March 19, 2014

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:
   Mike Allen (Plant Pathology & Microbiology), Research (COR)
   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)
   Lucille Chia (History), Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Comm
   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)
   John Levin (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
   Barry Mishra (SOBA), SOBA Executive Committee
   Eugene Nothnagel (Botany & Plant Sciences), Preparatory Education (PRP)
   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 ~ March 24, 2014

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, March 24, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in the University Office Building Room 220.
# Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Consent Calendar</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Action 1:00 – 1:05 | 1. A. Approval of the Agenda for March 24, 2014  
B. Approve Draft Minutes of February 24, 2014 | pp. 2-4 |
| Comments 1:05 – 1:25 | 2. Review of proposal to change the CAP Bylaw | pp. 5-30 |
| Comments 1:25 – 1:45 | 3. Review of Proposal to Develop Two Summer Session Oversight Committees | pp. 31-41 |
| Comments 2:05 – 2:30 | 5. Review of Online License Agreement | pp. 70-73 |
| Information & Discussion 2:30 – 3:00 | 6. Announcements by Chair Wudka & Committee Updates |
Executive Council Meeting Minutes  
February 24, 2014

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

Standing Committee Chairs:
Kenneth Barish, Planning & Budget  Lynda Bell, Graduate Council
Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy  George Haggerty, Academic Personnel
Mariam Lam, Committees  John Levin, GSOE Exec Committee
Eugene Nothnagel, Preparatory Education  Akula Venkatram, BCOE Exec Committee
Ameae Walker, SOM Exec Committee  Georgia Warnke, Faculty Welfare

Absent:
Kathryn DeFea, Undergraduate Admissions  Erica Edwards, CHASS Exec Committee
Barry Mishra, SOBA Exec Committee  Bahram Mobasher, Sr Assembly Rep
Gillian Wilson, CNAS Exec Committee  Zhenbiao Yang, Diversity & Equal Opportunity

APPROVAL OF EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AGENDA AND MINUTES:
The agenda for February 24 and the minutes from February 10 were approved as written

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE ADMISSION BY EXCEPTION POLICY
Executive Council reviewed and discussed the proposed changes to the Admission by Exception (AxE) policy and the opinions submitted from the committees of Educational Policy, International Education, Preparatory Education and Rules & Jurisdiction. Some of the suggestions provided by these reviewers were already included in the version Council reviewed. The main concern of Council was the exclusion of a standing member from the Bourns College of Engineering (BCoE) from the Special Review Committee (SRC). After some discussion Council suggested the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions further modify the policy to include a representative from the College of Engineering.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO REGULATION 6.12.1
The proposed changes to regulation 6.12.1 were received and discussed by Executive Council. The proposed regulation change will be forwarded to the Division for approval.

REVIEW OF CHANGES TO THE CAMPUS OFF-SCALE POLICY
Several standing committees of the Division reviewed the off-scale policy and the proposed changes. While there was overwhelming agreement that the policy itself should be reconsidered, the general consensus was that the changes proposed by the administration were in the best interest of the faculty and should be implemented immediately. However, Chair Wudka will advise the VPAP and the EVCP that the representatives of the Division would like to engage in a full discussion and review of the campus off-scale policy.

PROPOSALS FOR DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGES:
Department of Women’s Studies to the Department of Gender and Sexualities Studies
Executive Council reviewed the name change request and noted that the new name seemed grammatically awkward but otherwise the proposal was sound. Per the campus procedure for name change for an Academic Department, the name change proposal will be forwarded to the Division for approval.
**Department of Theatre to the Department of Theatre, Film and Visual Production**

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

**Department of Electrical Engineering to the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering**

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

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

**Healthcare Survey** - Chair Wudka reminded Executive Council that the campus healthcare survey would only be open for a few more days, and asked that Executive Council members remind their colleagues to participate.

**Online Education** - The ILTI program is continuing though there is a review of the process for faculty to receive funding.

**UC, CSU and CCC Master Plan Review** – Representatives from the California Higher Ed systems are convening to review the California master plan. Potentially on the table is discussion of allowing the Community Colleges to award Bachelor’s degrees and the CSU’s to award PhDs.

**UPDATES AND DISCUSSION BY COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

Lynda Bell, Chair of the Graduate Council indicated the need for the Academic Senate to review the administrative load associated with external graduate program reviews. There was suggestion of merging undergraduate and graduate program reviews. It was determined that the chairs of Graduate Council, CEP, Committees, Chair Wudka and the Senate staff will meet to review the processes at our sister campuses and pose some alternatives for Riverside.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Cindy Palmer, Executive Director*

*Office of the Academic Senate*
January 25, 2014

TO: Committee Chairs,
    Committee on Committees, Mariam Lam,
    Committee on Faculty Welfare, Georgia Warnke
Cc: Academic Senate Chair Jose Wudka

FROM: Karen Pyke, Associate Professor, Dept. of Sociology

RE: Disenfranchisement of Associate Faculty from CAP Membership

My service as campus representative to the system-wide Faculty Welfare Committee has made me aware of various rules and procedures at UCR not shared with other UC campuses and which have deleterious effects on the welfare and morale of our faculty.

One such UCR rule is that regarding membership on the Committee on Academic Personnel: "All members shall hold the rank of full professor….”
source: http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=d&section=08.04

UCR's disenfranchisement of associate professors from the most important Academic Senate committee is neither a system-wide practice nor a rule shared at other UC campuses. I have confirmed that Irvine, UCLA, Davis, and San Diego do NOT have such a rule, and I find no evidence of a similar rule at any of the other UC campuses. At UC San Diego, for example, the CAP by-law states: “This committee shall consist of at least ten, but no more than twelve, ordinary members of the Division holding tenure rank.” Source: http://senate.ucsd.edu/manual/bylaws/SDBylaw172.pdf

As this rule is discriminatory, for reasons I outline below, it should be abandoned. Thus I write you with the hope your committee will endorse a change in CAP membership rules.

Based on data I received from the Executive Director of the Senate in May 2012, of the 680 Academic Senate faculty members, only 212 -- less than one-third -- are women. A disproportionate number of these women faculty are at the associate and assistant ranks. Similarly, the majority of faculty members from historically marginalized racial groups in the

______________________________

1 The language defining the goals of the Berkeley CAP (called the Budget Committee) suggest they do not disenfranchise associate faculty: “The founding principle of the Budget Committee is that faculty members’ records should be reviewed by their peers” and “The members of the Budget Committee are appointed by the Committee on Committees, which is elected by the Senate’s members.” Source (also attached): http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/committees/bir/intro_to_bc.pdf
U.S. are also at the associate and assistant levels. Hence the rule barring tenured faculty at the associate rank from representation on CAP amounts to institutional gender and race discrimination as it disenfranchises a disproportionate number of tenured faculty who are white women and women and men of color, particularly those of Latino and African American descent.

Additionally, the disenfranchisement of associate professors effectively makes CAP a committee of elites. While CAP membership at UCR is limited to full professors, there is the COC practice of selecting more advanced full professors, often at Step VI or above. For example, when I was serving on COC, the committee chair directed COC members to select from among the most advanced of full professors for CAP service, further exacerbating what is already a problematic practice.

As noted by a fellow sociologist and social psychologist, who is also a College Dean at another UC campus (which does not have this rule), this practice gives the appearance of a conflict of interest for it allows an elite group to make decisions about the rest of the faculty that can have a direct bearing on the maintenance of their own elite status. That is, restricting gatekeeping privileges to elite faculty regarding personnel decisions empowers them to limit the number of faculty who enter their elite group, which it is in their interest to do as the elite status of a group is weakened when more members of the larger population join its ranks. I am not suggesting that this is the practice of the elite members of CAP, or that it is a conscious practice, but simply that having a CAP whose members hail from among the most elite of faculty encourages the appearance of a conflict of interest, thereby undermining faculty morale and confidence in the personnel process.

There is evidence that the elite status of CAP members might encourage greater conservatism regarding personnel policies. Take, for example, the Academic Senate’s 2010 review of an off-scale policy requiring those denied a merit to lose their O/S. While the Planning & Budget and Faculty Welfare Committees opposed this policy, noting it contradicts efforts to bring UC salaries to a competitive level, CAP endorsed this punitive measure. (See attached). In fact, UCR

---

2 While there are several non-white members of the current CAP, all of them grew up in countries where they were members of the racial majority and, further, were hired after securing their education abroad, suggesting their experiences with racial discrimination might be more limited than those of underrepresented faculty of color who grew up and/or were educated in the U.S. Also, none of the current CAP members appear to be under-represented faculty of African American or Latino descent.

3 “Institutional discrimination” refers to structural policies and practices that have the unintended effect of disadvantaging women and/or racial minorities. Institutional discrimination is more covert and tenacious than other forms of discrimination and occurs despite the intent or desires of those perpetuating it. Race and gender inequities that are statistically evident but whose sources are difficult to pinpoint often are the result of institutional forms of discrimination. “As institutional discrimination is built into the normal working relationships of institutions, its perpetuation requires only that people continue ‘business as usual.’ Its eradication requires much more than good will; it requires active review of the assumptions and practices by which the institution operates, and revision of those found to have discriminatory results. Such an operation cannot be approached casually; inevitably, extra effort is necessary.” Source: http://www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/jofreeman/womensociety/institidiscrim.htm
is the only UC campus to have this punitive policy at the same time that UCR faculty salaries are among the lowest of all UC campuses.

Restricting membership of CAP to current full professors can lead to a committee staffed by faculty who never served at UCR in the assistant or associate ranks, but were recruited as full professors from research labs or universities where rules, practices, and conditions can be very different from what they are at UCR. This would seem to undermine the ability of such CAP members to provide an informed evaluation of the personnel files of lower ranked faculty who labor in conditions that might be very different from those experienced by the evaluators. Among the current members of CAP, at least 4 were hired as full professors (Hille, Patterson, Chiarelli, Ding), and a fifth, whose rank at hire I cannot determine (Gan), joined UCR after 8 years at a research laboratory. Hence fully half of the current CAP members did not move through the ranks from assistant to full at UCR but joined our campus from another research environment. Among the other five members of CAP, at least one (Haggerty) is at a rank beyond Step VI, which is a milestone marker of distinction within the full professor rank. Thus using the current CAP as an example, there is evidence of bias toward those who came to UCR later in their careers and/or are very advanced full professors.

The emphasis on staffing CAP with full professors likely contributes another bias favoring those who engage faster forms of scholarship and are thus able to produce more research products. Such faculty are more likely to enjoy a faster rise through the ranks. If this is the case, CAP is more likely to be staffed by faculty who engage quantitative methods, and whose research productivity is aided by access to grants, research assistants, and post-docs. Conversely, faculty whose scholarship requires more time would be less likely to serve on CAP, such as creative writers and those who engage qualitative or ethnographic methods that are less likely to be supported with grants, course-buyouts, and the support of research assistants and post-docs. White women faculty and women and men faculty who are Latino and African American are disproportionately represented in those areas of scholarship that engage slower methods, and where research productivity does not occur at the same pace as in STEM and similar fields. Thus restricting CAP members to full professors can create a skewed CAP membership of faculty who engage faster research methods. This can further contribute a bias not only against faculty in general who engage qualitative and non-positivist forms of scholarship, but also against a disproportionate number of faculty in legally protected categories. This suggests yet another mechanism by which the rule banning associate faculty from participation on CAP is a mechanism of institutional gender and race discrimination, while also undermining the earning capacity and morale of all faculty engaged in slower research methods.

UCR has the highest per capita number of publications among all the UC campuses. Given that UCR is not ranked among the top UCs, this suggests UCR puts more emphasis on volume of research products than quality, otherwise the high volume of UCR research products would better correlate with its reputation relative to other UC campuses. An evaluative standard based on number of research products can create a hard choice for faculty who engage slower research methods: they can opt to publish a higher number of lower quality research products so as to move through the ranks and win wage increases (at the expense, however, of building their national reputation), or they can publish fewer higher quality works that enhance one’s national reputation (as well as that of their department/campus) but at the sacrifice of personal wages. (Berkeley addresses this by allowing completed chapters toward a book in progress to serve as a measure of productivity. Source: see attached, also footnote 1.)

