka is to draft a cover memo for the CEP and Courses response that will also include Council’s comments and forward all memoranda to the Office of Undergraduate Education.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM: ENDOWED CHAIR POLICY
Chair Wudka provided background regarding the policy and previous versions, as well as, Senate concerns regarding the policy. Council discussed the received responses; GSOE’s response was pending. There was discussion regarding the possibility of endowed chairships becoming corporatized should companies fund them; this was discussed as an issue of faculty welfare. Chairs of the consulted committees further discussed the policy and provided information for Chair Wudka to include in his memo to the Vice Chancellor of Advancement Hayashida. At the same time, Chair Wudka will recirculate the current version and the old version of the policy for Council comments.

CNAS REORGANIZATION
Chair Wudka provided background regarding the proposed reorganization of CNAS. Council discussed possible ways to conduct a review in order to complete reorganization under the charge of a special committee provided by PEVC D’Anieri. There was significant discussion regarding this issue and Council reviewed different ways the review could be completed. Council then voted to move forward by obtaining approval from PEVC to revise the special review committee’s charge to be in line with policy and then proceed with requesting appropriate Senate committee review. Senate committees will be asked to oppose
simultaneously on the establishment and disestablishment of the departments as described in the proposal; if disestablishment is not approved then there would be no requirement to opine on any related subsequent establishment. Committee on Committees was to be tasked to convene the special review committee to address the CNAS reorganization.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM: V-COURSE DESIGNATION
Courses Chair was the guest of Council and discussed the elimination of the V prefix for online courses. Council had significant discussion regarding online courses and the probability of an increase in online courses and exams as UC grows by 10,000 new students. Council moved and voted +16 -1 to remove the V designation from online courses. Courses will present to Council in the future as the issue of managing online teaching evolves. This issue will be discussed and voted on at the Winter Division Meeting.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM: PROPOSAL FOR MS OF SUPPLY CHAIN AND LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT IN SOBA
Chair Wudka provided an overview of the proposal, as well as, the responses of the consulted committees. After significant discussion it was decided that the proposal be sent back to SoBA including the feedback provided by the reviewing committees, and suggest that it be subsequently revised and resubmitted. SoBA Executive Committee Chair Chung agreed to share comments with SoBA colleagues. Additionally, on behalf of Executive Council, Chair Wudka will provide a memo to SoBA with comments.

SENATE CLUSTER HIRE SURVEY
As the survey responses were received and reviewed by Executive Council, the body considered next steps. Council discussed the responses at length and then agreed that in the interest of transparency and timeliness, the responses and accompanying graphs should be posted to the Senate website (password protected for access by Senate members only) post haste. In addition, via email, Chair Wudka will send the response documents to Administration with a cover memo indicating that the Executive Council will follow up with recommendations in the near future. The Cluster Hire council subcommittee will draft the recommendation document which be finalized by Council. Executive Council will invite PEVC D’Anieri and Associate Provost Baerenklau to a future Council meeting to discuss faculty hiring.

SEITZ/FCC ISSUE and RESPONSE FROM the COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE
Chair Wudka provided background regarding the issue and that Faculty Welfare had been asked to review and respond. FW Chair Hughes presented the committee’s response and then the body engaged in significant discussion. Executive Council agreed that in consideration of this issue, VCREDS Pazzani and Campus Counsel Bergquist should come speak to the body regarding UC Ventures and other entrepreneurial endeavors that faculty may consider.

RETIREMENT OPTIONS TASK FORCE REPORT: The Council had significant discussion regarding the retirement options and the window of time provided to review and respond regarding such a critical issue that seriously affects future faculty and staff, as well as, the overall future of the University. Council’s comments will be communicated to Systemwide via a memo as the UCR response.

CLUSTER HIRE SURVEY RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT: Council discussed the key messages derived from the Cluster Hire Survey responses and began compiling a list of recommendations, to be
collected by the same 3-member group Council tasked with drafting the survey, and then reviewed and approved by Executive Council. The final document to be shared with campus Administration.

