April 19, 2013

To: Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Vice Chair
Piotr Gorecki (History), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Richard Luben (Biomed), Senior Assembly Representative
Bahram Mobasher (Physics & Astronomy), Junior Assembly Representative
Byron Adams (Music), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Bahman Anvari (Bioengineering), BCOE Executive Committee
James Baldwin (Nematology), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Gregory Beran (Chemistry), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Ward Beyermann (Physics & Astronomy), Educational Policy (CEP)
Jan Blacher (Graduate School of Education), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Sarjeet Gill (Cell Biology & Neuroscience), Academic Personnel (CAP)
David Glidden (Philosophy), Preparatory Education
Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)
Jennifer Hughes (Religious Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Mariam Lam (Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages), Committees (COC)
Mindy Marks (Economics), Undergraduate Admissions
Connie Nugent (Cell Biology & Neuroscience), Graduate Council
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Research (CoR)
Melanie Sperling (Graduate School of Education), GSOE Executive Committee
Ameae Walker (School of Medicine), School of Medicine Executive Committee
Gillian Wilson (Physics & Astronomy), CNAS Executive Committee
Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

Fr: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda ~ April 22, 2013

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, April 22, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220 2nd Floor, University Office Building.
AGENDA

1. Approval of the Agenda for April 22, 2013 and the minutes for March 25, 2013
   Action 1:00 – 1:05

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHAIR WUDKA
   A. University Club
      • Barn Area Study Final
      • The Barn DPP Final
      • The Barn Theater and The Barn Group Report - 1993 Historical Resource Inventory
   Action 1:05 – 1:35

3. SOM PETITION TO USE A PASS/FAIL GRADING SYSTEM – COMMITTEE RESPONSES
   Information, Comments and/or Action 1:35 – 1:40
   Information 1:40 – 1:45

4. FINAL REVIEW OF APM 430 – RIVERSIDE AND COMMITTEE RESPONSES
   Information 1:45 – 1:50

5. SR 478 IGETC FOR STEM MAJORS – RIVERSIDE AND COMMITTEE RESPONSES
   Action 1:50 – 1:55

6. REVIEW OF APM 600 – COMMITTEE RESPONSES
   Information and Discussion 1:55 – 2:15

7. UPDATES FROM SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS
   Information and Discussion 2:15 – 3:00

8. GUEST: RE – DISCUSSION OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
   • JAMES SANDOVAL, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS
   • WILLIAM KIDDER, ASSISTANT EVC
   • BOB DALY, ASSISTANT VICE CHANCELLOR, STRATEGIC ACADEMIC RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
April 3, 2013

To: Ward Beyermann, Chair
    Committee on Educational Policy

    Ziv Ran, Chair
    Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Re: Petition by the School of Medicine to use a Pass / Fail grading for
    SOM medical classes

Please review the attached request by the School of Medicine. I request an expedited review since this should be settled before students are enrolled. I also include previous related correspondence.
April 3, 2013

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Request for use of pass/fail/honors Grading system for MDCL courses

Dear Jose,

I am writing on behalf of the UCR School of Medicine to petition the Academic Senate to authorize the use of Pass / Fail grading for SOM medical classes (which use the MDCL course designation) in place of the Satisfactory / No Credit grading scheme used by the campus.

We strongly prefer the Pass / Fail system since we use a competency-based grading system for these courses. The UCR SOM uses a wide array of educational pedagogies in support of its curriculum, including many small group interactive sessions which depend on peer-to-peer learning and teamwork. Hence, we do not have any letter or numerical grades posted on the transcript – rather students are provided an overall competence score for each educational unit which, if met or exceeded, results in a Pass grade. Students who do not achieve that competence score are provided a Fail grade which needs to be remediated before advancement to the next academic level (year 2, 3 or 4) can be approved. Therefore, the medical student transcript for years 1 and 2 will reflect only Pass or Fail grading.

For the 3rd and 4th medical school years, we will also use Honors (in addition to Pass / Fail) since superior performance in a specific clerkship or medical elective can identify individual students who merit this designation. The recognition of an Honors performance in a specific clerkship (particularly in a medical discipline which the student hopes to practice) will assist the student’s application for the residency position in this discipline.

The use of Pass / Fail / Honors grading is routinely used in medical schools across the country and is very familiar for most residency programs. Since each medical student needs to secure an appropriate residency slot in order to complete their medical training and licensure, adopting this grading scheme for our medical students in the new UCR SOM will be consistent with current practice nationally.

