November 5, 2013

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

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

Fr: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda ~ December 9, 2013

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, December 9, 2013
at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the University Office Building Room 220.
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EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
OCTOBER 28, 2013

Present:
Division Officers:
Piotr Gorecki, Secretary/Parliamentarian  Jennifer Hughes, Vice Chair
Ilhem Messaoudi Powers, Jr Assembly Rep  Jose Wudka, Division Chair

Standing Committee Chairs:
James Baldwin, Physical Resource Planning  Kenneth Barish, Planning & Budget
Lynda Bell, Graduate Council  Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy
Kathryn DeFea, Undergraduate Admissions  George Haggerty, Academic Personnel
Barry Mishra, SOBA Exec Committee  Eugene Nothnagel, Preparatory Education
Michael Vanderwood, GSOE Exec Committee  Akula Venkatram, BCOE Exec Committee
Georgia Warnke, Faculty Welfare  Gillian Wilson, CNAS Exec Committee
Zhenbiao Yang, Diversity & Equal Opportunity

Absent:
Erica Edwards, CHASS Executive Committee  Mariam Lam, Committees
Bahram Mobasher, Sr Assembly Rep  Ameae Walker, SOM Exec Committee

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AGENDA AND MINUTES:
The agenda for October 28 and the minutes from October 21 were approved as written.

STANDING COMMITTEE CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS:
Conflict of Interest Statements were noted as received from the Committees on Educational Policy, Preparatory Education, Undergraduate Admissions and the SOBA Executive Committee.

The Conflict of Interest Statement for the Graduate Council was removed from the consent calendar and opened for discussion. The Executive Council discussed the statement “…neither the reality nor the appearance of a conflict of interest…” which exists in the conflict of interests statements for several committees. After a short discussion, Executive Council agreed that using “neither the reality nor the appearance of …” is appropriate given the nature of the work of the applicable committees.

PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A MASTER’S OF PUBLIC POLICY DEGREE PROGRAM AT UCR
The Proposal to establish a Master’s of Public Policy was reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council and the Committee on Planning and Budget. The Executive Council expressed enthusiasm for the degree and discussed its significance for the campus. The proposal will be presented to the Division for a vote at a Special Meeting on November 4, 2013.
PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE BYLAWS OF THE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SOBA Faculty Chair Barry Mishra offered that the proposed changes were intended to allow flexibility for the school. There was also discussion of the role of the Dean or other senior administrative officers within sub-committees of the Executive Committee of a college (or Division or School). Chair Mishra advised that the SOBA Executive Committee will be reviewing the originally proposed revisions and asked that the bylaw proposal not be forwarded to the Division at this time.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Policy
Chair Wudka informed the Executive Council that the Child Abuse and Neglect Reporting Act (CANRA) does not apply to the majority of faculty, however everyone is encouraged to read the policy and submit questions directly to Chair Wudka. Concerns about the policy should be directed to the Committee on Faculty Welfare.

Online Education Request for Proposals (RFP) Wave II
Each campus is required to have a locally developed Intellectual Property Agreement, and Chair Wudka advised that the Riverside agreement is very close to finalization. Campus Counsel, David Bergquist, is reviewing the final recommendations made by representatives of the Academic Senate. The Wave II RFP has been released with a deadline of November 17, 2013 and the hope is that our local Intellectual Property Agreement will be ready for the Wave II RFP awardees.

Robinson Edley Report
Chair Wudka advised that he has asked the Committee on Academic Freedom to review the campus response to the Robinson Edley civil disobedience recommendations. The process/procedures of the “Campus Events Response Team” represent practices that have been in place for years at UCR, however, the Robinson / Edley recommendations require that we formally document our procedures with the goal of making our practices both “repeatable” and “auditable”. None of the groups described in the response are Senate groups, nor does the Senate have any responsibility or reporting roles, however since the procedures described apply to demonstrations on campus (and other circumstances) it is appropriate the Senate have the opportunity to comment.

Composite Benefit Rate
The implementation of a Composite Benefit Rate (CBR) plan is a given, however there has not been an agreement on the plan specifics. The Senate has been moderately successful in keeping the issue on the table until there is more widespread contentment and a greater understanding of the implications of each rate structure. On a local level, several Senate committees are working with the administration to review the financial impact to our campus and specifically to our faculty and their research efforts.

Health Care Benefit Update
Georgia Warnke, Chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, informed the Executive Council of the campus town hall and public information forums. Chair Warnke also advised that the CFW
is very aware of the lack of a tier 1 hospital in Riverside and is actively working to advise Office of the President of the Riverside inequities. Finally, Chair Warnke offered that it is likely too late to implement any changes to the plan for the 14-15 year; however the Committee on Faculty Welfare will work with the administration and human resources to document the hardships and experiences on the UCR campus and forward those to OP in advance of 15-16 health plan negotiations.

**Affirmative Action Hiring Practices**
Chair Wudka has asked the Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity to review the reports and disclosure forms used by the office of Affirmative Action. The current forms and reports are not especially helpful in assisting with assuring a search is conducted according to affirmative action guidelines and/or using best practice methods.

**President Janet Napolitano Visit to Riverside Campus**
Logistics and final format of the Executive Council meeting and Faculty Forum for the campus visit with President Napolitano were discussed. The Executive Council was also reminded of the Special Meeting of the Division to be held immediately following the faculty forum.