CNAS REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL: Chair Wudka gave an overview and background of the reorganization proposal and listed the committees that were consulted. He also shared that in the near future a Special Review Committee (SRC) would be convened to review the proposal overall and for possible conflicts of interest.

CLUSTER HIRE SURVEY RECOMMENDATIONS DOCUMENT: Council reviewed and discussed the draft document and finalized the comments to be sent to Administration, also to be posted to the Senate site.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO iEVAL: Council engaged in significant discussion regarding the proposed changes; especially regarding changing from a 5 to a 7-point scale, the importance of evaluations in the merit and promotion process, and ensuring the best and most helpful information is obtained via the evaluations. Chair Wudka clarified that the iEval form and questions belong to the Academic Senate.

KEN BAERENKLAU, ASSOCIATE PROVOST: AP Baerenklau and Council engaged in significant discussion with him regarding staffing levels, faculty hiring, Administration leadership style.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM – SENATE CONSULT TO VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL: INPUT ABOUT EXCEPTION REQUESTS – APM 275-16-F (3) CLINICAL X: Chair Wudka provided background regarding the item and invited SOM Executive Committee Chair to further present the issue to Council. SOM Chair provided and discussed the SOM handbook chart of professorial titles to help Council understand the titles and compensation in the medical school. She shared that Clinical faculty are often not interested in tenure to avoid being restricted by the UC salary scale caps. Council engaged in significant discussion. Council supports this exception be granted, and that it be reviewed annually for appropriateness and applicability.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM – SENATE CONSULT TO VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL: INPUT ABOUT THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR’S CONCERN REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND OUTSIDE LETTER WRITERS: Chair Wudka provided an overview of the request from the VPAP and then opened the floor to the chairs of the committees that provided responses. Council engaged in significant discussion and opined that the current system and perspective of outside letters and letter writers is effective and appropriate. The status quo allows for diversity of opinions and this is a benchmark of the current process.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM: PROPOSAL FROM OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION REGARDING PROVIDING TEACHING CREDITS FOR INTERNSHIPS COURSES: Chair Wudka gave background on the issue, summarized the committee responses received, and then opened the floor to the body. Council engaged in significant discussion and ultimately agreed to table this and invite Vice Provost for Undergraduate Steve Brint to discuss the proposal at a near future Council meeting to answer their questions.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM – UCR’S FIVE-YEAR PLANNING PERSPECTIVES FOR 2016-2021: Chair Wudka presented the issued and opened the floor for Council discussion. Council began discussion,
but postponed the remainder of it as Guest PEVC D’Anieri had arrived for his scheduled time on the agenda. When Council reconvened on the topic, Council engaged in discussion and agreed that Chair Wudka should prepare a cover memo to campus administration to accompany the Senate committee responses.

PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR PAUL D’ANIERI: PEVC was invited to discuss cluster hires and hiring plans. Chair Wudka introduced the PEVC and then Council members, in turn, introduced themselves to the PEVC. Chair Wudka then opened the floor questions for the PEVC and related discussions.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM – REQUEST FOR SENATE INPUT FROM VPAP AMEAE REGARDING LENGTH OF CANDIDATES’ RESPONSES TO THE DEPARTMENT LETTER: Chair Wudka introduced that issue and Council discussed it. Council’s opinion was that the proposed changes were unnecessary. Chair Wudka is to summarize and provide Senate committee responses to the VPAP Walker.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM – REQUEST FOR SENATE INPUT FROM VPAP REGARDING PROFESSORS ASSIGNING THEIR OWN TEXTS TO STUDENTS: Chair Wudka introduced that issue and Council discussed it. The consensus of Council was to leave things as they are – professor may assign their own texts to students. Chair Wudka is to summarize and provide Senate committee responses to the VPAP Walker.

CAMPUS REVIEW ITEM – REVISED REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH REGARDING PREPARATIONS FOR FACULTY GROWTH: Chair Wudka introduced the issue and then gave the floor to CoR Chair to present the key messages of the report. These included the need to address space, lack of adequate staffing levels, administrative issues, shared space/facilities, BAS and PEVC are aware of space issues. Council supported the report; chair Wudka will forward it to the Chancellor and PEVC with a cover memo.