---

4 UCR has the highest per capita number of publications among all the UC campuses. Given that UCR is not ranked among the top UCs, this suggests UCR puts more emphasis on volume of research products than quality, otherwise the high volume of UCR research products would better correlate with its reputation relative to other UC campuses. An evaluative standard based on number of research products can create a hard choice for faculty who engage slower research methods: they can opt to publish a higher number of lower quality research products so as to move through the ranks and win wage increases (at the expense, however, of building their national reputation), or they can publish fewer higher quality works that enhance one’s national reputation (as well as that of their department/campus) but at the sacrifice of personal wages. (Berkeley addresses this by allowing completed chapters toward a book in progress to serve as a measure of productivity. Source: see attached, also footnote 1.)
Looking at current CAP membership for evidence of such a bias, there are 7 members who engage quantitative, positivist research methods, mostly in grant-supported lab settings, while only 3 members engage qualitative or ethnographic scholarship. While it is possible for members of CAP who come from labs and engage quantitative methods to be supportive and understanding of other kinds of scholarship, the very composition of this CAP gives the appearance of a bias that can hurt faculty morale and confidence in the personnel process.

When I’ve shared concern about the discriminatory CAP policy, some full professors have countered that it would be inappropriate for associate faculty to evaluate the files of full professors. Yet it is not deemed problematic under current practices to have full professors on CAP evaluate full professors of higher rank. Further, extending this logic would seem to require that we also deem it inappropriate to have faculty in STEM fields evaluate the files of those in the Humanities, and vice versa. Before any justification for the disenfranchisement of associate faculty from CAP can be entertained, its logic should be tested to ensure it applies to any and all CAP practices and policies, not just those pertaining to associate faculty.

Some faculty argue that the rule banning associate faculty members a voice on CAP is designed to protect associate faculty from the high service load. While one should be suspicious of paternalistic policies that effectively deny access to power or equity, in this case the alleged protection offered by this policy is challenged by the fact that CAP is the only Senate committee that rewards non-Chair membership with a course release.

Indeed, it is noteworthy that the current Chair of Committee on Committees is an associate professor woman of color who can, according to Senate rules, Chair this committee but is barred from having a voice on CAP. As Committee on Committees is the second most time-consuming Academic Senate committee at UCR, (according to a Senate study conducted around 2005, when I served on COC as a newly-tenured faculty member) the argument that this rule aims to protect associate professors from a service over-load simply does not hold water. Prohibiting associate professors from serving on CAP effectively denies them access to compensation for their non-Chair Senate service, reserving such compensation only for full professors, while allowing associate professors to serve on other high demand committees, including as campus representatives on system-wide committees, without compensation.

Because the Senate surveys faculty about their willingness to serve on committees, it would be easy for COC to only recruit associate faculty members for CAP who volunteer for such service, ensuring associate faculty are not pressured to serve. I suspect that we would still have a CAP membership that draws mostly from the ranks of the full professoriate, but allowing associates to serve if they should desire can enhance morale and confidence, promote a commitment to “peer” review, and allow greater inclusivity in Senate decision-making processes.

I hope your committee will consider these arguments and move to endorse a change in CAP membership rules.
INTRODUCTION TO THE BUDGET COMMITTEE
Updated February, 2006

The Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations is a committee of Berkeley’s Academic Senate. Its name is misleading: it is an academic personnel committee, not a fiscal oversight committee.

1. History.

The founding principle of the Budget Committee is that faculty members’ records should be reviewed by their peers. This is a principle that was first articulated in the early twentieth century during a faculty revolt against an autocratic administration. Prior to this revolt, the UC president appointed all deans and department chairs, as well as the members of the Academic Senate’s committees. Consultation with deans and chairs was usually perfunctory, and faculty salaries were set by the central administration. Spurred by national agitation for academic reform and by the creation of the American Association of University Professors, the UC faculty called a meeting of the Academic Senate to demand faculty election of all deans and chairs and creation of a standing committee to confer with the president concerning appointment, promotions, tenure, salaries, and related matters.

The resulting Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations was created in 1920 “to confer with the President concerning the University budget, and to make recommendations to him respecting promotions, salaries, equipment, and related matters.”1 The Budget Committee in turn created the institution of confidential ad hoc faculty committees to review promotion cases, because it believed that the records of faculty members should be frankly assessed through a process of broad-based peer review.

As the UC system grew and more campuses were established, each campus developed its own Budget Committee. Other campuses now call their Budget Committee the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), but Berkeley has kept the original name. The responsibilities of these committees vary from campus to campus: on other campuses, some decisions about faculty members may be made by deans or other administrators without Senate advice, but the Berkeley Budget Committee continues to offer advice on all appointments, promotions, and merit increases for faculty members.

2. What the Budget Committee is.

The members of the Budget Committee are appointed by the Committee on Committees, which is elected by the Senate’s members. The Budget Committee has nine members, and each one usually serves for three years. In its work, the Budget Committee is guided by two general mandates from the Senate: to maintain the excellence of the Berkeley faculty, and to promote the equal treatment of the faculty across campus.

---

1 Minutes of the Academic Senate, April 19, 1920, p. 424.
The Budget Committee works year-round, usually meeting once or twice a week. The committee makes recommendations to the campus administration about hiring and advancing faculty members and about authorizing searches for new faculty members. It also makes recommendations to both the administration and the Senate about a variety of policy issues. The Budget Committee arrives at its recommendations through consensus.

The UC system is unusual in allowing faculty members to share this campus-wide perspective on academic personnel matters with the central administration; this enables the Senate to have a strong and independent voice in this important arena.

3. The process of academic review.

Much of the Budget Committee’s work involves the analysis of academic personnel cases. (In recent years, the committee has reviewed over 900 cases per year.) Cases for appointment, merit increases, and promotion come forward from departments along with supporting materials, including information provided by the candidate. The relevant dean then reviews the case, writes an analysis and recommendation, and sends the case to the Academic Personnel Office, which reviews it and then forwards it to the Budget Committee. If the case is for promotion or for a tenure-level appointment, the Budget Committee will recommend appointment of a campus ad hoc review committee of three to five faculty members. This committee will review the entire case, including the dean’s recommendation, before preparing its analysis and recommendation.

When the Budget Committee receives a case for review, then, it has before it the department’s recommendation and supporting materials, the dean’s recommendation, and (if there is one) the campus ad hoc committee’s report. Based on these case materials, the Budget Committee prepares an analysis of the faculty member’s record of achievement in research, teaching, and service. Only after the entire committee has discussed the case and reached a consensus does it prepare the final written version of its analysis and recommendation.

This “minute” communicates the committee’s reasoning to the central administration, which by long tradition incorporates much of the minute into the letter to the dean in which the administration conveys its decision. That letter may be slightly modified by the dean before being redressed and sent to the chair, who may then share it with the faculty member whose record of achievement has been reviewed. These letters refer generically to “reviewers”: that term can mean the Budget Committee, the chair, the dean, the ad hoc review committee, people who wrote external letters, or some combination of these.

Reconsideration of a case may be requested by the central administration, by a dean or department chair, or by the faculty member whose record has been reviewed. When the Budget Committee receives such a request, it will carefully review the new information that has been provided and then make a recommendation on that basis. After reviewing the request for reconsideration and the Budget Committee’s recommendation, the administration may then alter its original decision. After a process of reconsideration,
the administration may in the end reach a decision different from the one that the Budget Committee ultimately recommended; such differences occur in a handful of cases each year.

Further information about the review process is available from the Academic Personnel Office [http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/] and from the Academic Senate’s Committee on the Status of Ethnic Minorities and Women [http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/SWEM_guide_AP.html].

4. Merit increases and promotion.

The Budget Committee is guided by the University of California’s Academic Personnel Manual. [http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/apm-220.pdf] Merit increases for faculty members (“steps”) are normally awarded for excellent records during the review period in three areas of evaluation: research, teaching, and service. (A review period almost always ends one year before the effective date of the proposed advancement.) In general, the ladder gets steeper as it gets higher: in all three areas of review, more is expected of faculty in the upper reaches of the professoriate than of those at lower steps.

Reviews of promotions to tenure or to full professor, or of advancement to Professor Step VI or Special Salary, also focus on the three areas of evaluation, but they consider the faculty member’s career achievements as well as the specific achievements since the last merit review. These four “milestone” reviews require external letters of evaluation; promotions to tenure or to full professor also require review by a campus ad hoc review committee. (A campus ad hoc review committee may also be required for a tenure-level appointment.)

Research: In ordinary merit reviews, the record of research will comprise the accomplishments since the last merit review. Factors taken into consideration may include the quality, number, and impact of refereed and non-refereed papers or books, the venues of publication, presentation of conference papers or talks, and awards. Completed chapters of a book in progress [https://mossberg.berkeley.edu/CALmessages/display_message.asp?d=9/10/2004&s=101] may in some circumstances be considered as part of the research record. In some disciplines, the research record may comprise other forms of creative accomplishment.

Teaching: Ideally, assessment of classroom teaching [http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/evaluation.html] is based on a wide range of information. While student evaluations are essential, other information may be equally important, for example, peer evaluation and self-assessment. Lack of success in a single class will not ordinarily be a cause for concern, but a pattern of declining teaching or poor teaching may slow or halt advancement. A teaching record also includes information about such accomplishments as writing a textbook or mentoring students (for example, by serving as an undergraduate advisor or a member of master’s and dissertation committees). Once in
a career, a step may be awarded primarily for teaching that is exceptional in its quality and quantity, if the advancement is to a step that is below the level of Professor, Step VI.

**Service:** Berkeley faculty members offer many kinds of service, including service to their departments and to the Academic Senate. They also perform outreach service and service to governments, academia, and the community. Once in a career, a step may be awarded primarily for service that is exceptional in its quality and quantity, if the advancement is to a step that is below the level of Professor, Step VI. In this as in other areas of evaluation, more is expected from more senior faculty, and full professors are expected to shoulder responsibilities for leadership in their departments or on campus.

5. **FTE allocation.**

Every year, the Budget Committee offers advice to the central administration about allocating faculty FTE (“full-time equivalents,” i.e., faculty positions) to campus units; and when the campus resets FTE targets, the Budget Committee also offers advice about the target size of each campus unit. Requests concerning FTE come forward from departments, are analyzed and reviewed by deans, and then are analyzed and reviewed by the Budget Committee. In making its recommendations, the Budget Committee is constrained by the central administration’s determination of the maximum number of FTE available.

In considering FTE issues, the Budget Committee takes many factors into account, including the general distinction and trajectory of the department, the relation of the department’s current size to its target size, the department’s programmatic needs, and its success in carrying out its teaching missions. In thinking about what to recommend, the Budget Committee must always weigh a given department’s needs against the needs of other units across the whole campus, because there are never enough FTE to satisfy all of the reasonable FTE requests that come forward.

6. **Issues of concern to the Budget Committee.**

**Long waits for news:** Faculty members often wonder why they usually do not hear about the results of their merit or promotion cases until the spring, or even the summer or fall. Several factors affect the timing of the final decisions.

After a case leaves a department, it goes to the dean; depending on the dean’s workload, decanal review may take from several days to several months. The case is then received by the Academic Personnel Office, which may need time to consult with the dean’s office about various details of the case. Review by a campus ad hoc review committee, when that is necessary, will delay matters further, often by several months. These committees consist of three to five faculty members with relevant expertise from a number of different departments; campus ad hoc committees can be difficult to convene, and their work may involve time-consuming preparation and deliberation.
The Budget Committee gives priority to urgent appointment and retention cases, to promotions, and to any other cases marked as urgent by the Academic Personnel Office. Routine merit cases and requests for reconsideration receive attention only after urgent cases have been cleared from the agenda. The turnaround time for cases in the Budget Committee varies from a few days to several months, depending on its caseload.