**GUEST: Professor Mary Gauvain, Associate Vice Provost of Faculty Success, Equity & Diversity**
Associate Vice Provost Gauvain explained some of the goals of her office and her position. In particular, VP Gauvain would like to focus on:
- Faculty Mentor Programs - functioning as a sort of broker for faculty who would like to have or be a mentor to other faculty
- Issues of Leadership - training and supporting the faculty leaders on our campus, offering greater transparency on available leadership positions
- Faculty Professional Growth and Development - providing support to faculty for progressing beyond tenure and support systems for faculty who are transitioning to other research areas

The meeting was adjourned at 3:07 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
*Cindy Palmer, Executive Director*
*Office of the Academic Senate*
November 5, 2013

To:       J. Wudka, Chair
          Riverside Division

Fr:       G. Waines, Chair
          Committee on Distinguished Campus Service

Re:       Conflict of Interest Statement

The Committee on Distinguished Campus Service approved the adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2013-14:

The Committee on Distinguished Service has adopted the following policy for situations in which personal affiliation of a Committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in Committee deliberations. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The Committee Chair may ask the Committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
November 5, 2013

To: J. Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

Fr: J. Holt, Chair
   Committee on Distinguished Teaching

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2013-14:

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching has adopted the following policy for situations in which personal affiliation of a Committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in Committee deliberations. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The Committee Chair may ask the Committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
November 18, 2013

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

From: Zhenbiao Yang, Chair  
Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement 2013 - 2014

The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity adopted, by unanimous vote, the Conflict of Interest Statement below.

“In any situation wherein the personal affiliation of a committee member could be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member shall recuse her/himself from supporting or opposing any motion, from voting on any motion made in the course of the deliberations, and leave the room when the relevant discussion begins to ensure that all other Committee members can engage in open and honest discussion. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity. In case of uncertainty, the Chair, in consultation with other committee members, shall make the final decision.”
28 October 2013

To: J. Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

Fr: C. Varma, Chair
Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement

The Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2013-14:

If a member of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer thinks that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call that possibility to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will then convene the committee, in the absence of the individual with the potential conflict. Those present will then decide by a majority vote if a conflict exists. If the decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicting matter and will not vote on that issue.
November 19, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division

Fm: Christina Schwenkel  
Chair, Committee on International Education

Re: 2013-14 Conflict of Interest Statement

The Committee on International Education approved the adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2013-14:

The Committee on International Education has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
November 4, 2013

TO: J. WUDKA, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE: 2013-2014 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Research re-adopted the following Conflict of Interest statement:

If a member of the Committee on research submits an application for funds from this committee, he/she will not participate in the evaluation discussion or decision concerning that particular application. Further, each application for Intramural Research funding will be reviewed and evaluated individually by two members of this committee, before final discussion by the entire committee, in order to ensure a fair and impartial review of each application. Finally, if any member of this committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict of interest to the attention of the chair. The chair will convene the committee, and those present will decide by majority vote if a conflict exists. If their decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicted matter and will not vote on that matter.
November 4, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Robin DiMatteo  
   Chair, Shadow CAP

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement for 2013 – 2014

The standing committee, Shadow CAP, will review personnel actions that involve current CAP members or their spouses/partners. The Shadow CAP committee consists of six faculty members who have previously served on CAP. The memberships are appointed by the Committee on Committees.

There is an expectation that Shadow CAP Committee members will neither participate nor vote in departmental meetings when formal discussions and votes are held for merit, promotion, quinquennial or appraisal actions of the current CAP members. Individual exceptions to this understanding will be reviewed by the Committee, and exception statements will be filed with a copy of this statement and maintained in the Academic Senate Office. In these exceptions, the Committee member will not participate in related discussions or votes taken by the Shadow CAP Committee.

In addition, Shadow CAP Committee members will notify the Chair of the Committee whenever they believe a conflict-of-interest exists regarding their own participation or the participation of any other Committee member in any action under consideration by the Committee. If the matter concerns the Chair of the Committee, members will notify the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Shadow CAP recognizes its responsibility to maintain the utmost confidentiality and fairness in its deliberations. Accordingly, it is the duty of its members to refrain from discussion of any personnel actions with anyone outside Shadow CAP either before or after Shadow CAP considers a file.
October 30, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Fr: Guanshui Xu, Chair
    Committee on University Extension

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement for 2013-2014

The Committee on University Extension approves the following conflict of interest statement:

If a course, credential program, certificate program, or other item/issue should come before the Committee on University Extension which affects the department of a committee member, the committee member will provide information, but will not vote on the item/issue. A Committee on University Extension member who is paid by University Extension for teaching or consultation with regard to a specific course, credential program, certificate program or other item/issue will provide information, but will not vote on the item/issue.
October 15, 2013

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

FR: Akula Venkatram, Chair
    Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: 2013-2014 Conflict of Interest Statement

This was read and unanimously approved at the September 19, 2013 BCOE Executive Committee meeting.

Bourns College of Engineering
Executive Committee
2013-14 Conflict of Interest Statement

If the personal affiliation of a committee member with an organization or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member should bring this fact to the attention of the committee, and the committee member may be asked to provide information, as appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
October 30, 2013

Subject: 2013-2014 GSOE Executive Committee Conflict of Interest Statement

1. On October 1st, 2013 the GSOE Executive Committee unanimously voted to adopt the following COI statement:

If a committee member’s personal affiliation with an organization or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member should bring this fact to the attention of the committee. The committee member may be asked to provide information, as appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.