Council then discussed faculty growth and the new policy (effective July 2016) regarding allocation of indirect costs, wherein 5% goes to the PI for research funding. Chair Wudka indicated that he will provide a link to this new policy to Council members and will draft a cover member to the PEVC from Council.

REPORT TO COUNCIL FROM THE COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS: THE DECLINE OF UCR AFRICAN AMERICAN AND AMERICAN INDIAN STUDENTS, 2013-2015: Committee on Undergraduate Admissions Chair framed the issue and goal of the report and shared its contents with Council. The key messages highlighted were: for African American and Native American students, applications increases, but enrollment declined; Native Americans are under-studied; more information is to be learned about these groups’ college choice practices. In addition, UC messaging seems to indicate (even if inadvertently) that these groups are not welcomed or embraced. Council member the Undergraduate Admissions Chair discussed the report’s recommendations with Council. Council agreed to support these recommendations to be presented to the administration.

CHANGE IN THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ALLOWED REPEAT UNITS IN RESPONSE TO THE CAMPUS ADOPTION OF BANNER: Chair Wudka provided an overview of the item as a reminder to Council. He then presented three options for Council’s endorsement consideration:
1. To follow the majority of the other UC campuses and stop when a course would put the student over the 16-unit limit.
2. To allow one course to go over, which would in effect allow students to repeat up to 20 units.
3. To change regulation 7.4.2 to allow up to 19 repeat units as was proposed by the Banner implementation team.

After significant discussion and the mention of a preference to be in a position to make their choice based on a data instead of Banner’s limitations, Council’s consensus is to proceed with the first option: to follow the majority of the other UC campuses and stop when a course would put the student over the 16-unit limit.

**AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT – PROPOSAL REGARDING GENDER STUDIES BREADTH REQUIREMENT:** Chair Wudka presented the item and opened it for discussion. Council engaged in significant discussion regarding this item. A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposal as written; this motion carried.

**FTE Transfer Requests:**
- Amalia Cabezas from Media and Cultural Studies to Gender and Sexuality Studies
- Juliet McMullin from Anthropology to SOM, but will be a CFM in Anthropology.

The following guests were received by Executive Council:
- Ron Coley, Vice Chancellor of Business and Administrative Services
- Maria Anguiano, Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget
- Kim Wilcox, Chancellor
- Paul D’Anieri, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Chris Chase-Dunn, Chair, Committee on Courses
- Milagros Pena, CHASS Dean
- Jim Sandoval, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
- Mike Pazzani, Vice Chancellor of Research
- Stefano Lonardi, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
- Ken Baerenklau, Associate Provost
- Joe Childers, Dean, Graduate Division
- Kelechi Kalu, Vice Provost of International Affairs

Respectfully submitted by,

**Jose Wudka (Physics and Astronomy), Chair**
- Piotr Gorecki (History), Vice Chair
- Maria Sarita See (Media and Cultural Studies), Secretary/Parliamentarian
- Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Assembly Representative
- Jodi Kim (Ethnic Studies), Assembly Representative
- Richard Arnott, Research (COR)
- Ken Barish (Physics & Astronomy), Planning and Budget (P&B)
- David Biggs (History), SPP Executive Committee
- Jan Blacher (Graduate School of Education), GSOE Executive Committee
- Eddie Comeaux (Graduate School of Education), Undergraduate Admissions (UAC)
Peter Chung (School of Business Administration), SOBA Executive Committee
Iryna Ethell (School of Medicine), SOM Executive Committee
Sarjeet Gill (Cell Biology & Neuroscience), CNAS Executive Committee
William Grover (Bioengineering) Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Jennifer Hughes (History), Faculty Welfare (FW)
David Lo (Biomedical Sciences), Graduate Council (GC)
Coleen Macnamara (Philosophy), Preparatory Education (Prep Ed)
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology & Neuroscience), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Library, Information Tech & Scholarly Communication
Jeffrey Sacks (Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages), Committees (COC)
Akula Venkatram (Mechanical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
Georgia Warnke (Political Science), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Jason Weems (History of Art), CHASS Executive Committee
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director