Everyone involved in academic personnel review wishes the process were a faster one. Still, although the campus process is time-consuming, the many layers of assessment allow the campus administration to solicit informed opinion from many quarters and to ensure that the opinion of no one individual has undue weight in the decision making process.

**Salary inequities:** In recent years, the Budget Committee has been very concerned by broad issues concerning faculty salaries, and it has worked closely with the administration to try to keep Berkeley competitive in faculty recruitment and retention. Of equal concern to the committee, however, are inequities between the salaries of faculty members who have recently been recruited and retained and the salaries of faculty members who have not.

Several members of the Budget Committee served in 2003-04 on the Chancellor’s Task Force on Faculty Compensation. The [Task Force’s recommendations](http://evcp.chance.berkeley.edu/documents/Reports/documents/FacCompTaskForcefinal_report.pdf) received the support of the Academic Senate’s Divisional Council in the fall of 2004, and the Budget Committee hopes the campus administration will begin to phase in the Report’s recommendations as soon as possible. As these new policies are phased in, the campus will be adopting a new way of thinking about salary equity: while the campus-wide ideal will still be that faculty members of equal accomplishment will be at the same rank and step, it will no longer be a campus-wide ideal for all faculty members at the same rank and step to receive the same salary. Rather, the ideal will be for faculty members at the same rank and step within the same discipline to receive the same salary. This is probably the best way for Berkeley to conceive of equity while preserving the rank-and-step system, remaining competitive, and decreasing inequities within disciplines.
October 12, 2010

TO: DAVID BOCIAN  
VICE PROVOST, ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

FM: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: Off-Scale Policy

Three Academic Senate Committees, P&B, CAP, and FW, and the Executive Council (EC) have all closely examined the O/S Policy request of August 19, 2010. The reports from the three committees are attached. These reports and the proposed policy were discussed at length at the Executive Council meeting on October 11, 2010.

I summarize below the views expressed in each of the reports, and then I provide you with some additional perspectives from the EC regarding the proposed policy.

1. **Planning and Budget.** P&B voted 4 to 3 in opposition to this policy. The majority view was that the policy would interfere with any effort to re-establish a competitive salary scale at UC. They were also concerned about the absence of any description of the process whereby a “lost” O/S could subsequently be restored.

2. **CAP.** CAP supports the policy in general but recommends the following:
   a. The timing for removing O/S should be altered to include a one-cycle “grace” period so that a faculty who receives an unsatisfactory review would not automatically lose the O/S but have an additional review cycle to attain a satisfactory review.
   b. Satisfactory Academic Progress to retain the O/S should be based on excellence in all three categories (research, service, teaching).
   c. Specific procedures for reviewing proposed O/S actions need to be developed and approved as soon as possible.

3. **Faculty Welfare.** The Faculty Welfare Committee opposes the policy because it undermines efforts to restore competitive salaries campus wide, and it encourages the use of other procedures, such as seeking outside offers, as a means of increasing compensation. The Committee also notes that there is an active systemwide task
force charged with developing mechanisms for restoring the salary scale, and the Committee regrets that the campus O/S policy was installed without benefit of this task force’s findings.

**Executive Council.** The Executive Council recommends the following regarding the O/S policy:

1. The EC endorses the notion that a faculty member with an O/S salary needs to maintain satisfactory academic progress for the O/S to continue.

2. The EC is concerned that the proposed scheduling of reviews could be potentially problematic and lend itself to the possibility of someone “gaming the system.” For example, as currently described a faculty member may have a satisfactory quinquennial review followed by a qualified satisfactory quinquennial review, which would result in the maintenance of the O/S for 5 to 10 years beyond the reward of the O/S.

3. The EC is concerned that the proposed scheduling of reviews could have different implications across diverse disciplines. For example, in the sciences where evidence of regular progress is the norm, an unsatisfactory review in a single cycle may have a very different meaning than in the humanities where the usual products (e.g., books) may take longer to produce.

4. The EC is seriously concerned that the O/S policy, even with this change, undermines efforts at the campus and systemwide levels to restore a competitive faculty salary scale. The continued use of O/S salaries to make *ad hoc* adjustments to compensate for the noncompetitiveness of the salary scale undermines the ability of the campus to address the salary scale issue financially, while also lowering the morale of faculty who are unable to regularly seek outside offers to obtain and maintain salaries.

5. The EC would welcome the opportunity to engage in examination and consultation regarding the O/S procedures and policies on the campus. We note that APM 620-80 states that

> “Chancellors in consultation with the appropriate committee(s) of the Division of the Academic Senate, and the appropriate Vice President shall develop local procedures for the implementation of the off-scale policy. Such procedures shall include the criteria for appointment or advancement to a position with an off-scale salary as well as an appointee’s continuation with an off-scale salary or return to an off-scale salary.”
Although the August 19, 2010 request asks for Senate involvement in the implementation of one aspect of the O/S policy, we feel that consultation is needed concerning other aspects of this policy, including but not limited to, procedures for the initial appointment to a position with an O/S salary.

Cc: Dallas Rabenstein
    Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
March 6, 2014

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

From: Kathleen Montgomery, Chair  
Committee on Academic Freedom

Re: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors

The Committee on Academic Freedom met on February 25, 2014, to discuss the proposal to expand eligibility for CAP membership to Associate Professors.

There was consensus on CAF not to support such a change.

Following are some of the points raised by CAF members:

- **Seniority and vulnerability issues:** Having Associate Professors on CAP could be contrary to Senate Bylaw 55 with regard to not voting on personnel cases above one’s own rank, which is the policy in the majority of departments across campus. There also was reluctance to subject an Associate Professor, who was not himself/herself already beyond the promotion hurdle of Full Professor, to the burdens of serving on CAP, both in terms of managing the excessive workload while maintaining one’s own research program toward promotion, and in terms of managing the political vulnerability to which CAP members may be subject.

- **Credibility and experience issues:** The credibility of CAP recommendations depends heavily on having its members represent some of the most accomplished and experienced faculty on campus. A survey of practices at sister campuses demonstrates that the eligibility of potential CAP members is more stringent than at UCR, with a preference for Full Professors at a minimum of Step III, IV, or VI and above. Some on CAF argued for tightening the eligibility criteria at UCR as well, but this suggestion was not formally considered.

- **Bias and diversity issues:** It was pointed out that the current CAP bylaws require that the membership on CAP “shall represent the variety of disciplines and fields across campus” and that women have routinely served on CAP. Although several potential sources of bias are raised in the proposal, there is no substantive evidence that such biases are in fact systemic at UCR or on our sister campuses. To the contrary, former CAP members now on CAF reported on the determined efforts during CAP deliberations to respect the scholarship of all faculty, regardless of discipline, methodological approach, or personal characteristics of candidates.
March 6, 2014

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

From: George Haggerty, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors.

Members of CAP considered Professor Pyke’s memo of February 3, 2014. We are immediately struck by the importance of the issues Professor Pyke raises, but we do not feel that there is a quick and easy solution of the kind she recommends.

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

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

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

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

Finally, we feel that we must take issue with the adversarial tone of Professor Pyke’s memo. We think mutual respect is the least we can expect from other senate committees and faculty. We are all UCR faculty members working towards goals similar to those that other senate committees and individual faculty members espouse.
Committee on Committees

February 24, 2014

To: José Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division

Fr: Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees

Re: Proposed Change to CAP Bylaws Concerning Inclusion of Associate Professors

Dear José:

Our committee has met and discussed at length the proposed revision to the CAP Bylaws regarding the inclusion/exclusion or disenfranchisement of Associate Professors. The following summarizes our suggestions and concerns.

Some suggestions and recommendations:

1. The proposal needs to specify the exact language change(s) and/or additions requested of the Bylaw phraseology. Perhaps this will be accomplished once the proposal is formally submitted in appropriate form with strike-outs, additions, etc. We feel that the proposal in its current breadth and length hurts more than helps the intended change proposed. For example, if the line in question, “All members shall hold the rank of full professor…” is the problematic statement, what specifically can it be changed to in order to avoid such appearance of intended disenfranchisement? The UCSD example may be instructive, or the author can look to the other compiled campus/division Bylaws for models.

2. According to each division’s Bylaws, UCR is not the only division to include language that specifically excludes Associate Professors, as stated in the proposal. UCSF also enunciates that CAP members must be at full professor rank. The easiest argument to make in order to (at the very least) avoid the appearance of exclusion, then, is to insist upon a Bylaw wording change that renders our UCR Bylaws consistent with the other systemwide divisional Bylaws that do not over-state possible exclusions.

3. Aligning the current Bylaw language with the larger problem of too few senior women and minorities at UCR, which the CoC members acknowledge as a tangible problem, may not be as helpful to the immediate and specific language change request, as the latter is an endemic nationwide and larger institutional problem beyond the purview of this particular Bylaw. Because we are sympathetic to the material inequalities explored in the proposal- but anticipate that the change will be hindered by those who are not or those who do not recognize the inequalities as articulated in the document- we feel it may be to the author’s advantage to disaggregate many of these larger national concerns from the specific request at hand. Indeed, two members of our committee appreciated the academically “elite” membership of CAP in selecting more advanced full Professors due precisely to the level of
experience and workload demands of CAP, while they did recognize that the composition of such “elite” membership has had huge disproportionate consequences for racial and gender equality. They felt that these inequalities and disenfranchisements are indicative of larger institutional and structural apparatuses that will need more comprehensive approaches to resolve.

Some concerns:

1. One question is whether Associate Professors have the necessary background to assess the careers of others at higher Professorial ranks. The estimate is that Associate Professors have normally served at least six years prior to being appointed to Associate Professor and have been involved in merit and promotion decisions within their own departments. Full Professors normally have at least twelve or thirteen years prior to appointment. Across the campus, relatively fewer departments currently allow Associate Professors to vote on full Professor merit and promotion cases; in these departments, then, the Associate Professors will not have had such experience. It was noted by several that even the full Professors at the lower steps have had difficulties with service workload and reviews of more senior and above-scale full professor files. With regard to having sufficient expertise to do this kind of evaluation in which criteria are quite different, sufficient lengths of tenure, sufficient time needed to do this work, etc., one CoC member suggested that rather than the current language excluding Associate Professors in the Bylaws, the author might instead introduce typical practice language along the lines of, “Typically, CAP members...,” which could help to solve this issue in the future.

2. The Committee on Committees was equally concerned with implementation, should Associate Professors be permitted to serve on CAP. To date as stated earlier, some departments do not allow Associate Professors to do voting for full Professor files. If such a change were to be implemented, what would be the next logical steps in trying to align all Departments with the “new” CAP practice? It would be odd to have different practices implemented campus wide and at the department levels. While we understand that Bylaw 55 and its annual departmental voting procedures may have to do with internal departmental administrative necessities and considerations, this procedure will nevertheless create an incompatible alignment with the CAP Bylaw change if Associate Professors are able to review Professor files for CAP without ever having any experience of doing so within their own departments. It would also be off-balance to allow a rank carte blanche in voting at the CAP level for files they are not allowed to vote on before becoming CAP members and after completion of CAP membership. What then are the potential ramifications of implementation?