Mike Vanderwood, Ph.D.
Interim GSOE Faculty Chair
TO: Jose Wudka, Chair Academic Senate
FROM: Ameae Walker, Chair Executive Committee School of Medicine
RE: Conflict of Interest Statement

The School of Medicine Executive Committee adopts the following policy on conflict of interest: If a member of the committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, said member should bring the potential conflict of interest to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will convene a meeting in the absence of the person with the potential conflict and those present will determine whether a conflict exists. If the decision is in the affirmative, the individual considered to have a conflict may be asked to recuse him/herself during committee discussions of the subject matter in question and, should a vote be taken, will not vote on the issue. Should the Chair be the person considered to have a conflict of interest, the Vice Chair of the committee will serve the function of the Chair in the process outlined.
To be adopted:

Present:  

**8.14.2** The Graduate Council exercises regulative and coordinating functions in the Graduate Division of the Riverside campus except for the final approval of new programs leading to established graduate degrees and the final recommendation to the Assembly of the Academic Senate on new graduate degrees. It is the duty of the Graduate Council to:

Proposed:  

**8.14.2** The Graduate Council sets policy regarding graduate academic affairs on the Riverside campus, and advises the campus Graduate Division on all regulatory issues pertaining to academic matters involving graduate students. The only exceptions to this rule are: final approval of new programs leading to established graduate degrees, and the final recommendation to the Assembly of the Academic Senate on new graduate degrees, both of which come from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. It is the duty of the Graduate Council to:

Justification: The current bylaws do not accurately represent the Graduate Council’s affiliation with the Graduate Division. The proposed bylaw change accurately clarifies the duties of the Graduate Council in relationship to the Graduate Division.

Approvals

Approved by the Graduate Council:  

September 26, 2013

Approved by the Committee on Committees:  

November 7, 2013

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate:  

November 5, 2013

Received by Executive Council:
October 23, 2013

To: George Haggerty, Chair
    Academic Personnel

                        Helen Henry, Chair
    Privilege & Tenure

                        Ziv Ran, Chair
    Rules & Jurisdiction

                        Georgia Warnke, Chair
    Faculty Welfare

                        Zhenbiao Yang, Chair
    Diversity and Equal Opportunity

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

Last spring, the San Diego Division submitted proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55 that would allow the extension of departmental voting rights on academic appointment and promotion actions to salaried non-Senate faculty in the Adjunct Professor or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

The proposed revisions would permit Senate members in an academic unit to vote on whether to extend Bylaw 55 rights and would require that a decision to do so must be reconsidered annually. Former Council Chair Powell asked UCAP and UCFW to consider the proposal in systemwide context. In May, the Academic Council discussed the proposal and advice from UCAP and UCFW and voted to send the proposal, along with the comments from UCAP and UCFW, for systemwide review. Because it was too late in the academic year to begin such a review, Council voted to postpone the review until the fall.

Accordingly, I have enclosed the proposal, the letters from UCAP and UCFW, and the relevant portion of the minutes from Council’s discussion in May.

Please review this with your committee and submit your comments by November 27, 2013.
October 23, 2013

To: Erica Edwards, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

Barry Mishra, Chair
SOBA Executive Committee

Michael Vanderwood, Acting Chair
GSOE Executive Committee

Akula Venkatram, Chair
BCOE Executive Committee

Ameae Walker, Chair
SOM Executive Committee

Gillian Wilson, Chair
CNAS Executive Committee

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

Last spring, the San Diego Division submitted proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55 that would allow the extension of departmental voting rights on academic appointment and promotion actions to salaried non-Senate faculty in the Adjunct Professor or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

The proposed revisions would permit Senate members in an academic unit to vote on whether to extend Bylaw 55 rights and would require that a decision to do so must be reconsidered annually. Former Council Chair Powell asked UCAP and UCFW to consider the proposal in systemwide context. In May, the Academic Council discussed the proposal and advice from UCAP and UCFW and voted to send the proposal, along with the comments from UCAP and UCFW, for systemwide review. Because it was too late in the academic year to begin such a review, Council voted to postpone the review until the fall.

Accordingly, I have enclosed the proposal, the letters from UCAP and UCFW, and the relevant portion of the minutes from Council’s discussion in May.

Please review this with your committee and submit your comments by November 27, 2013.
March 25, 2013

Professor Robert Powell  
Chair, Academic Council  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

Subject: Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 55

Dear Bob,

At its meeting on May 22, 2012, the Representative Assembly of the San Diego Division approved a proposal to amend Senate Bylaw 55 to extend voting rights on academic review actions to two specific classes of non-Senate faculty (NSF) members in Health Sciences – “career” salaried faculty in the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

Proposal

Senate Bylaw 55 currently allows voting privileges in departments to be extended to emeriti faculty if two-thirds of the department’s tenured faculty members vote to support the extension. The Health Sciences Faculty Council (HSFC) proposal, which is supported by the UCSD Senate Council, would allow the extension of voting privileges to career salaried faculty in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series using the same process as the extension to emeriti faculty. The proposal does not require every department in the Health Sciences to extend voting privileges to these non-Senate faculty members, recognizing that different departments have different cultures when it comes to department governance. Under this proposal, the extension of voting privileges would be in place for at least one year; reconsideration of the extension follows the same process as that for emeriti faculty. Under the proposal, voting privileges could be extended only to those Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors who hold an appointment of more than 50% (“career”) in the department.

