April 11, 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 ~ April 14, 2014

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, April 14, 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>Description</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent Calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1:00 – 1:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A. Approval of the Agenda for April 11, 2014</td>
<td>pp. 2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Approve Draft Minutes of March 24, 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>1:05 – 1:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Review of proposal to change Senate Bylaw 55</td>
<td>pp. 5-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>1:25 – 1:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Discussion of R’Courses</td>
<td>pp. 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>1:55 – 2:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Announcements by Chair Wudka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>2:25 – 3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Updates by Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Council Meeting Minutes
March 24, 2014

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

Jennifer Hughes, Vice Chair
Bahram Mobasher, Sr Assembly Rep

Standing Committee Chairs:
Michael Allen, Research
Lynda Bell, Graduate Council
Lucille Chia, LITSCC
Erica Edwards, CHASS Exec Committee
John Levin, GSOE Exec Committee
Eugene Nothnagel, Preparatory Education
Ameae Walker, SOM Exec Committee

Kenneth Barish, Planning & Budget
Ward Beyermann, Educational Policy
Kathryn DeFea, Undergraduate Admissions
Mariam Lam, Committees
Barry Mishra, SOBA Exec Committee
Akula Venkatram, BCOE Exec Committee
Georgia Warnke, Faculty Welfare

Absent:
James Baldwin, Physical Resource Planning
Gillian Wilson, CNAS Exec Committee

George Haggerty, Academic Personnel
Zhenbiao Yang, Diversity & Equal Opportunity

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

REVIEW OF PROPOSAL TO CHANGES THE CAP BYLAW
There was considerable discussion of the proposal submitted by Professor Karen Pyke suggesting the bylaws of CAP be modified to allow Associate Professor to serve on the committee. Professor Pyke introduces several factors and reasons for her proposal, among them suggesting that women and minorities are not well represented on CAP due to the restrictive bylaw. Several Senate committees reviewed the proposal and while many were sympathetic to the argument, most did not give support. Of considerable concern was the contradiction between the proposal and Senate Bylaw 55, which does not allow Associate Professors a voting right on Full Professor files unless delegated by the department. Executive Council unanimously agreed that Chair Wudka will forward the committee responses to Professor Pyke along with the comments of Council and will advise that for continued official review of the proposal, Professor Pyke should resubmit the proposal in the standardized bylaw review format.

REVIEW OF PROPOSAL TO DEVELOP TWO SUMMER SESSION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES
Several committees reviewed and supported the proposal, however there was concern that the new structure did not allow for an over-arching member who will serve continuously on both committees. Several committees felt that this lack of overlap may potentially diminish the senate position in summer session decision and leaves each committee vulnerable to disconnect between the administrative and academic discussions. Vice Chair Hughes confirmed that as the sole senate representative in the current structure she has experienced a process that is not vigorous or effective. Graduate Council too is concerned with the lack of Senate oversight in the current model and hopes that the proposal may help address that deficiency. After considerable discussion, Council suggest two changes to the proposal, 1) the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education be added as an ex-officio member of the Administrative Committee and 2) to insure regular meetings of both committees, perhaps even set a minimum number of meetings (once a quarter).
REVIEW OF THE DRAFT UCR LIBRARIES STRATEGIC PLAN
While most committees who reviewed the document were impressed with the ambition of the plan, there was significant concern expressed about the lack of articulation of plan implementation. In addition, there was general concern from several committees about the lack of clarification of future maintenance or growth of a physical, print collection. The CHASS Executive Committee and Faculty Welfare in particular were concerned that the plan did not include any discussion of either maintaining or improving the current print collection. Faculty Chair Edwards spoke at length of the need for its faculty to have access to print material such as images, musical scores and other print based research material which is not digitized and/or which is costly. CHASS therefore is significantly concerned about the library seeming to phase out its print collection and suggests a disconnect in understanding exists between the library and the teaching and research activities of CHASS faculty and the importance of print material on the CHASS merit/promotion process. Executive Council agreed that the strategic plan process should move forward only with significant faculty (and student) input and collaboration. To that end, the Senate’s Committee on Library, Information Technology & Scholarly Communication will form an ad hoc committee subcommittee that will advise the University Librarian thorough the implementation of the strategic plan for the UCR Libraries. This subcommittee will include representation from the Graduate Council, Committee on Research, Committee on Educational Policy and the Executive Committee of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences; it should provide regular reports to the LIT&SC Committee for the committee chair to present at Executive Council and, when pertinent, to provide recommendations for Senate action

REVIEW OF THE ONLINE LICENSE AGREEMENT
Council reviewed and discussed the online agreement and suggested minor revisions. Specifically that inclusion of an introductory paragraph would be helpful. Chair Wudka will work with campus counsel to finalize the document.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR
Healthcare Survey - Chair Wudka advised Executive Council that the campus healthcare survey was completed and a report is forthcoming. The report will be presented to the campus and to Office of the President.

Campus Budget Process – The campus budget process for this academic year is in proceeding, although the Chancellor’s Budget Advisory Committee will no longer be convened. Chancellor Wilcox has indicated his intent to heavily involve the Senate’s Committee on Planning & Budget in campus budget decisions both this year, and to a greater extent in future years.