3. With all due respect to associate (and even assistant) professors, two members stated that they respected the wisdom of our other sister campuses (and our own earlier members of the Senate) and their bylaws or expectation that only very senior full professors serve as members of the CAP. Typically at other systemwide campuses, full Professors at Step V or VI and above are appointed even though not necessarily stipulated. Step III has historically been the lowest rank appointed. While the Fall Quarters may not see as much review work, Winter and Spring Quarters carry very heavy loads and difficult discussions often overwhelming for even relatively recent full Professors. They felt that we needed to examine and implement more structures to promote more women and minorities into those higher ranks at UCR. It has been very difficult for CoC to appoint even eligible full professors to serve on CAP. Our own CoC has been flexible to every extent possible with the balance in composition between representation of colleges, gender and racial diversity, and other
requirements (occasionally prioritizing the latter considerations over the earlier), in order to create more equality in CAP membership during appointments. Even then, however, we are often turned down, and unable to populate a one third female CAP membership, for example.

4. There is some faulty logic in the document, particularly on pages 2 and 3, that appear to raise as many questions as they attempt to address. The suppositions of “elite gatekeeping” are in part, pragmatically-speaking, the charge of the CAP. While we understand that one often follows the other, an academic “elite” oriented toward professionalization needs to be differentiated from the larger racial and gendered elitism “undermining faculty morale” depicted in the proposal. In another example, the statements about the Committee on Committees procedures in appointment are a generalization of one committee composition’s work process onto the history of the whole, and not evident in the rules governing the workings of each CoC. Thirdly, the logic of compensation for committee chairs is to accommodate the time taken away from research and teaching required of these committee chairs. This intense amount of work is also why Associate Professors are not encouraged to take on such positions.

5. The specific statements about compensation for Committee Chairs is inaccurate. The Chairs of Planning and Budget, Graduate Council and Educational Policy also carry incentivization. Those three committees actually meet more frequently than the Committee on Committees, and require- as does CAP- inordinately larger amounts of homework in the form of review materials. Please see the Committee on Committees webpage for a breakdown of each Senate Committee’s annual meeting requirements.

Again, the Committee on Committees was very sympathetic to the concerns raised by this proposal, and the spirit of the proposal itself. One member suggested other mechanisms be put in place, such as: a) requiring a third of CAP members each year be comprised of women, b) departmentally-based rules for advancement that would facilitate and promote more women and minorities moving to the full Professor rank, and c) other possible mechanisms that might extend voice and participation to Associate Professors (giving them access to files, even if not expected to vote). However, these ideas and suggestions are beyond the scope of our charge, and within the authority of the Committee on Committees, we focused our discussion on how to assist the author in improving the proposed CAP Bylaw change.

Sincerely,

Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees
February 11, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Georgia Warnke  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors.

After discussing a possible revision to CAP bylaws at its meeting on February 6, 2014, UCR’s Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare suggests replacing the stipulation that “All members shall hold the rank of full professor…” to the stipulation that “All members shall hold tenure rank…”
March 12, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Helen Henry  
   Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re: Proposal to Consider a Change to the CAP Bylaws

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure met on February 19 to discuss the proposal by Professor Pyke that our CAP Bylaw be modified to allow the appointment of Associate Professors to this Committee. Although there was some agreement with the rationale behind such a change, our committee was, overall, opposed to it. Below are some of the reasons that we reached this conclusion:

1. As we can see from the summary of practices and Bylaws on our sister campuses, changing the bylaw is unlikely to change practice in making COC appointments to CAP, regardless of what is stated in the Bylaws. The practice of having the very best senior professors undertake this task is as deeply ingrained at UCR as it is on the other campuses. We certainly do not want to start down the pathway of defining in Bylaws how many of each kind of professor (rank, step and field) should serve on CAP. We question the wisdom of our deliberately having a bylaw which is unlikely to be followed in practice.

2. Those with working knowledge of CAP felt that workload issues would be confusing and difficult to handle. Limiting Associate Professors to files below their own rank might be difficult and yet the majority of Departments on campus have exactly this restriction on the participation of Associate Professors in their decisions on Academic Personnel files.

3. We discussed the various forms of potential bias that are presented in the proposal and the degree to which the composition of the membership of CAP might contribute to them. The evidence that CAP composition is a causative factor was not persuasive. We were not convinced that such a change, even if smoothly implemented, would actually correct these perceived forms of bias; certainly not the forms of disciplinary bias discussed in the proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this interesting proposal.
March 14, 2014

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

From: Ziv Ran, Chair  
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction considered the request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors, but does not find the document to be within the committee’s purview as a formal bylaw change, request for advice, interpretation or ruling.

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction believes informally that it may be possible to amend the CAP bylaw in a manner consistent with other bylaws and rules, provided Associate Professors do not act on Full Professors or candidates for promotion to Full. It is also desirable not to overburden those Associate Professors hard at work trying to advance their careers. It may be that these constraints so limit the scope of potential changes as to make those changes not highly worth pursuing.
March 17, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

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

RE: Revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors

We note that CAP has always included at least two members from fields such as English, Art, Music, and History that generally employ qualitative research methods.

The point regarding disenfranchisement of women and minority faculty is important, and is a concern if there is a statistically significant difference in the rates of advancement to Full Professor between members of these groups and others. The Senate could look into this issue. It would also be useful to know to what extent the other UCs, regardless of membership policies, actually include Associate Professors in their Committees on Academic Personnel.

Most important among the attributes of CAP members is an understanding of the highest standards of scholarship, breadth within and across disciplines, and an ability to objectively evaluate the accomplishments of peers disregarding personal opinions or biases. Regardless of any change to regulations, these should remain the only standards by which eligibility for CAP is judged. If needed, the Committee on Committees could implement measures to ensure that CAP members represent the range of scholarly methods used across UCR’s academic disciplines.

The rank of Associate Professor is typically achieved in six years, but not everyone can also expect to simultaneously achieve the breadth needed for CAP service, even within his or her own discipline. Promotion to Full Professor typically serves to verify such breadth in addition to depth.
March 11, 2014

TO:    José Wudka, Chair  
       Academic Senate

FROM:  Erica Edwards, Chair  
       CHASS Executive Committee

RE:    Request to Revise CAP Bylaw

In our February 26, 2014 meeting, the CHASS Executive Committee met to discuss Professor Karen Pyke’s proposal to consider a revision to the CAP bylaw, a revision which would allow Associate Professors to serve on CAP.

The Executive Committee encourages a vigorous discussion of the CAP bylaw; we are persuaded by several of Professor Pyke’s points. However, we are not convinced that the proposal’s evidence is adequate to its claims. For example:

1) The proposal claims that the Irvine, Los Angeles, Davis, and San Diego campus allow associate professors to serve on CAP, but it only provides documentation about UC Berkeley’s Budget Committee. (See Footnote 1, page 1.) Should the proposal include documentation regarding the other campuses?

2) There is no evidence to suggest that CAP’s conservative personnel policies correlate to the senior status of its members. The proposal argues that “the elite status of CAP members might encourage greater conservatism regarding personnel policies” (p. 2). This claim is supported only by the speculation that CAP’s support of the return-to-scale policy was an effect of its implicit conservatism and that, further, this conservatism was an effect of its race and gender makeup (which was an effect of its composition of full professors). This logic is speculative at best. While we, too, oppose the punitive return-to-scale policy, we believe that its implementation can only circumstantially be linked to the composition of CAP or the seniority of its members.

3) We are inclined to agree with Professor Pyke’s argument that the CAP bylaw is discriminatory; however, we feel that such an argument would require further documentation about racial and
gender disparities on p. 1-2. While the proposal specifies, for example, the number of Academic Senate faculty members who are women, it claims that a “disproportionate number of these women faculty are at the associate and assistant ranks” and that “the majority of faculty members from historically marginalized racial groups in the U.S. are also at the associate and assistant levels” without similarly citing figures. We feel that greater specificity would make the proposal’s claims more convincing.

4) The proposal’s notes about the racial makeup of the current CAP (Footnote 2) are wholly based in speculation and unfounded conjecture.

It is precisely because we take the aim of this proposal seriously that we encourage greater clarity and precision with regard to its claims. We believe a robust discussion of the revision of the CAP bylaw—which, again, we encourage—will not be possible without clearer evidence supporting the claim that the bylaw is discriminatory.

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

FROM: Gillian Wilson, Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

DATE: February 23rd 2014

RE: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of associate professors at its meeting on February 18th 2014. The CNAS EC welcomes periodic review of merit and promotion procedures at UCR. However, the CNAS EC believed it would be premature to comment on the request at this time. The CNAS Executive Committee suggests the facts in the request be substantiated, and the request be evaluated by the Committee on Faculty Welfare, before the request be returned to the Executive Committee for comment. One major issue is how membership of associate professors on CAP might integrate with Bylaw 55 (the result of which is that many departments restrict voting privileges on the files of full professors to full professors).
To: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division
From: John S. Levin, Chair, Graduate School of Education
Date: Feb 13rd, 2014
Subject: Request to revise CAP bylaws to allow participation of Associate Professors

The Faculty of GSOE has reviewed the request, and carried out a discussion at their February 11, 2014 faculty meeting.

Chair Levin discussed the CAP Bylaw Proposal with the faculty. No strong views against the request were aired. There were at least two points of view, one in general favoring the inclusion of Associate professor participation and the other raising concerns about inclusion. Those in favor noted that the diversity argument in the Pike request had merit; another that the presence of unnecessary systemic barriers that impede representation should be removed. Those who raised concerns about inclusion of Associate professors noted that there was no evidence of lack of representation or exclusion and that there is considerable precedent within GSOE itself for excluding Associate professors in voting for matters related to Professors.

This discussion suggests that there should be further consideration of the request, with a specific focus upon the principles that would either include or exclude Associate professors from participation on CAP.
To: Jose Wudka  
From: Ameae Walker, Chair SOM executive Committee  
Re: Change in CAP bylaws  

March 16th, 2014

Due to very full agendas at regular monthly meetings of the executive committee, input on the proposal to allow Associate Professors to serve on CAP was solicited from the committee via e mail. The following therefore represents a summary of those responding.

There was no concern about the inclusion of Associate Professors on CAP, except a concern for those who at the Associate Professor level will opt to serve. We hope that they will be counseled as to the pros and cons. All committees on campus strive to have representation from as many constituents as possible and this has a tendency to overburden women faculty and faculty of color with committee duties.

As an individual, the chair would also like to enthusiastically support any proposal to establish a minimum number of years that a faculty member should have been on campus before they serve on CAP. This would be to ensure they have the perspective to evaluate the accomplishments of those who have made their career at UCR. This is not to malign the abilities of the majority of newcomers who have been willing to serve, but simply to ensure that there is every appearance of true peer evaluation. One detail in the proposal is incorrect in this regard since I believe that Tom Patterson began his career at UCR and then went elsewhere before returning.

Still speaking as an individual, it is unclear what the concern is in regard to fast pace versus slower pace scholarship. There are memberships from many departments and all members have to learn what the “norm” for a particular discipline is. If membership is skewed, the best approach to rectifying this is to encourage appropriate faculty to serve; the problem is usually in finding appropriate people who are willing. Those in related disciplines or disciplines within the same college have at least some perspective on the norm. Representation cannot cover all constituencies. Even within departments there can be a huge range - for example, compare a theoretical physicist with a physicist who works within a large consortium because their research uses equipment only present in one place on earth and for which they have to sign up a year in advance: Both the scholarly output and number of co-authors is likely to be very different. In the latter case, somehow, CAP has to make sense of papers with 250 authors in regard to a merit or promotion. The role of the Chair is crucial in making the case. I think Committee on Committees would welcome any help and ideas for recruiting faculty to serve on this and many other important committees.
Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

The purpose of this proposed regulation is to establish two new committees for advising and managing the summer session at UCR. These new committees would replace the existing Summer Session Steering committee with the responsibilities of the latter being divided between the new committees according to whether they represent academic or administrative (resource) issues. The membership of these committees, which represent both the Administration and Senate, will be ex-officio, except for the members representing the Committee on Educational Policy and Course, who will be appointed by the Committee on Committees for a renewable one-year term. All members have voting rights. It is anticipated that each committee will meet once per quarter with additional meetings scheduled if needed. No official report on the activities in these committees will be filed with the Senate. Instead, the Senate members will report back to their representative committees. All staff support for these committees will be provided by the administration.