Rationale

In the Health Sciences, many clinical faculty members are appointed in the Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical series. These NSF members perform many of the same duties as Senate members and are critical to the success of the Health Sciences’ research, education, and clinical enterprises. Indeed, in the five decades since UCSD was founded, the funding landscape of the state has changed, and now about 70% of Health Sciences faculty members are in non-Senate positions. These NSF faculty members are ineligible to vote on departmental actions related to the academic review process, and so cannot fully participate in critical departmental decisions such as faculty hiring and career reviews. Indeed, it can be very difficult for departments with large percentages of NSF to operate if
this substantial majority of their faculty is not given a voice in the academic personnel process. The inability to vote on academic personnel review files is demoralizing for NSF in the Health Sciences, enforcing an artificial division of the faculty into two different classes.

The San Diego Division therefore proposes to allow NSF in the Health Sciences to participate in voting and academic review, a change that is fully consistent with the principle of shared governance. UCSF has proposed to solve this problem by making members of the NSF series officially Senate members. However, this approach would radically change the makeup of the Senate and the concomitant service, scholarship, and teaching expectations might be difficult to fulfill. This led to the proposal discussed above, which has support from the Divisional Senate Council and from other campuses with medical schools. The proposal was also overwhelmingly approved by the Divisional Representative Assembly on May 22, 2012 with vote of 30 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

The San Diego Division formally submits the attached proposed revision to Senate Bylaw 55 for consideration and approval.

Sincerely,

T. Guy Masters, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

Attachment

cc: Divisional Vice Chair Pogliano
Executive Director Winnacker
REPORT OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL

The UCSD Health Sciences Faculty Council forwards to the Representative Assembly the attached proposal for extending voting rights on academic review actions to two specific classes of non-Senate faculty in Health Sciences – salaried faculty in the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. As explained below, faculty members with these specific titles are absolutely essential to the educational and research missions in the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences and are clearly part of the logical and appropriate peer group of Senate faculty responsible for the same missions.

This issue has been discussed extensively within Health Sciences and is supported by the Faculty Council, Health Sciences Department Chairs, and Health Sciences leadership. We recognize that this proposal will require systemwide action to modify Academic Senate Bylaw 55 and the proposal includes draft language to do so, similar to the current provision within Bylaw 55 to extend voting privileges to emeritus faculty.

We wish to emphasize that the intent of this proposal is not to require all departments to extend voting rights to non-Senate faculty, but to allow individual departments to do so upon vote of their Senate faculty. Also, the intention is restrict this proposal to voting on academic appointment and review actions within Health Sciences departments and not to further involve non-Senate faculty in Academic Senate business or governance.

The primary rationale for this proposal is the fact that non-Senate faculty now make up a majority of faculty in Health Sciences, upwards of 75% in some departments and increasing. These faculty members play critical roles in both the clinical education and research missions in our professional schools to the benefit of the whole University community. Fully engaging the salaried Adjunct and Health Sciences Clinical Professors in the academic appointment and review processes of their own departments is both necessary and optimal for the University to achieve and excel in its Health Science missions. The alternative of requiring these faculty members to move into a Senate series is less desirable because there are other important differences in responsibilities beyond academic appointment and review between these Health Science faculty and Senate faculty on other parts of the undergraduate and graduate campus.

The Senate Council discussed the proposal at its meeting on May 7, 2012 and was generally supportive. The consensus of the Council was that the proposal should be forwarded to the Representative Assembly for consideration. The Health Sciences Faculty Council recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the proposal. If the Assembly approves the proposal, it will be submitted to the systemwide Academic Assembly for consideration and approval.

Douglas Conrad, Chair    Andrew Ries, Associate Vice Chancellor    Frank L. Powell, Immediate Past Chair
Health Sciences Faculty Council    Health Sciences, Academic Affairs    Academic Senate, San Diego Division

******************************************************************************

HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL
VOTING PROPOSAL FOR NON-ACADEMIC SENATE FACULTY

- Whereas a core value of the University of California is the principle of shared governance between faculty and administration
- Whereas non-Academic Senate faculty make up the majority of salaried faculty in the Health Sciences
- Whereas the growth of faculty in Health Sciences has been beneficial to both Health Sciences and the whole University community
- Whereas non-Academic Senate faculty are critical to all academic missions in Health Sciences with
  - Important roles in teaching
  - Substantial contributions to the growth and success of the research enterprise to the benefit of all faculty and campuses in the University community
  - Active participation in University service
- Whereas University voting policies were established in an earlier era in which there were few salaried, full-time non-Academic Senate faculty in Health Sciences
- Whereas disenfranchising non-Academic Senate faculty in Health Sciences from the academic appointment and review process has the unintended consequence of unnecessarily motivating more faculty to seek appointment in series that convey membership in the Academic Senate
It is proposed that each department in Health Sciences be allowed (but not required) to extend voting rights for academic appointments and reviews to career (i.e., >50% effort) non-Academic Senate faculty who are subject to regular academic review upon 2/3 vote of eligible Senate faculty in that department.

- It is further proposed that systemwide Academic Senate Bylaw 55 be modified to insert the following text (similar to the extension of voting rights to Emeritus faculty).