Sincerely,

Neal L. Schiller, Ph.D.
Senior Associate Dean, Student Affairs
Distinguished Teaching Professor
March 21, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
   Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Ziv Ran Chair  
      Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Request for interpretation of course review & the grading system for SOM

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has discussed your query regarding course review and the grading system for the School of Medicine. R&J finds that:

1. Regardless of the status of the Biomedical Science program, all undergraduate courses at UCR are under the purview of the academic senate and subject to review and approval by the appropriate Senate committee(s). This does not apply to graduate courses offered by the School of Medicine.

2. We concur with your interpretation of SR 778: alternate grading systems should be reviewed by CEP and approved by R&J and the division.
March 6, 2013

Dear Ziv,

I received the requests attached below from the Registrar and I would very much appreciate the opinion of R&J in these matters.

On the matter on course review for the School of Medicine we’ll want to make sure that (1) they only will teach graduate courses and what happens if they decide to offer courses with numbers below 200; (2) that there are no complications with their association with the Biomed. Sciences program (e.g. will it be moved into the SoM in the near future? If so, what will it be its relationship to the school?); (3) who will review the courses in SoM? And, of course, any other issues R&J finds pertinent.

On the matter of the grading system I could only find http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/rpart3.html#rpart3-IIIch4-3, especially SR778 as rules for instituting a non-standard one (in this case H/P/NP) and I would like to have R&J’s “blessing” before I assert that to the SoM. If the procedure is indeed the one listed in SR778 then I was planning to request a proposal from the School’s Executive committee, to be considered by R&J, CEP and any other relevant committees, then to be discussed by Executive Council and, finally by the Division. Please let me know if R&J believe this to be the appropriate process.

Thank you and best regards,

-Jose
Jose,

Currently there is a group meeting trying to iron out all the necessary administrative tasks and set up to ensure the School of Medicine is ready for their first class to enroll in Fall 2013. During these meetings I have brought two academic items up that I need your review before moving forward.

1. **Course Approval** –

   I would like to confirm with you the delegation of authority for the courses taught by the School of Medicine. In my discussion with Neil Schiller we have reviewed the Standing Order 105.2

   [http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws/so1052.html](http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws/so1052.html) which states

   (b) *The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned.*

   Based on this information, the initial thought is that the approval of courses would be held within the School of Medicine and not be the authority of Committee on Courses based on the underlined exception above. The piece that I am unclear about is the true relationship of Biomedical Sciences with the School of Medicine. Currently there are undergraduate courses approved to be offered by Biomedical Science (BMSC 091, 092, 093, 094, 097, 191, 194 and 197L). If Biomedical Science is not under the School of Medicine then it seems that the exception would be relevant because the School of Medicine only offers graduate level work, but if Biomedical Science is actually under the School of Medicine then it would seem that authority of courses would lie with the Academic Senate. As a point of information, Neil has discussed the desire to retain the subject code of BMSC for certain courses that would be taken by non-
medical students and then use a new subject code of MDCL for course taken by medical students only.

I did query the other UC campuses who have medical schools and below are some of the responses I received. I greatly appreciate your review and determination on how UCR should proceed related to the authority of courses for the School of Medicine.

**San Diego**

Until very recently all courses, even School of Medicine, went through our normal course approval process. However, SOM courses also went through a SOM Committee on Courses. Recently, our EPC (CEP) formally delegated the authority to approve SOM courses to the SOM Committee on Courses. That is only for courses that are only for medical students. If the courses are also for graduate students then they still have to go through the full approval process. A side note – our new eCourse system does not include the approval workflow for the SOM. Therefore, they are still using the old paper Course Approval forms.

**Davis**

Under the Regents' Standing Orders, the Davis Division Committee on Courses of Instruction has authority over all courses offered by professional schools that also offer undergraduate courses of instruction. The School of Medicine agrees that the Committee on Courses of Instruction retains authority over all courses in the School of Medicine numbered 1 to 99, 100 to 199, 200 to 299, and 300 to 399.

By authority of the Memorandum of Understanding (see attached 1187_001pdf), the Committee on Courses of Instruction agrees to delegate its authority over courses numbered 400 to 499 in the UC Davis School of Medicine to the Faculty of the School of Medicine.