The charges and membership for each committee are described below.

**Academic Steering Committee**
**Summer Sessions and Special Programs**

**Charge**
The charge of this committee is to advise Summer Sessions’ on its academic integration as UCR’s non-mandatory, open enrollment fourth quarter. The committee will provide guidance and recommendation to Summer Sessions on; the coordination of summer’s academic objectives with the campus’ academic objectives; supporting student success; and on summer policies, procedures, and practices. To help meet this charge, the Steering Committee may form any subcommittees, with additional members, which it deems necessary and appropriate.

**Membership**
- *Co-Chair*: Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education
- *Co-Chair*: Member from Academic Senate representing Committee on Educational Policy
- Member from Academic Senate representing Committee on Courses
- Associate Dean, BCOE
- Associate Dean, CHASS
- Associate Dean, CNAS
- Associate Dean, GSoE
- Associate Dean, SoBA
- Administrative Director, Summer Session
- Registrar

**Administrative Steering Committee**
**Summer Sessions and Special Programs**

**Charge**
The charge of this committee is to identify issues related to meeting the demands of a State-Funded Summer Sessions and to develop recommendations responding to those issues. Recommendations should include the identification of any process reengineering that must occur, system improvements that are necessary, and the appropriate division of workload between C&C, SBS, UE, VCSA, and Summer Session offices. To help meet this charge, the Steering Committee may form any subcommittees, with additional members, which it deems necessary and appropriate.
Membership

- Co-Chair: Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management
- Co-Chair: Associate Vice Chancellor, Resource Management and Analysis
- Vice Chair of the Academic Senate
- Administrative Director, Summer Session
- Director, Financial Aid
- Director, SBS/Cashiers
- Registrar

Justification

Several years ago, an Administrative Steering Committee was temporarily established to help guide Summer Sessions’ migration from a self-supporting unit to a State subsidized fourth quarter. During the intervening years, the members of the committee have found it an excellent vehicle to guide the summer quarter’s administrative development beyond its initial purpose, and they unanimously agreed to continue the committee indefinitely. As the summer quarter plays an ever-increasing role for UCR’s matriculated students, it is important to ensure its academic facets adequately support student success, as well as work in harmony with the regular quarter academic policies and practices. Also, the size and complexity of the summer program has increased to the point where separating the committee’s purview into two committees each with more appropriate streamlined membership will increase the efficiency of the overview process. While the Senate is represented on the present steering committee by the Division’s Vice Chair, its representation will increase with the appointment of two more members, one from Committee on Educational Policy and one from Course, to the Academic Steering committee. The Associate Deans responsible for student affairs from each college and school are needed to better coordinate the college/school and summer session objectives. The proposed committees do not replace any functions now performed by standing senate committees. This sentiment has been put forward by numerous academic entities on campus, and the office of Summer Sessions fully endorses these recommendations.
Committee on Committees

February 24, 2014

To: José Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

Fr: Mariam Lam, Chair
    Committee on Committees

Re: Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session

Dear José:

Our committee has met and reviewed the proposed establishment of two new academic and administrative committees to oversee the Summer Sessions.

We recommend three minor editorial suggestions:

1. In the opening paragraph, line 6, “the Committee on Educational Policy and Course...,” there should be an “s” on “Courses.”
2. Under the Academic Steering Committee’s Charge, line 3, “recommendation to Summer Sessions on; the coordination of summer’s academic objectives,” the semi-colon should be removed.
3. Under Justification, line 10, “efficiency” is mis-spelled as “efficiently.”

Additionally, several CoC members wondered if the University Extension should not also be included in the gathering of feedback on this proposed establishment, if the Office of Summer Sessions currently operates under its purview. They wanted to make sure that the Extension’s charges and bylaws do not conflict or overlap with those of the new committees.

If there is no input necessary from the University Extension, then the Committee on Committees approves of the proposed establishment of the two committees upon the minor editorial changes above. We believe the establishment of the two new committees better ensures Senate input and guarantees shared governance.

Sincerely,

Mariam Lam, Chair
Committee on Committees
February 18, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Richard Smith, Chair
      Committee on Courses

Re: Campus Review of Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session

The Committee on Courses reviewed and discussed the proposal for the creation of a joint administrative Senate committee for Summer Session at their February 4, 2014 meeting. The Committee noted concern that there was only one academic member, the Senate Vice Chair, on the proposed administrative committee, who in turn does not serve on the academic committee. The Committee opined the need for academic overlap on both Committees so that the academic committee was aware of administrative issues.

In addition, concern was noted by the Committee that a School of Medicine representative was not included on the academic committee as the School offers courses throughout the summer. The Committee recommends the inclusion of a faculty representative from the School of Medicine on the proposed academic committee.
March 3, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: Lynda Bell, Chair  
Graduate Council

RE: Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session

Graduate Council reviewed and discussed the proposal to create a new committee structure to oversee decisions about Summer Session at their February 20, 2014 meeting. The Graduate Council was concerned about communication between the two committees now proposed and suggested that the Administrative Steering Committee be a subcommittee of the larger Academic Steering Committee. The reason for the concern is that Graduate Council members believe that faculty input is important in all decisions related to Summer Session including critical issues of funding. If the Administrative Steering Committee does not have adequate faculty representation, and funds are shifted in ways that alter the composition of classes offered (cutting some or many, for example), faculty members’ expertise on curriculum matters will be absent from the deliberations. GC finds this worrisome since under the rules of shared governance, the faculty is charged with oversight on all matters related to curriculum.
March 3, 2014

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

From: Ziv Ran, Chair
    Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session

The committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the proposal for regulation to establish two new committees for advising and managing the summer session at UCR. The committee finds that the proposal would be in compliance with Senate rules and bylaws provided the following paragraph is added to each committees charge:

'The joint committees hereby established do not preempt the Senate's right to establish standing committees whose charge might overlap or otherwise conflict with the joint committees. In the event that the joint committees did overlap or otherwise conflict with the portfolio of standing committees the Senate chose to establish, the joint committees would have to be disbanded or their charge modified so as to comply with bylaw 8.2.4.'
March 3, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

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

RE: Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session

The BCOE Executive Committee supports the proposal to replace the current Summer Sessions Steering Committee by two committees, one academic and one administrative. The BCOE recognizes the increasing importance of the summer session in the education of UCR students, and thus supports the formation of the proposed academic committee to oversee and guide the integration of the summer session courses with the three quarter curriculum.
TO: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Gillian Wilson, Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

DATE: February 23rd 2014

RE: Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the proposal to create two new committees for advising and managing the summer session at its meeting on February 18th 2014. The CNAS EC welcomes the inclusion of college associate deans as members of the summer session steering committee(s), but suggests that the divisional deans of student affairs be specified explicitly i.e., Associate Dean -> Associate/Divisional Dean of Student Affairs or equivalent.

The main concern of the CNAS Executive Committee was that the proposal was lacking in details as to how the two committees would communicate e.g., How will discussion/decisions be communicated between the two committees? How will conflicts be resolved? The CNAS EC believes that the proposal to create two subcommittees would likely delay decision-making and negatively impact student time to graduation. The committee therefore suggests that, rather than creating two summer session committees, it would be more practical and efficient to create one new large committee (including associate deans), and then create separate sub-committees for academic and administrative issues.
February 13, 2014

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

From: John Levin  
Chair, Executive Committee of the Graduate School of Education

Re: Proposal to establish two summer session oversight committees

Please see the comments below, which are submitted based upon discussion at the GSOE Executive Committee meeting on February 4, 2014.

1. At some point in the document there should be an explanation for the change from self-supporting to state supporting if this is the principal rationale for the new committee structure. If that is not the rationale, then the document should articulate another rationale.

2. On page 1, under Academic Steering Committee, CHARGE, the third line "Summer sessions on" the ";" should be replaced by a ";:

3. On page 1, under Academic Steering Committee, MEMBERSHIP, Associate Dean level personnel are noted as members. Later on page 2, the Associate Dean is referred to as "responsible for student affairs." In GSOE, our one Assoc. Dean is not responsible for student affairs (rather academic affairs, excluding students). We have no such administrative personnel responsible for student affairs, although in our Teacher Education program, that responsibility falls on the Director of Teacher Education. As a matter of practice, The Dean of GSOE is responsible for student affairs.

4. Under Administrative Steering committee, we are of the view that at least one ladder faculty should be included under MEMBERSHIP, in addition to the VC Academic Senate.

5. The document refers to The "Committee on Course", but I think the correct name is Committee on Courses. Thus in two places an "s" needs to be added.
March 3, 2014

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

From: Barry Mishra
   Chair, School of Business Administration Executive Committee

Re: Proposal to Establish a New Summer Session Oversight Committee

The soba executive committee thinks the proposal looks fine.
To: Jose Wudka  
Chair Riverside Division of the Academic Senate  

From: Ameae Walker  
Chair, SOM Faculty Executive Committee  

Re: Creation of Joint Administrative Senate Committee for Summer Session  

February 28, 2014  

The SOM executive committee considered this issue by e-mail communication and vote because of the time constraints.  

Those responding were unanimously in favor of the proposal.
University of California Riverside Libraries

Strategic Plan

WORKING DRAFT FOR CAMPUS COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

February 7, 2014

Background and Rationale
In March 2013, the University of California, Riverside hired a new University Librarian with extensive experience in the creation and management of unique digital and physical collections in support of the research and teaching mission of universities. His mandate is to continue - and accelerate - digital access to the rich information resources held by the university and beyond in order to make faculty and students at UCR competitive in the world marketplace of ideas. He came to the UCR Libraries with a vision for how to more fully surface the campus needs around the Libraries and the services they could be providing but also recognized the need to tailor that vision to meet the UCR community’s needs.

On August 8, 2013, Kim Wilcox was appointed as the university’s ninth chancellor. He has re-affirmed the university’s commitment to the UCR 2020: The Path to Preeminence plan as well as articulated the need to aggressively transform the university’s operations in order to fulfill the vision outlined in the plan.

The Chancellor has selected new key indicators of success for the UCR Libraries as they move forward. One of the most important of these new indicators will be its documented success supporting faculty and students in their efforts to seek out and secure research grants. An additional indicator of success will be the UCR Libraries’ ability to bring in extramural resources to further its mission.

As part of this latter goal, there is an explicit expectation that 30-40% of the new University Librarian’s time is to be spent seeking extramural financial resources - both public and private - to enable the libraries to transform itself and the services it provides faculty and students in order to propel the university forward. Within the next 12 months, it is anticipated that specific financial targets will be established that the UCR Libraries will need to meet annually.

The four key goals of the UCR 2020 plan are: Academic Excellence: Developing a Preeminent Research University for the 21st Century; Access: Enhancing Opportunities to Graduate, Professional, and Undergraduate Students; Diversity: Serving as an Exemplar for Diversity, Inclusion, and Community; and, Engagement: Shaping our World.
Due to the financial impact of the economic turmoil of 2008 and its aftermath, the university has struggled to continue moving forward. Most key indicators of success of the UCR 2020 plan have shown modest improvement. The time to make dramatic change in order to complete the plan by 2020 is now. The University of California, Riverside Libraries are poised to make such a transformative leap to help propel the university forward.

**Vision**
Empower positive change by bringing together diverse individuals, communities and information to advance research, education, and innovation.

**Mission**
- To advance the university’s attainment of academic excellence by bringing the world’s knowledge to our faculty and students at the graduate, professional, and undergraduate levels;
- To inculcate the informational literacy skills essential for researchers and students to identify, acquire access to, and fully utilize high-quality information;
- To accelerate the academic achievement and creation of knowledge by the diverse academic communities that the University serves;
- To energize the UCR communities’ positive engagement in and transformation of local, national, and international arenas.