Academic Senate Bylaw 55, Departmental Voting Rights
(http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/manual/blpart1.html#bl55)

### E. Extension of Voting Privileges to non-Academic Senate Faculty in Health Sciences

Voting privileges on personnel matters within any department or school in Health Sciences may be extended to one or more of the classes of career (i.e., >50% effort) non-Academic Senate members of that department, as a class, who are not otherwise entitled to vote under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw, upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw. Any extensions of the voting privilege under this Article E must remain in effect for at least one calendar year (twelve months); thereafter, any faculty member entitled to a vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw may request reconsideration. Following a request for reconsideration, and prior to any subsequent vote on the cases in question, the Chair or other appropriate departmental officer shall put the question of renewal of privileges to a vote. An extension of voting privileges will be renewed only upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw.

Considered by the Representative Assembly of the San Diego Division on May 22, 2012 with the following result:

*Motion to approve passed: 30 in favor, 3 opposed, 2 abstentions*
ROBERT POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Proposed Amendments to Senate Bylaw 55 (Departmental Voting Rights)

Dear Bob,

UCFW reviewed the proposal from the San Diego Division to amend Bylaw 55, to provide departments in the Health Sciences the option to extend voting privileges to two non-Senate faculty (hereafter NSF) titles, the “career” salaried faculty in the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series. The purpose of the proposal was to remedy inequities in those departments in which NSF comprise a large fraction, perhaps a majority, of the department. The proposal is modeled on a current provision of Bylaw 55, which extends voting privileges to emeritus faculty members, at the discretion of the department as indicated by a vote of 2/3 of the Senate faculty in support, for a year at a time, subject to annual renewal.

UCFW was supportive of the concept and recommends that the proposal be circulated for Systemwide review. UCFW recognizes, however, that any amendments to the Senate Bylaws must be carefully considered, and Systemwide review may identify areas in which the proposal needs to be modified prior to approval. UCFW therefore offers the following points that might require further consideration by the campuses, schools, and colleges during Systemwide review.

- Are the Adjunct Professor and the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series the only two NSF titles that should be considered? On the campuses with Agricultural Experiment Stations, similar inequities may exist in departments whose faculty includes NSF Agronomists (APM 320) and Cooperative Extension Specialists (APM 334). The problem identified by the San Diego Division may extend to other NSF titles, and Systemwide review likely will result in a recommendation to expand the list of titles.

- Some UCFW members suggested that, although it would be appropriate to extend full voting privileges to NSF titles for their own merits and promotions, it would be inappropriate to extend full voting privileges on the files of Senate faculty members within those departments. These members were concerned that the culture of departments may be changed if the new NSF did not value scholarship, innovative research, teaching, and University and public service equally as Senate faculty members. Is there danger that the greater number of non-
senate voters would change the expectations of the department's Senate members for merits and promotions? This would need careful consideration in departments with large proportions of NSF, such as the departments with ~70% of such members mentioned in the San Diego Division's cover letter.

- Would an annual threat of having their voting privileges revoked also skew the voting process?

UCFW developed two recommendations that might be considered further during Systemwide review:

- Rather than at the divisional level, the respective colleges or schools, as appropriate, within campuses review and identify the titles that should be considered for the extension of voting privileges by their units. It is the colleges and schools, rather than the Systemwide organization or the campuses that know best where the inequities among faculty titles exist and if the extension of voting privileges might alleviate them.

- An alternative to conferring full voting privileges on all faculty titles would be to confer full voting privileges only within each title, and to confer advisory voting privileges on other faculty titles. These advisory votes would be separately summarized and discussed in the Departmental letter.

UCFW recognizes that the University has become so complex that schools and departments now have substantially different cultures. We are therefore supportive of a careful and deliberate process to expand voting privileges within departments where appropriate. We recognize that UC may be stepping on to a "slippery slope" in considering modifying departmental voting privileges, but the dangers must be carefully compared to the inequities that currently exist within departments having significant numbers of non-Senate faculty.

Sincerely,

\[\text{J. Daniel Hare, UCFW Chair}\]

Copy: UCFW
Robert Powell, Chair, Academic Council
William Jacob, Vice Chair, Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate
May 17, 2013

BOB POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSED REVISION TO SENATE BYLAW 55

Dear Bob,

UCAP discussed the proposal by the San Diego division to amend Senate Bylaw 55 during its May 8th meeting. All members of UCAP except UCSF and UCLA are opposed to the proposal to extend departmental voting rights on academic merit and promotion reviews to salaried non-Senate faculty in the Adjunct Professor or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

Sincerely,

Harry Green, Chair
UCAP
XI. Senate Bylaw 55

ISSUE: The San Diego Division submitted a proposal to amend Senate Bylaw 55 to extend departmental voting rights on academic merit and promotion reviews to salaried non-Senate faculty in the Adjunct Professor or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series. Chair Powell asked UCAP and UCFW to consider the proposal in systemwide context.