The Faculty Executive Committee, Block Council, Fourth Year Oversight Subcommittee, Committee on Education Policy, and specific curriculum subcommittees must approve all new medical school curriculum, with existing medical course changes/updates approved on the department level.


**San Francisco**

The UCSF Committee on Courses approves all School of Medicine courses. But
note Standing Order 105.2(b); Riverside may want to proceed differently:
http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws/so1052.html
(One point of potential confusion for us is whether M.D. courses are “graduate level” since they use 100-series course numbers, which normally are for upper-division courses.)

2. **New Grading Types**

In speaking with Neil Schiller in the School of Medicine, I believe we will need to have new grading types approved for UCR. It is my understanding that the School of Medicine will need Pass (P)/No Pass (NP) for courses offered in the first two years and then Honors (H)/Pass (P)/No Pass (NP) for Clerkship curriculum in the third and fourth years. In reaching out to the other campuses I believe that this needs to be approved through our campus and then my understanding is that it needs to be approved at the Systemwide Academic Senate.

I would greatly appreciate your guidance on the submission of this request by the School of Medicine on campus and the process they must complete or if I am incorrect in my understanding I appreciate your guidance on how best to proceed. There is a desire to have this approved for Fall 2013 so that there is consistency on the student transcripts. The current courses for Fall 2013 are approved with Satisfactory (S)/No Credit (NC) grading that is our current campus grading type.

I greatly appreciate your guidance on these two issues. If you have any questions that I can assist with, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you

Bracken
April 15, 2013

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: WARD BEYERMANN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: PETITION BY THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE TO USE A PASS / FAIL GRADING FOR SCHOOL OF SOM MEDICAL CLASSES

The Committee on Educational Policy approves the request by the School of Medicine to authorize the use of Pass/Fail grading for SOM medical classes.
April 10, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Ziv Ran Chair
      Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Petition by the School of Medicine to use a Pass / Fail grading for
    SOM medical classes

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction discussed the proposed grading system and
finds the request is consistent with the code of the Academic Senate.
March 12, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Dear Bob:


The latest version of APM430 was reviewed by the UCR committees on Research, Academic Personnel and International Education, and by the Graduate Council. With the exception of the Committee on Research (CoR), the reviewers declined to opine or did not have additional comments. CoR noticed that desirable candidates for the Visiting Scholar title may not have an appropriate terminal degree and suggest the following modification to 430-10 (added text in italics):

430-10 Criteria for Appointment.
Visitors must possess a terminal degree or have experience appropriate to their status, or may be an undergraduate student. Their appointment must serve an academic purpose for the unit in which they are visiting.

Sincerely yours,
Jose Wudka
Professor of Physics & Astronomy and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cynthia Palmer, Director of UCR Academic Senate office
April 15, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Dear Bob:

RE: Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations, Including SR 478 to Accommodate “IGETC for STEM Majors”

The proposed changes to SR478 were reviewed by our committees on Undergraduate Admissions (UA) and Educational Policy (CEP), as well as by the executive committees of the colleges of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS) and Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS). All reviewers were generally supportive of the change, though several points and issues were raised.

Clarifications & changes

- The clause excluding remedial English composition courses should be restored: there is no justification for this deletion and it can severely impact the possibilities of success for students who transfer under this program
- CNAS supports the changes contingent on the understanding that the college can opt out in order to insure higher admission standards (current interpretation of SR414)
- UA requests a clarification on the campus flexibility in setting the time required for program completion after transferring to a UC campus. The proposed policy allows one full year, while the UCR colleges that accept the policy allow 1 quarter
- There appears to be a typographical error in section D.2.b, which should presumably read “A transfer student intending to major in a science, engineering, or mathematics program that recognizes IGETC as satisfying the B/GE requirements ...” since it’s the program, not the student, that recognizes IGETC.

CHASS expressed concern about the possible impact this policy will have in increasing enrollment numbers when current resources are already strained. In addition, CEP noted that the effectiveness of the program will depend heavily on appropriate advising at the community college level, recognizing this lies outside the UC direct sphere of influence

Sincerely yours,
Jose Wudka
Professor of Physics & Astronomy and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cynthia Palmer, Director of UCR Academic Senate office
TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: WARD BEYERMANN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SENATE REGULATIONS, INCLUDING SR478 TO ACCOMMODATE “IGETC FOR STEM MAJORS”

The proposed amendment was circulated to the members of the Committee on Educational Policy. Most of them responded, and there was agreement in favor of adopting this amendment with one abstention. In addition to the approval, the following comments were provided and supported.