**Values**
The UCR Libraries demonstrate their commitment to academic excellence through a strong service orientation and client focus. We celebrate the diversity of our community by providing access to a wide range of materials, by recruiting a diverse staff, and by making the Libraries a welcoming place for all. The UCR Libraries practice and foster collaboration, strategic but informed risk-taking, and support experimentation to meet strategic goals of the University and the Libraries.

**Strategic Goals**

**Strategic Goal 1: Research and curation**
Dynamically curate the unique information resources acquired by or generated on the University of California, Riverside campus to accelerate the research and teaching programs of the university
- Objective 1.1: Curate digital research data in order to preserve and disseminate the unique research findings of UCR faculty and students with the world and to enable new forms of academic inquiry and discovery through creative and dynamic use and reuse of the digital assets of the university.
Objective 1.2: Curate world-class collections of purchased, licensed, and unique content supporting diverse research and teaching initiatives on campus
Objective 1.3: Support research grant generation and data management plans by inserting library support into key points in the grant process as appropriate
Objective 1.4: Support sustainable publishing models for academic discourse to help ensure the widest dissemination of our faculty and students’ research in the academic record
Objective 1.5: Support researchers in developing and producing new knowledge products.

Strategic Goal 2: Learning spaces
Create dynamic learning spaces that propel the university’s research and learning objectives forward by providing diverse environments for information-based academic inquiry.

Objective 2.1. Create physical and virtual spaces for dynamically creative interaction, group study, innovation and knowledge creation, as well as quiet contemplative study
Objective 2.2: Renovate and transform the Rivera Library into an inspiring and stimulating environment that accelerates learning, enhances and enables new and existing forms of research, supports knowledge production and dissemination, and offers a mixture of spaces, services, tools, and technologies for diverse academic needs, especially those of the Humanities, Arts, Business, and Social Sciences.
Objective 2.3: Renovate and transform the public spaces of the Orbach Science Library into an inspiring and stimulating environment that accelerates learning, enhances and enables new and existing forms of research, supports knowledge production and dissemination, and offers a mixture of spaces, services, tools, and technologies for diverse academic needs, especially those of the STEM fields.
Objective 2.4: Become the trusted neutral ground where the university can invest in advanced learning technologies for the benefit of the entire campus
Objective 2.5: Bring together members of diverse academic communities and ideas together in order to create the opportunities for enriched interdisciplinary creation of knowledge

Strategic Goal 3: Collection Access
Nimbly and effectively connect the UCR community with world-class information resources in a timely basis to advance the academic success of the university community.

Objective 3.1: Create robust and timely access to world-class research collections to ensure that UCR faculty and students have the information resources necessary to be globally competitive with researchers from top tier universities world-wide.
Objective 3.2: Dramatically enhance the visibility of research and scholarship created at the University of California, Riverside or by members of the UCR community
Objective 3.3: Create personalized experiences for our faculty and students as they seek and acquire intellectual content regardless of location or format
Objective 3.4: Create robust and nimble access to academic information resources in both physical and digital formats
Objective 3.5: Aggressively adopt new methodologies, practices, and partnerships to ensure quick and timely access to content held in federated / consortial repositories, regardless of format

Strategic Goal 4: Teaching, Learning, and Literacies
Serve as a catalyst for the creative acquisition, exploration, and dissemination of ideas through the implementation of new methodologies and pedagogies in a variety of information literacies.

- Objective 4.1: Empower students to develop the skills, literacies, experiences, and perceptions necessary for them to be competitive in the world marketplace of ideas.
- Objective 4.2: In partnership with faculty and other campus stakeholders, become a hub for the development and dissemination of digital literacies and new pedagogies on the UCR campus by establishing a Digital Scholars Lab.
- Objective 4.3: Become a leader on campus in the visual presentation of information, both in physical and digital formats.

Strategic Goal 5: Diversify Revenue Sources through Development and Grant Support
The UCR Libraries have been tasked to aggressively seek out and explore financial support in the form of funding from private donors, both individuals and corporate; public-private partnerships; and public and private grant funding for research initiatives in the libraries.

- Objective 5.1: Develop partnerships with faculty to include the library in grant-funded projects that require data management and curation
- Objective 5.2: Create a library-wide development program linked to the UCR development office
- Objective 5.3: Systematically explore grant opportunities for the library from private foundations and public agencies such as IMLS.
- Objective 5.4: Create a culture that incentivizes and rewards successful development of grant opportunities
- Objective 5.5: Leverage both the printing program and unique collections to generate revenue

Enabling Infrastructure
The following objectives will serve to create a sustainable base upon which the strategic goals and objectives outlined above will be supported.

Information Technology Systems and Services
- Objective I.1: Build a scalable, sustainable infrastructure to support library strategic goals in research and curation; learning spaces; collection access; and
teaching, learning, and literacy.

● Objective I.2: Create a program to ensure information technology developments are meeting user needs (e.g. user centered design, usability testing)

Governance and Communication

● Objective G.1: Create a governance structure that enables effective decision-making while soliciting input from key constituencies
● Objective G.2: Practice transparency in both internal and external communication
● Objective G.3: Promote the value of library services to key constituencies through a variety of channels

Organizational Excellence

● Objective O.1: Provide training and development opportunities to all levels of staff to enable the organization to anticipate and meet a rapidly changing environment
● Objective O.2: Strengthen performance management to reward excellent performance aligned with strategic goals and to encourage regular and ongoing performance feedback
● Objective O.3: Develop a culture and mechanisms for rewarding innovative thinking and calculated risk-taking to meet larger institutional objectives
● Objective O.4: Build a robust capacity for organizational analysis and design to ensure that the UCR Libraries maximally meet stakeholders’ needs in alignment with the university’s research and teaching agenda.
● Objective O.5: Develop strategies to quickly and appropriately utilize assessment to understand organizational effectiveness

Conclusion

Pundits frequently ask the question whether libraries will be necessary five, ten, or fifty years from now. The strategic planning process which the UCR Libraries undertook dramatically demonstrated the need for libraries now and into the future. Moreover, this process also revealed opportunities for the library to even more effectively meet the needs of the UCR community by retooling some functions, refining others, and developing new services where needed.

Through these efforts, the UCR Libraries will accelerate the pace of academic inquiry on the UCR campus by providing quick and nimble access to information in all formats in order to foster research and teaching. The UCR Libraries will dramatically increase access to high-quality information in electronic form, both through curation of born-digital content and reformatting of analog materials into digital format and through dissemination of the skills needed by today’s students to thrive in a world where 95% of academic information is no longer encoded only or primarily in physical formats. At the same time, the UCR Libraries will ensure quick and durable access to print information resources not replicated or replaced by digital content. The UCR Libraries will also create dynamic opportunities for faculty, students, and community members with diverse
information needs and insights to come together physically and virtually to create new knowledge.

The UCR Libraries will embark on a new set of initiatives aimed at facilitating the UCR campus community to effectively secure research grants to support the research initiatives on campus as well as to successfully bring in other extramural resources to further the academic information goals of the university.

Ultimately, the UCR Libraries will become the trusted neutral ground where campus community members, ideas, technologies, and information come together to transform the world into a better place.
Appendix 1: Strategic Planning Process

Planning Process

Steven Mandeville-Gamble came to the UCR Libraries with a vision for the UCR Libraries which provided an initial framework and definition for the plan. Although a number of changes are needed to align the UCR Libraries’ strategy with University directions, the UCR Libraries have many fine qualities. Therefore, Steven Mandeville-Gamble used an Appreciative Inquiry approach to engage library staff and key stakeholders in the strategic planning process. Appreciative Inquiry is a strengths-based approach to improving organizational effectiveness.

In June 2013, the UCR Libraries embarked on a strategic planning process to create a nimble and robust road map to guide the direction the UCR Libraries will take in order to most effectively meet the curricular and research needs of the University community. This initiative was led by University Librarian Steven Mandeville-Gamble and external consultant Katherine Kott. These two, and a team of eight staff members representing public services, special collections, technical services and administration serve as the Libraries’ Strategic Planning Steering Committee (SPSC). The SPSC membership facilitated meetings, workshops, and other forums designed to surface and support insights and aspirations of key stakeholders. Collected feedback has been aggregated into a cohesive guide, and broadly disseminated. Results of the strategic planning process will provide the framework for a separate initiative to implement articulated goals.

Information for the strategic plan was gathered from a number of sources. Prior to the kickoff meeting in mid-July, SPSC members viewed a video of North Carolina State University’s new cutting-edge Hunt Library, and read R. David Lankes’ 2012 book entitled: “Expect More: Demanding Better Libraries for Today’s Complex World”. Both were discussed at the kickoff meeting and served as stimulating resources throughout the planning process. This initial meeting was also used to define the role of the SPSC; set regular meeting schedules; identify key stakeholders; draft a plan for stakeholder information discovery and insight sharing sessions, and review the project Appreciative Inquiry/Library staff involvement charter drafted to outline project parameters. Over the past 7 months, the SPS committee has worked to craft a strategy for the advancement of the UCR Libraries in the coming 3-5 years. Early in the process, the group acknowledged the need for outcomes to be nimble enough to adapt to user- and technology-driven modifications. During the regularly scheduled bi-weekly meetings, the SPSC used Appreciative Inquiry to discuss possible themes, and draft questions for use in Discovery and Dreaming focus groups for library staff, students, faculty and other key stakeholders. Committee members participated in these sessions as facilitators and/or note takers, and worked with consultant Kott to compile collected data and amalgamate it with the final Strategic Planning document.
Library Staff Involvement

In his inaugural communication with staff at the end of his first week on the job the University Librarian articulated his intent to develop a strategic plan in the coming months. Staff were kept abreast of these plans, and the formation of the steering committee through subsequent communications. Similar to SPSC members, staff had access to the Hunt Library video, and other ancillary resources including a bibliography. They were also able to participate in a presentation on The Future of Libraries by Joan Lippincott, Associate Executive Director of the Coalition for Networked Information (CNI). A public blog, [http://libstaff.ucr.edu/blogs/lspp/](http://libstaff.ucr.edu/blogs/lspp/), also facilitated transparency and kept staff apprised of the planning process, outcomes, and collected information from key stakeholders.

While the aforementioned communication tools kept library staff current, they were also directly involved in the planning process through participation in two open forums. To facilitate staff work schedules and maximize participation each forum was offered twice, and focused on two major themes – Discovery and Dreaming. Using the Appreciative Inquiry model, the “Discovery” sessions invigorated more than 50 staff members to share insights on the strengths of the library and their most valued assets. There was a similar turnout roughly two months later when staff gathered to participate in the “Dream” forum. Using themes identified in the discover sessions, staff engaged in spirited brainstorming about the future of the UCR Libraries. A summary of emerged themes from both forums is discussed elsewhere in this document.

Discovery & Dream workshops

The UCR Libraries held two workshops in Fall 2013 as part of the strategic planning initiative providing library staff with the opportunity to participate in the process and help inform the decision making. Two separate sessions were held for each of these workshops in order to accommodate staff schedules and increase the overall level of participation.

The first of these workshops, the Discovery phase, was held in mid-September and brought staff together to answer the following four questions formulated by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee using the appreciative inquiry approach to surfacing ideas, thoughts, goals, and aspirations:

1. What do you love most about the UCR Libraries? What makes your work at the UCR Libraries meaningful?
2. What do you most hope that you can contribute?
3. What would help you be maximally effective as a team member at UCR (e.g., training, classes, mentoring, resources, support, opportunities to experiment, culture shift, etc.)?
4. Looking toward the future, what role do you see the UCR Libraries serving in the campus and local communities?

Staff was divided into small groups with a member of the steering committee assigned
to each in order to facilitate the conversation and help ensure that the proceedings were fully documented. Groups were given ten minutes to discuss each question and were then asked to provide a short presentation summarizing their discussions. Several themes emerged from this workshop and a summary of the insights gained is presented below:

- Retain Staff
- Collaboration
- Explore / Understand Library functions
- Library as destination
- Communication
- Experiment / Sandbox [process]
- Resources
- Project Presentations

The complete results from the Discovery phase are available online.