DISCUSSION: UCSD divisional Chair Masters said that his division would like to extend the provision in Bylaw 55 allowing emeriti voting rights to non-Senate faculty. It would enable Senate members in a unit to vote on whether non-Senate faculty in that unit could review personnel cases and/or vote on them. This would be decided by each department and would be renewed annually. UCAP Vice Chair Jeffrey Knapp stated that UCAP opposes the proposal because there is a substantive distinction between Senate and non-Senate faculty in the areas of achievement for which faculty are evaluated. UCAP was not persuaded that giving voting rights would solve the problem of demoralization among non-Senate faculty. A member noted that LSOEs have a different portfolio than ladder-rank faculty, but are Senate members and have full voting rights. Another member noted that his department has extended advisory voting rights to agronomists. A member suggested sending the proposal for review and asking respondents to comment specifically on UCFW’s recommendations. A member stated that UCSF’s proposal to extend Senate membership to some non-Senate faculty was rejected last year. In contrast, this proposal is modest. It gives departments the ability to determine how they want to govern themselves, and is voluntary. Because it must be renewed annually by a vote of the Senate faculty, it could be easily reversed if the Senate faculty in the department wished to do so. UCAP Vice Chair Knapp said that UCAP focused on appointments, not merit reviews. He provided the example that if clinical faculty, who are primarily focused on teaching, vote on appointments, research may be devalued in a search. He also stated that the analogy to emeriti is problematic because emeriti are Senate faculty and are a small minority. Non-Senate faculty can constitute up to 70% of a department, so they would instantly have a supermajority. A member stated that Merced extends voting rights to assistant professors because they have small units, but cautioned that Council should carefully consider which non-Senate titles will be included, noting that the term “adjunct” is used in many different ways. The titles that are eligible and the percent of appointment should be specified in the proposal. A member countered that departments should define the eligible titles. A member commented that votes should be segmented according to Senate versus non-Senate faculty in order to assess the effect of the policy. A member spoke in favor of accommodating the differences among the units and divisions, even though her division would be unlikely to implement the proposal. A member asked to what degree the proposal is a slippery slope to granting non-Senate faculty Senate membership and noted there are other options, such as advisory votes or non-Senate faculty voting only on non-Senate faculty merit reviews, not on Senate faculty or on appointments. A member commented that the proposal addresses a specific case with a systemwide solution.

ACTION: Council voted to send the proposal, along with the comments from UCAP and UCFW for systemwide review in the fall (11 in favor, 5 opposed).
November 26, 2013

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

From: George Haggerty, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

At its meeting on November 18, 2013, CAP discussed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 and approves of the changes but provides the following recommendations:

The language provided in UCSD’s proposal states that “voting privileges could be extended only to those Adjunct and Heath Sciences Clinical Professors who hold an appointment of more than 50% (“career”) in the department” whereas the proposed bylaw 55 language change indicates that voting privileges would be extended to all non-Academic Senate Faculty in Heath Sciences. UCR has a growing non-senate health science faculty composed of several career paths that are not limited to the Adjunct and Heath Sciences Clinical Professors series. If it is UCSD’s intent to limit senate voting rights to these two career tracks, the proposed bylaw 55 language should reflect what is stated in the proposal.
November 25, 2013

TO:    Jose Wudka, Chair
        Riverside Division

FR:    Akula Venkatram, Chair
        Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE:    Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 55

The BCOE Executive Committee has reviewed the Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 55, and has concluded that it applies only to the Health Sciences Faculty. Thus, comments or recommendations on the amendment to Bylaw 55 are not warranted at this time.
November 20, 2013

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Erica Edwards, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The CHASS Executive Committee is not enthusiastic about a systemwide change in Senate Bylaw 55. The Committee does not see the value in extending voting privileges to non-Senate faculty and sees the case outlined in the May 2012 San Diego Division Proposal, which proposed an amendment to Bylaw 55 to extend voting rights on academic review actions to "career" salaried faculty in the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series, as an exceptional one.
Dear Jose,

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55 that would allow the extension of departmental voting rights on academic appointment and promotion actions to salaried non-Senate faculty (NSF) in the Adjunct Professor and Health Sciences Clinical Professor series at its meeting on November 5th.

Overall, the CNAS Executive Committee was in favor of the proposed amendments, believing that they are likely to result in a desired outcome, that of increased engagement of non-Senate faculty in departmental business. The Committee accepts that there are risks, as stated by the Committee on Faculty Welfare, “of stepping on to a "slippery slope" in considering modifying departmental voting privileges”. The Committee also notes the opposition to the amendments from all members of UCAP except UCSF and UCLA. However, the CNAS Executive Committee concludes that the risks are likely minimal due both to voting privileges being decided at the departmental level and to their being subject to annual review.

Additional comments:

1) The clinical faculty do less research but more teaching, while the adjuncts do less teaching and more research. There may therefore be a mismatch in expectations for the different categories of appointments which could bias decisions for Senate faculty who have to maintain a more balanced portfolio.
2) Are there separate tracks and rules for Adjunct and Clinical Professor series?
3) Does CAPP review these files or are they reviewed only by the Deans of the Medical Schools?
4) Could the bylaw be amended initially for a trial period?
5) Are similar voting rights likely to be extended to other categories of NSF e.g., Extension Center faculty?

Yours sincerely,

Gillian Wilson
Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
November 27, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
    Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Georgia Warnke  
    Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

At its meeting on November 14, 2013, UCR’s Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55. The amendment would allow individual departments to extend voting rights to Non-Senate Faculty if they so choose.

The Faculty Welfare committee cannot support the amendment at this time. In addition to a growing Non-Senate health science faculty, UCR has a robust Cooperative Extension Program. The Faculty Welfare committee is unclear how extending voting rights to these groups would affect university governance and thinks the implications of the change in the by-law require further study.