1. There were substantive and reasonable objections with the previous one-size-fits all version of IGETC. That policy encouraged Community College students to complete general education courses instead of basic science courses, which are prerequisites for the upper-division curriculum in STEM fields. Transfer students arrived at UCR without the equivalent of a freshman/sophomore preparation and had course loads full of lower-division classes with time-consuming labs. As a consequence many of these students delayed graduation, or even worse, performed poorly in their introductory science classes, forcing them to start over in a new major. In fact, CNAS never accepted the present version of IGETC. The new transfer STEM pathways will likely expect completion of a year of calculus and either a year of college chemistry or physics. This may be difficult to satisfy along with the traditional IGETC requirements within the timeframe a student typically spends at a Community College. The IGETC-for-STEM option seems to allow STEM transfers the flexibility to complete some of the needed STEM prerequisites before transferring. Hopefully, the counseling process at the Community Colleges will adequately advise this group of students who are interested in the STEM pathway.

2. Several members were concerned about removing the clause prohibiting the use of remedial composition courses for the English Composition requirement. The consequences of this action are uncertain, and without adequate justification, the clause should remain.

3. Finally, there appears to be a typographical error in Section D.2.b. The first sentence should read “A transfer student intending to major in a science, engineering, or mathematics program that recognizes IGETC as satisfying the B/GE requirements ...” since it’s the program, not the student, that recognizes IGETC.
March 26, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division, Academic Senate

From: Mindy Marks, Chair
       Undergraduate Admissions Committee

Re: Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations, Including SR478 to Accommodate “IGETC for STEM Majors”

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has reviewed the Proposed Amendment to SR 478 and support the endeavor. The Committee does have a clarifying question. Will the Campuses have the autonomy to change the timelines? For instance the document states that "The IGETC must be completed within one academic year (two semesters or three quarters plus any summer that might intervene) of the student's transfer to UC." Currently UCR requires students to complete their IGETC requirements by the end of the 1st quarter. Will we be in violation of the policy?
April 3, 2013

TO: José Wudka, Chair
   Academic Senate

FROM: Jennifer Hughes, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Response to Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations, Including SR 478 to Accommodate “IGETC for STEM Majors”

The CHASS Executive Committee supports the revision to allow transfer students in STEM majors to take up to three general education requirements in their first year at UCR. CHASS Executive Committee expresses concern, however, that this may further impact class size in the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and suggests that additional university resources be dedicated to general education course instruction, including the hire of additional faculty.

Jennifer Hughes, Chair

UCR CHASS Executive Committee
TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

FROM: Gillian Wilson, CNAS Executive Committee

RE: Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulations, Including SR 478 to Accommodate “IGETC for STEM Majors”

Dear Jose,

The CNAS Executive Council discussed the proposed amendments during the meeting of March 12th, 2013.

The committee approved the amendments contingent that the statement in 478.D.5 remain in the final version.

This statement reads "Consistent with SR 414, each college retains the right to accept or not accept IGETC as satisfactory completion of its lower division B/GE requirements.", and allows CNAS the flexibility to set higher standards for admission than those in IGETC.

Gillian

Gillian Wilson
Professor
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of California Riverside
900 University Avenue
Riverside, CA 92521
April 11, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Sarjeet Gill, Chair  
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Systemwide Review of - APM 600 series

CAP discussed the revisions to APM 600 and approves the changes. CAP has no further comments or recommendations.
April 19, 2013

To: Jose Wudka
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Irving G. Hendrick
       Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

    Section IV, Salary Administration (APM – 600 Series)

The Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed changes to APM – 600 Series
and is unaware of any objections worthy of note to comment on.
April 18, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Connie Nugent, Chair
       Graduate Council

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Academic Personnel
    Manual Section IV, Salary Administration (APM – 600 Series)

The Graduate Council discussed the proposed revised Academic Personnel
Manual Section IV at their April 18th meeting and had no comments.
April 16, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Jan Blacher  
Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget

Section IV, Salary Administration (APM – 600 Series)

The Committee on Planning & Budget reviewed the above document and recommends approval pending any comment by the Committee on Academic Personnel. This document contains minor revisions to policies regarding schedules of academic appointments, payments and administration.