The library staff re-convened in mid-November for the second workshop, the Dream phase, where the assignment was to imagine what the UCR Libraries would be like in the year 2020. Small groups were formed and asked to brainstorm ideas that were based on the themes surfaced during the Discovery phase. The groups were then asked to generate a press release that could go on the University web site to promote the UCR Libraries. The resulting press releases from each group are available online.

The Strategic Planning Steering Committee has compiled and reviewed all data generated from these workshops using it as an information source while drafting the strategic plan.

**Focus Groups**

The SPSC held focus groups for students and faculty from Oct. 29, 2013 through December 2, 2013. We held separate sessions for different cohorts, including undergraduate students, graduate students, library student employees (undergraduates), faculty members, and School of Medicine faculty members. We advertised the focus groups through a variety of avenues, including the student and faculty Scotmail lists, the graduate student mailing list (via the Graduate Division), the Academic Senate, the internal library mailing list, and the library student employee mailing list. In addition the University Librarian communicated with the Dean’s Council. All together we met with 49 individuals (11 undergraduates, 18 undergraduate library student employees, 13 graduate students, four faculty members, and three School of Medicine faculty members). In most cases we split larger groups up so we would work with no more than six or seven people in a focus group.

**Focus group methodology**

Each focus group included a facilitator and a note-taker; occasionally with larger groups we included a second note-taker. The members of the SPSC took on these duties. The facilitators were responsible for leading the focus groups and did not need to take notes. Each group followed the same scenario and used the same three questions (with
some minor variations for the specific cohorts). The focus groups lasted one hour, and the facilitator spent approximately 15 minutes on each question while also reacting to the dynamics of the group. The facilitators made efforts to keep their reactions impartial and non-judgmental, although they asked follow-up questions where appropriate, to make sure they were representing the views expressed.

**Focus group questions**
1. What roles does the library play in your life at UCR?
2. How could the UCR Libraries better meet your [information] needs?
3. Looking toward the future, what role do you see the UCR Libraries serving in the campus and local communities?

**Focus group results**
Initially members of the SPSC aggregated the details discussed from each focus groups for the specific cohort, and categorized their comments to highlight their ideas in order of importance. Ultimately these concepts were synthesized and integrated into results from the focus groups and the Dream Workshops. See the charts below to see the highlighted ideas from the individual focus groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Library Student Employees</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What roles does the library play in your life at UCR?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Library as study and work space</td>
<td>1) Library as study and work space</td>
<td>1) Access to collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Access to collections</td>
<td>2) Access to collections</td>
<td>2) Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Navigation/teaching</td>
<td>3) Services</td>
<td>3) Library as study and work space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How could the UCR Libraries better meet your needs?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Library as study and work space</td>
<td>1) Library as study and work space</td>
<td>1) Access to collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Reserves</td>
<td>2) Services</td>
<td>2) Library as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Faculty members</td>
<td>School of Medicine faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking toward the future, what role do you see the UCR Libraries serving in the campus and local communities?</td>
<td>1) Partner/collaborator/good citizen 1) Library as study and work space 1) Partner/collaborator/good citizen</td>
<td>2) Library as study and work space 2) Partner/collaborator/good citizen 2) Access to collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Library as study and work space 2) Partner/collaborator/good citizen 2) Access to collections</td>
<td>3) Teaching/Outreach 3) Teaching/Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Teaching 3) Teaching/Outreach</td>
<td>4) Marketing 4) Library as study and work space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Marketing 4) Library as study and work space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What roles does the library play in your life at UCR?                  | 1) Access to collections 1) Access to collections                              | 2) Designated SOM librarian(s)                                              |
### How could the UCR Libraries better meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) More access to collections/responding to research needs</th>
<th>1) Grow the collection in response to SOM growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Support for grants (data management, data curation, etc.)</td>
<td>2) Easier online access and navigation for students/faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Open Access &amp; scholarly publishing advice and guidance</td>
<td>3) Teaching imbedded in curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Digital humanities projects</td>
<td>4) Develop student-centered spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Looking toward the future, what role do you see the UCR Libraries serving in the campus and local communities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Partner with the faculty</th>
<th>1) Outreach to SOM partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Collaborator beyond the UCR community</td>
<td>2) Open Access &amp; scholarly publishing advice and guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Support for grants (data management, data curation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Expand student-centered spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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March 18, 2014

To:   Jose Wudka, Chair
       Riverside Division

From: Ward Beyermann, Chair
       Committee on Educational Policy

Re:   Review of the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan

The strategic plan for UCR’s libraries was sent to the members of Educational Policy for feedback. While the response was limited, two members provided thoughtful comments. The more critical of these responses is concerned with the banal nature of the document and the absence of detail for achieving specific goals. For example, strategic goal 5 discusses diversifying revenue sources and pursuing extramural funding. It would be informative to know what is achievable at other university libraries. Also, strategic goal 1.3 talks about “…inserting library support into key points in the grant process…”; however how specifically will this be accomplished?

The second response suggests an additional role for the library, not mentioned in the plan. It is pointed out that the campus lacks a coordinated cross-disciplinary effort to utilize the geographic information system (GIS). The library is well suited for this task because it involves the collection, organization and presentation of information. Also ESRI, an international supplier of GIS software in Redlands, has reached out to UCR in the past to establish a “Geospatial Reasoning Institute”.

Personally, I find this document to be an ambitious plan. That is not necessarily a bad, though more detail adds plausible to the large number of objectives. There is also some ambiguity in the objectives. For example, strategic goals 1.2 and 3.1 are very similar. I have the impression the distinction is with who obtains these collections. Also, it seems like strategic goal 3.2 may belong under strategic goal 1. More detail, as suggested by our first respondent, may clarify this and justify the placement of these objectives.
March 14, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Georgia Warnke  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: UCR Libraries Strategic Plan

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met with the University Librarian at its meeting on March 11, 2014 to discuss the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan. The committee generally supports the goals outlined in the plan but has three concerns.

First, it would like to see more opportunities for faculty involvement in the library’s planning beyond focus groups and consultation with the Senate committee on Library, Information Technology and Scholarly Communication. The library should be in constant contact with the academic departments.

Second, the committee is concerned that Strategic Goal 5: Diversify Revenue Sources through Development and Grant Support not be used to end the university’s own financial commitment to the library.

Third, the committee understands the importance of digital resources. Nonetheless, it would like to remind the library that many disciplines, particularly in the humanities, remain book-based and that digital resources cannot yet substitute for the experience of losing all sense of time among the shelves of a well-stocked library.
March 14, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Lynda Bell, Chair
    Graduate Council

RE: UCR Libraries Strategic Plan – Draft

A subset of Graduate Council members met in a special meeting on March 13, 2014, to discuss the document entitled “University of California Riverside Libraries Strategic Plan: Working Draft for Campus Community Feedback.” Members who could not be present were invited to submit comments via email. We want to emphasize at the outset of our comments that our Graduate Student Assembly member, Preston Williams, made a special effort to attend the meeting, thus signaling how much the role and functions of UCR Libraries matter to our graduate students. We will divide our comments into two parts. The first part deals with the broad scale and scope of what the draft document either explicitly or implicitly suggests about the future direction of the UCR Libraries; the second part has some very specific recommendations about what our members feel the Libraries should be doing concretely to facilitate both research and teaching.

Our broadest point is that since this draft document makes some very large claims about both showcasing and facilitating the research mission of UCR faculty and students (goals which we applaud), there must be sustained and systematic involvement of both the Academic Senate and the Graduate Student Association in further work on the plan. Our GSA rep, for example, said that any committee charged with developing this plan further, should have more than one graduate student representative so that student views from various disciplinary perspectives could be best represented. Also, we think it obvious that the Academic Senate Committee on Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication must be engaged in a systematic way with further work on the Strategic Plan. We do not have a firm idea of what sort of joint body is needed that will best represent librarians, faculty, and graduate students, but we do believe very strongly that substantial input from all of these three major stakeholder groups, as well as cross-fertilization of ideas, will be necessary. More faculty and student involvement in a systematic way (not through focus groups, but rather through structured committee channels), would give the document “a more concrete feel and more educational value” as one of our members put it. A second big point that we believe worth making is that we do not know from this document alone how the UCR Libraries fit into a UC systemwide plan for library development. This is critical from our vantage point because a few years ago, faculty were told that hard decisions to cut back on the purchase of journal subscriptions and research monographs (even from major presses) had to be made, and that more use of the systemwide facilities and Interlibrary Loan would be expected into the future. Is this still the case? In short, what is the overall plan of the UC system for library development and how will the UCR Libraries interface with that plan into the future?

Turning now to specific recommendations stemming from our reading of the document, we find that perhaps the strategic goals 3 and 4 that deal with “Collection Access” and “Teaching, Learning, and Literacies” deserve to be prioritized in the document (i.e., moved forward, certainly...
From the perspective of what library users, faculty and students alike, want, need, and expect from libraries, these are the points that stand out most prominently in their minds. We do realize that the research libraries of the 21st century will be changing in terms of their goals and strategic missions (as noted in what is now strategic goal 1, for example); nonetheless, on the road to that transition, we hope that the UCR Libraries will pay close attention to what is needed in “the here and now” to make their services even better than they are at present. A list follows of some very concrete issues that Graduate Council members felt need immediate attention, and thus, deserve discussion in the draft Strategic Plan:

From our GSA rep:

1. There should be regular open meetings organized by the Libraries for graduate students on the most up to date ways to search for information related to their research fields.

2. VPN access, for work off-campus with library resources, should be easier; information about it should be very transparent and easy to access. Help should be provided by librarians to users in terms of downloading specific VPN software to their computers.

From our faculty members:

3. Methods to access library resources through quick and easy interfaces with ilearn courses should be developed and made easily available to the faculty.

4. Methods for archiving faculty-generated teaching and research materials within the Libraries’ systems should be developed so that they could be made publicly available.

5. The processes through which “special requests” for specific journal articles can be made should be more opaque and easily completed. Ideally, more journals would be purchased so as to obviate the need for such requests.

6. Access to digital databases for research that only the “big” campuses now purchase (UCLA and Berkeley) should be accessible to faculty throughout the system. Currently, one member notes that there are critical virtual databases in her field that she must physically go to UCLA or Berkeley to access. She hopes that the UCR Libraries might negotiate online user rights for such databases for faculty and students who have legitimate needs for them.

From this brief list of points generated in thirty minutes time, it becomes obvious that faculty and graduate students at UCR should be communicating their hopes for the UCR Libraries through systematic interactions on a regular basis. We hope that as the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan moves forward to its next iteration, such interactions will become a regularized part of the planning process.
March 14, 2014

To: J. Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: L. Chia, Chair
    Committee on Library, Information Technology and Scholarly Communication

Re: Draft Library Strategic Plan

The Committee on Library, Information Technology and Scholarly Communication has reviewed the draft Library Strategic Plan, as requested on February 19, 2104. The committee met with the University Librarian, Steven Mandeville-Gamble, on March 7, 2014 to request further information and clarification on certain points.

The committee is supportive of the goals outlined in the strategic plan to create services that complement and expand existing resources on campus. However, the committee also believes it would be appropriate for the committee to be involved in reviewing and providing feedback on what projects are supported by the library, for example through the “Digital Scholars Lab,” to ensure Faculty and student views are properly represented as set out in the committee’s charge.