Furthermore, according to legislative ruling 5.67 the change to include Non-Senate members seems to violate the Standing Order of the Regents.

5.67 The right to vote in department meetings as specified in 105.2(c) of the Standing Orders of the Regents is limited to those members of the department who are also members of the Academic Senate. Neither the Standing Orders nor Senate Bylaw 188 [renumbered to 55] authorize the extension of this voting privilege to persons who are not members of the Senate.
November 18, 2013

To: Jose Wudka  
    Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Helen Henry  
       Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re: Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 55

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure has considered the proposal. Although we see the potential for grievances arising from this mixing of Senate and non-Senate faculty in the Academic Personnel process, we do not feel that this represents a major obstacle in the continued consideration of this proposal.
At its meeting on November 21, 2013, the Committee on Research discussed the proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 55. We write now to express our deep concern about the implications of such an amendment.

The amendment causes us alarm for several reasons:

- Given the politics and realities of departmental culture, it seems unreasonable to think a department might be able to deny NSF these new potential voting rights, either on first vote or on an annual review basis.
- Though currently limited to “Adjunct Professor or Health Sciences Clinical Professor series,” the amendment would potentially open a systemwide discussion of voting rights for a range of adjunct faculty. (Here we share the concern articulated by UCFW.)
- We don’t see any analysis for other solutions that have been tried as a way to address the morale and inclusion of NSF in their units (e.g., advisory votes).

In sum, while we understand that NSF may feel as if they work in a two-tier system, we also believe that NSF have different commitments, experiences, and job responsibilities than do Senate Faculty. It seems critical to COR to preserve the integrity of Senate Faculty voting rights on matters of appointment and promotion.
November 27, 2013

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

From: Ziv Ran, Chair
Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The proposed amendment diminishes the Academic Senate, perhaps the principal agent of the current shared governance system. It degrades the current degree of autonomy of the Senate in empowering Non-Senate Faculty to vote on merit and promotion cases involving Senate Faculty, including promotions to tenure, which confers permanent membership in the Senate. The amendment appears to be at odds with the intent of Standing Orders of the Regents 105.2, which mentions the several titles which may vote but fails to mention any adjunct titles. Apparently, such was also the conclusion of Systemwide Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction in its 5.67 ruling. We recommend modifying the amendment so that Non-Senate Faculty may vote only on Non-Senate Faculty and possibly on non-personnel issues that are of concern to Non-Senate Faculty.
To: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate  
From: Ameae Walker, Chair SOM Faculty Executive Committee  
Re: Systemwide Review of Proposal to amend Bylaw 55

The SOM executive committee met Nov 12th 2013 and discussed the proposal to amend bylaw 55. Since a quorum was not present, no consensus position was developed and the ratio of pros and cons raised should not be interpreted as having any meaning in this regard. With that caveat, listed below are points raised by those present or communicated to the chair either before or after the meeting or during circulation of drafts of this document. The list is intended only to raise relevant pros and cons about a complex issue. The points raised cover potential issues at all UC campuses and concerns voiced because of experiences at other UCs and some non-UC institutions. They are not intended to be specific to the new UCR SOM.

1) Participation: All responding members of the committee felt that participation in academic personnel meetings by faculty in non-senate health sciences clinical and adjunct positions (in the proposal requesting amendment defined as being those with >50% salaried appointments) was important. Participation helps educate all faculty members as to the demands of each series and is a departmental unifying activity. Many departments, for example, include ladder rank assistant professors in the departmental meeting where personnel files are discussed, but do not extend voting privileges to assistant professors. The more integral all faculty members feel, the better. Also, all faculty members learn what will be expected of them in terms of their own promotion through the ranks. Participation can include an advisory vote. Feelings about a full vote were more mixed- see points following.

2) Each department can decide: It was felt by some that because each department faculty could decide for itself, and that the decision was made by senate faculty on a yearly basis, any unintended fallout could be easily rectified. Others suggested that a lack of uniformity in privilege among departments (perhaps because of differences in percentages of senate versus non-senate members) could result in dissatisfaction.

3) Non-senate voting on non-senate: It seems reasonable to many that non-senate faculty should be allowed to vote on other non-senate faculty within the same or similar series since they have perspective on the demands of the positions.

4) Non-senate voting on senate: The University of California promotes senate faculty on the basis of their trifold contributions to research, teaching, and service. Individuals in non-senate positions have different requirements in this regard. Some therefore felt non-senate should not be voting on senate files. Those non-senate faculty members who do contribute in all areas should be employed in a senate series so they can vote.

5) Senate voting on some non-senate series: The issue of senate faculty being equally unqualified to vote for example on Health Sciences clinical faculty was raised. However, having senate faculty voting on non-senate files (hiring and
teaching excellence during merits and promotions) ensures fulfillment of the charge to the Senate’s oversight of curricular matters. In addition, while some senate faculty (some senate members are clinically qualified) may not be qualified to judge an individual’s clinical prowess, clinical performance is assessed by all (clinically qualified senate members included) who read the personnel file on the basis of letters from those both qualified and in a position to directly observe/supervise the individual.

6) **Potential impact on senate faculty welfare**: Judging by effects on the careers of senate faculty in clinical departments at other institutions, less value may be placed on individuals who are not generating clinical income.

7) **Terms of employment**: Non-senate faculty members are employed on a contractual basis. They re-negotiate their contract, usually every 1-3 years. They may therefore feel less free to vote “their conscience”. This is also true for some in senate series (In residence and professor of clinical X). Tenure is an important factor in ensuring integrity of the academic personnel process. This is one reason why the vote is usually not extended to assistant professors.

8) **Temporary aspect of extension of voting rights**: Since extension of voting rights has to be voted on each year by the senate faculty, it is felt that there is an easy remedy should any extension of voting rights prove to have unforeseen consequences. However, that said, a reversal of privileges usually results in bad feeling, and so careful forethought should be given to any initial extension.

9) **Practical issues**: For some large clinical departments, the number of people eligible to vote (a statement that has to appear on the departmental letter) may be in constant flux with high turnover of contract clinical or adjunct faculty. If the vote is extended to non-senate faculty, and the vote is to be meaningful, then there needs to be a mechanism to ensure that said faculty become familiar with the different requirements of various series-required attendance at departmental personnel meetings would be one such mechanism.
The UC Office of the President maintains an online faculty handbook\(^1\). One section of it, entitled 'Teaching and Student Relations,' has a brief statement under a sub-section entitled 'Absences from Classes.' The verbiage of that sub-section is as follows:

*A faculty member will deal directly with respect to the student's brief absences from class for any cause.*

In an effort to encourage broad awareness that there can be a place for excused absences, we propose to modify the verbiage as follows:

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

\(^1\)http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/programs-and-initiatives/faculty-resources-advancement/faculty-handbook.html
From: Bradley Jourdan White [mailto:bradley.white@ucr.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2013 5:54 PM
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu
Cc: Helpdesk; Leo Schouest; Michael Capriotti; Rick Redak
Subject: Lack of Photo Roster Availability

Hello,

I am wondering why the photo roster is not available during the grading period this year? This did not occur last year and is very unfortunate. In a class with hundreds of students, it allows me to assess whether a student on the borderline between two grades is someone who attended class regularly or someone who did not. Most professors, like myself, know the faces of students who are engaged and attend regularly although, though we may not have their names memorized

I am really disappointed that photo roster is not available and hope that you can immediately reverse this decision and put the photo roster backup.

Bradley J. White, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Center for Disease Vector Research
Department of Entomology
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

-----Original Message-----
From: gareth.funning@gmail.com [mailto:gareth.funning@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Gareth Funning
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2012 9:01 AM  
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu  
Subject: Photo roster not working today

I tried to log into photo roster today to check the faces of the students in my final exam. It wouldn't display the list of my current courses like it did before. If this is an intentional feature to disable the roster after the end of instruction (but not the end of the quarter), it is not a very helpful one. [Otherwise, I think having a photo roster is a great idea, and it is very useful.]

Gareth

--

Gareth J Funning, Assistant Professor, Dept of Earth Sciences University of California, Riverside, CA 92521 http://faculty.ucr.edu/~gareth

-----Original Message-----
From: Philip Hackney [mailto:hackney@math.ucr.edu]
Sent: Saturday, March 16, 2013 12:36 PM  
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu  
Subject: Photo roster unavailable

Hi,

I just thought I'd again give feedback on the removal of the photoroster at the end of the quarter.

1) we currently have an active cheating situation that we don't know how to resolve, because we cannot identify the student. It would be very helpful if we at least had the photo roster.

2) it's trivial to save a copy for later (as I did in an earlier quarter for other reasons) so whatever these rules are designed to prevent they can't possibly prevent for someone who actually tries to get around them.

-Philip Hackney

-------------------

From: Philip Hackney [mailto:hackney@math.ucr.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 7, 2012 12:41 PM
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu
Subject: No courses listed in photo roster for current term

Hello,

My courses for the current term have disappeared from photo roster. See attached screenshot. If I navigate to the earlier term for Winter 2012 or Spring 2012 I still have classes, just not for Fall 2012. They were there earlier in the quarter.

Same result on Safari 6.0.2 and Chrome 23.0.1271.95 on Mac OSX 10.8.2

Thank you,
Philip Hackney

From: John N Medearis [mailto:john.medearis@ucr.edu]
Sent: Thursday, December 6, 2012 8:41 AM
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu
Subject: photo roster: no roster

Hi,

I find -- a bit more than occasionally -- that when I try to consult the photo roster, I have no classes on my current "course roster." This is true at the moment, even though I am teaching two courses this fall. And within the last few weeks, I have consulted the photo roster, and found my courses listed.

Thanks for your help,
John Medearis

From: Rick Redak [mailto:richard.redak@ucr.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 5, 2012 11:21 PM
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu
Subject: entomology 10 001

How come my course, Entomology 010-001, does not show up in the photo roster application?

Rick Redak
Professor and Chair
Dept. Entomology

________________________________________
From: Haibo Yu [mailto:haibo.yu@ucr.edu]

Hello,

I have a problem to find any of my class list of quarter fall2012 (thea101 and thea170) but all previous list are still there.
Thanks for your time.

Haibo Yu
Professor
Theatre department

From: David Arthur Malueg [mailto:david.malueg@ucr.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2012 8:56 AM
To: photorosterfeedback@ucr.edu
Subject: Web Site Inquiry

Why is photoroster not available this week?

Dave Malueg

*****************************************************************************

David A. Malueg                      phone: 951 827-1494
3136 Sproul Hall                      fax: 951 827-5685
Department of Economics               email: david.malueg@ucr.edu
University of California, Riverside   
Riverside, CA  92521
USA