The committee is eager to receive further information from the University Librarian regarding how the objectives identified will be implemented, and recommends that the Senate be more actively involved in the further development of the strategic plan. We suggest specifically that an ad hoc committee be appointed by the Senate’s Committee on Committees in conjunction with the Executive Vice Chancellor and that such a committee would include several members of the CLITSC.
March 14, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

From: James Baldwin, Chair  
Committee on Physical Resources Planning

Re: Library Strategic Plan

The Committee on Physical Resources Planning reviewed the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan at its meeting on March 12, 2014. The strategic plan addresses themes pertinent to the Academic Senate Physical Resources Committee with regard to a proposal for improved learning spaces intended to promote greater interdisciplinary interaction. The committee supports these improvements but felt the plan did not explain to what extent availability of existing meeting space is currently limiting fostering such interdisciplinary interaction. The committee notes that there is a lot of existing physical space available which is rarely used, for example in the Orbach Library. The strategic plan does not address how to most effectively utilize or repurpose these existing space to meet the strategic goals.

While not specifically physical, the library proposal to be a centralized resource to aid in data management relevant to museum and specimen curation is considered a positive step that will impact a number of collections across the campus. In some cases improved database resources and expertise on this campus will support such collections to be more competitive for national funding.
March 19, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

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

RE: Review of UCR Libraries Strategic Plan

The BCOE Executive Committee has reviewed the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan - DRAFT. The Strategic Plan for the UCR Library was formulated through two workshops held in Fall 2013 and Focus groups held from October 29th to December 2, 2013. The stakeholders participating in the focus groups included 7 faculty members. The draft plan is motivated by 5 strategic goals, which are articulated well. This section is followed by the Conclusion section, which describes the state of the UCR library when the strategic goals are reached. However, the document does not contain what is generally considered to be a plan, a set of definite actions and associated schedule, to reach the stated goals.
March 11, 2014

TO: José Wudka, Chair  
    Academic Senate

FROM: Erica Edwards, Chair  
    CHASS Executive Committee

RE: UCR Libraries Strategic Plan

In our February 26, 2014 meeting, the CHASS Executive Committee met to discuss the draft of the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan.

We applaud the Plan’s broad vision and support its ambitious goals for growth. However, we would like to suggest that the Strategic Plan include more specific details about its plans for print book acquisition and indicate that its fiscal vision includes a sizeable budget for print manuscripts and materials.

The Plan proposes to “accelerate the research and teaching programs of the university” through digitization (which would presumably both make research available to our faculty in digital formats and encourage our faculty to make our research available through “new knowledge products.” (See Strategic Goal 1: Research and Curation.) We are concerned that the focus on digital materials ignores how fundamentally our research in CHASS continues to depend on print materials such as scholarly monographs, musical scores, print journals, and rare books and manuscripts. For example, the Eaton Collection of Science Fiction and Fantasy is the largest publicly accessible collection of print materials in science fiction, fantasy, horror, and speculative fiction in the world, and it draws world-class students and faculty to our campus. One way to support access to important archives such as this one (Strategic Goal 3) might be to provide small travel grants, as many important repositories do, to researchers who wish to travel to Riverside for research in our special collections. We would like to see, that is, attention to how digitization supplements the acquisition of and access to print material rather than replaces such acquisition and access.

Our teaching and research depends on print materials, and we are alarmed that the library is already deaccessioning books and other printed materials. We often have trouble accessing the scholarly monographs that fuel our research in the humanities and social sciences without Interlibrary Loan, and we are concerned that the vision for digitization doesn’t address current problems with access to
scholarly publications. For example, it is not rare for a humanities scholar to find that only one or two UC libraries hold a well-known and highly important monograph in one’s field, and that this monograph is only available at UCR through ILL or by e-book. And the digital apparatus for e-book loans is unfeasible for the kind of research we do in the humanities and social sciences: loan periods are often as short as 24 hours; photocopies are disallowed; and cross-referencing footnotes is nearly impossible. In addition to our suggestion that the Strategic Plan place greater emphasis on its print collection, we would also suggest that the Plan provide a source for its claim that “95% of academic information is no longer encoded only or primarily available in physical formats” (see “Conclusion”) and include information about how digital tools such as e-books might be refined in coming years.

Our research, teaching, and tenure and promotion in CHASS are heavily dependent on our library system. Not only do university libraries foster scholarly conversations in our disciplines by creating access to the work of scholars from other universities; they also create ways for our own scholarly monographs, journals, and other materials to circulate to the public. We would like to suggest that this important relationship between print materials and research in the humanities and social sciences be more clearly articulated in the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan.

Erica Edwards, Chair

UCR CHASS Executive Committee
March 7, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division

From: John S. Levin, Chair, Executive Committee, Graduate School of Education

Subject: University of California, Riverside, Strategic Plan (February 7, 2014)

The Graduate School of Education Executive Committee has reviewed the UCR Libraries Strategic Plan. Members of the committee were pleased with the written document and its ambitions.

The document, in the view of the Chair of the Executive committee, suffers from hyperbolic and at times inappropriate diction. For example, p. 2 (and there is an absence of page numbers), under Vision, the use of “empower” suggests a condition of hierarchical authority, not consistent with my view of a university; as well “empower” is an inappropriate verb in “empower positive change;” p. 3 and elsewhere “Nimbly and effectively,” describes the actions of a deer rather than an organization unless the library views itself as part of the business/corporate community depicted in the business management literature (there is a superfluity of nimbleness in the document); “aggressively transform” on page 1; “Aggressively adopt” and “aggressively seek” on page 4 suggest a rather hyper-masculine stance. There are other terms—“personalized experiences” and “maximally meet”—that are just not clear, and phrases that are just incorrect and hyperbolic: see page one for “to enable the libraries to transform itself.” In short, the document needs considerable editing, clarifications (what “new methodologies,” what “new pedagogies”? and how specifically are these going to be implemented?), and pulling back on assertions. As well, it is not always clear if the plan is for the campus or the Libraries, or special campus constituents: the governance structure on page 5 could be for the libraries and staff; the culture (“Create a culture”) could be for the faculty given that it is tied to grant opportunities; and of course some of this could be intended for students: but none of this is clear enough.
To:  Jose Wudka, Chair of the Senate  
From:  Ameae Walker, Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee, SOM  
Re:  Review of Library Strategic Plan  

At its meeting, 3/11/14, the SOM FEC discussed the Library Strategic Plan. The Committee had no concerns about the plan.

SOM Executive Committee  
Ameae Walker, Chair  
Paul Lyons, Vice Chair  
Monica Carson  
Iryna Ethell  
David Lo  
Christian Lytle  
Ilhem Messaoudi  
Neal Schiller  
Emma Wilson  
Mahendr Kochar (clinical)  
Emma Simmons (clinical)  
Richard Olds (ex officio)  
Phyllis Guze (ex officio)
UC Online License Agreement

The Regents of the University of California ("The Regents"), across its ten campuses, is developing on-line course programs for its ILTI Curriculum (individually a "Course", and plural "Courses") and wishes to obtain the expertise and experience of the faculty in designing and refining the online academic experience for the students.

The Regents recognizes the value to the University of California of having online course content available for use during the regular term and summer sessions in credit-bearing instruction of University of California undergraduate students, and also recognizes the value to non-UC students of having access to online course content created by the preeminent members of the UC faculty.

The Regents is required as a condition of UC policy and U.S. law to obtain a license from participating faculty members for the use of any intellectual property developed or used in the development of these Courses. In determining the best approach to obtaining such license, The Regents affirms that it greatly values the unique expertise and contributions of the participating faculty members in designing the Course content, and thus wishes to share control of the dissemination of the Course content with these faculty members in accordance with applicable Regents’ policy.

Accordingly, interested faculty and The Regents will work together to enter into agreements with each other to obtain the necessary licenses for presenting the Courses, and separate agreements with the individual campuses offering the classes at issue to develop the faculty members’ Course which shall include timelines, educational objectives, and pedagogical requirements and shall also include a statement which defines what will be included in the Course materials.

The Regents will also pay participants a sum acknowledging the faculty members’ valuable time and effort in developing Courses ("Faculty Remuneration").

Under the 2003 UC Policy on Ownership of Course Materials, the terms of this UC Online Course Agreement ("Agreement") must be set forth in writing, and it is set forth below.

LICENSE

This UC Online Education License Agreement is made between The Regents of the University of California ("The Regents"), a California corporation having its corporate offices located at 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, California 94607-5200 ("The Regents"), and <Faculty PI>, an employee of The Regents with offices located at <UC campus> ("Contributor"), and the parties agree as follows:

1. Intellectual Property Ownership:

1.1 To the extent that the Course under this Agreement includes any work of authorship
entitled to protection under the copyright laws, the parties agree to the following provisions:

1.1.1 Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the Contributor owns the portions of the Course created by him/her, in accordance with U.S. copyright law and the 1992 University Policy on Copyright Ownership.

1.1.2 Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the Regents own the portions of the Course created by it, in accordance with U.S. copyright law and the 1992 University Policy on Copyright Ownership. Each campus has the discretion to transfer to the Contributor ownership of materials that are owned by The Regents and created on its campus.

1.1.3 As permitted under the 2003 University Policy on Ownership of Course Materials, the Contributor hereby grants to The Regents a non-exclusive, license to copy, distribute, perform, display, and create derivative works of the Course in all mediums either now known or developed in the future for the term of this Agreement only, upon payment of the remuneration identified herein only, and for use within the University of California.

1.1.4 Any modifications, supplementation of Course content, or creation of derivative works by The Regents will be made only after a) reasonable notice to the Contributor or his/her department and b) the express written consent of the Contributor. Any additional or differing conditions governing modification or supplementation of Course content by The Regents will be governed by the agreement entered into between the Contributor and the campus offering the Course.

2. Payment:

2.1 As full consideration for all services provided by the Contributor and for the rights granted to The Regents, including the granting of a license of the Course to The Regents on the terms set forth in section 3, The Regents shall pay the Contributor remuneration, the amount of which will be determined between the Contributor and the offering campus but shall be no less than 10% of the gross income derived from the Course.

2.2 Contributor shall also be entitled to a royalty share each time the Course or a derivative thereof is used other than at UC in a manner that generates commercial revenues for The Regents, the amount of which will be determined between the Contributor and the offering campus as specified in the agreement entered into between the Contributor and the campus offering the Course, but which shall be no less than 10% of the gross income.

3. Term

3. This Agreement shall remain in effect for no fewer than three (3) years and no more six (6) years, with an option to renew on one-year terms, if both parties agree. The specific term of this Agreement will be determined by Contributor and the offering campus.
4. **Copyright Permissions:**

4.1 Contributor will comply with the copyright clearance policies and practices of his/her academic department and campus, if any exist, in preparing the Course, and The Regents and the Contributor shall work together, in good faith, to ensure compliance to the best of their ability with all applicable copyright laws, including the TEACH ACT and requirements for obtaining permissions with respect to copyright clearance.

5. **ADA Compliance:**

5.1 In designing the Course, Contributor will make good faith efforts, in cooperation with The Regents, to comply with all ADA requirements, including but not limited to those relating to Course accessibility.

6. **Contributor Warranty:**

6.1 The Regents and the Contributor shall work together, in good faith, to ensure that in performing the services under this Agreement, a) the Course will be the Contributor’s original work or that the Contributor has secured any necessary permissions to use any third party work, and b) the Course will not violate the right of privacy or publicity or infringe upon any copyright or other proprietary rights of any other person or entity, c) the Course shall not contain libelous, defamatory or other unlawful material, and d) the Contributor has the full right, power, and authority to grant the license to The Regents. It is recommended that Contributor require that any guest lecturer or other person providing content for the Course agree to be bound by this provision.

6.2 The Regents shall Indemnify Contributor in accordance with The Regents’ obligations to Contributor based on the Contributors’ status as an employee of The Regents, but only for actions or failures to act within the scope of said employment.

7. **Governing Law and Dispute Resolution**

7.1 THIS AGREEMENT IS TO BE INTERPRETED AND CONSTRUED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

**CONTRIBUTOR**

By_________________________________  *Signature*

Name:_________________________________  Title:_________________________________

Date:_________________________________

**THE REGENTS OF THE**