System-wide Election – The System-wide Senate will hold elections next week and the Riverside Division has a candidate on the ballot. If elected, Professor Daniel Hare will serve as Vice-Chair, for the 14-15 term and as Chair in 2015-2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:57 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy Palmer, Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
Dear Colleagues:

As you know, the San Diego division has proposed an amendment to Bylaw 55 that would permit the Senate members of an academic department in the health sciences to extend voting rights on personnel cases to specified classes of non-Senate faculty colleagues in that department. You reviewed the original version of this proposal last fall, and Council discussed the responses in January. Council then asked the San Diego division to revise its proposed amendment to Bylaw 55 to address concerns raised in the systemwide Senate review, and to resubmit a revision for Council’s consideration and a second review. Council considered a revised proposal at its February 26 meeting. After an extended discussion, Council agreed to send two versions of the revised submission for a simultaneous second review, believing that the revision had addressed many of the original concerns, so that a second review would be appropriate. Both alternatives are attached to this memo. They maintain track changes to clarify how the original proposal has been modified.

San Diego’s original proposed amendment would allow a department or school in the health sciences to extend voting privileges on personnel matters, including rank and step, to non-Academic Senate members of the department upon a two-thirds vote of the department’s Senate faculty, and would require reconsideration after a year if requested by a Senate member of the department. San Diego’s revision maintains those basic provisions, but clarifies that the vote to extend privileges would be limited to faculty with the rank of Associate Professor and higher, and that the votes of Senate and non-Senate faculty would be reported separately to CAPs.

A major revision, which was requested by Council in January, is a new requirement that the relevant Division or its Legislative Assembly must first act to allow departments or schools to determine whether to extend voting rights. The intent is to transfer the initial authority to the divisional level, recognizing that some divisions may not want to extend voting rights but do not object allowing other divisions this option.

The two versions being sent to you are identical except for the scope of their applicability. By deleting the three words “in health sciences,” the second version would make the proposed amendment applicable to departments and schools in any discipline. Only one of these alternative versions of the amendment could be enacted as legislation. Council asks you to opine as to whether...
you would support enactment of one of the alternatives, both, or neither. Both alternatives are
attached to this memo.

San Diego and other supporters maintain that the Bylaw amendment can help address the
disenfranchisement felt by a large and growing number of contingent faculty who support UC’s
teaching mission substantially, but lack the privileges and protections of Senate membership.
Council’s second alternative recognizes that because the growth of contingent faculty is not limited
to the health sciences but extends throughout UC’s academic enterprise, it may be logical to extend
the voting provision to non-Senate members more broadly. Council is aware that its alternative
represents a significant difference from the original proposal and needs to be discussed further by
Senate divisions and committees. Council will not determine whether to propose legislation to the
Assembly until it receives and is able to deliberate on the next round of comments.

In the Council discussion it was noted that strictly speaking, all votes sent to CAP are “advisory” (as
are CAP’s recommendations to the Chancellor), and the possibility of reporting a separate non-
Senate member “advisory vote” to CAP is already available to schools or departments. Nothing in
the proposed revision would change the ability of schools or departments to take and report separate
votes on personnel actions. Proponents believe that enacting this change will clarify the availability
of recording non-Senate votes in documents sent to CAP and will signal that CAPs must consider
such advice when departments or schools elect to offer it.

I ask that you distribute these materials for review and that you submit responses to
SenateReview@ucop.edu by Friday, April 25, 2014 so that Council can discuss the responses at its
meeting on April 30. As always, committee chairs who determine that the subject is not in the
purview of their committee need not reply.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Bill Jacob

Encl (1)

Cc: Senate Executive Directors
    Senate Committee Analysts
Bylaw 55 Proposed Amendment Version 1

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

- Subject to prior approval by a Division or its Legislative Assembly, voting privileges on personnel matters within any department or school in Health Sciences may be extended to one or more of the classes of career (i.e. >50% effort) non-Academic Senate members of that department, who are not otherwise entitled to vote under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw. This requires at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of all Senate faculty who have achieved the Associate Professor rank or its equivalent to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw.

- The extension of voting privileges to each class of non-Senate faculty should be considered separately. Voting privileges with regard to rank and step would apply equally to Senate faculty and non-Senate faculty. In departments that have adopted these voting privileges, the Chair shall report separately the votes of Senate and non-Senate faculty.

- Any extensions of the voting privilege under this Article E must remain in effect for at least one calendar year (twelve months); thereafter, any Senate faculty member who has achieved the Associate Professor rank or its equivalent may request reconsideration. Following a request for reconsideration, and prior to any subsequent vote on personnel matters, the Chair or other appropriate departmental officer shall put the question of renewal of voting privileges to a vote. In this case, an extension of voting privileges will be renewed only upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of all Senate faculty who have achieved the Associate Professor rank or its equivalent.
Bylaw 55 Proposed Amendment Version 2

E. Extension of Voting Privileges to non-Academic Senate Faculty

- Subject to prior approval by a Division or its Legislative Assembly, voting privileges on personnel matters within any department or school may be extended to one or more of the classes of career (i.e., >50% effort) non-Academic Senate members of that department, who are not otherwise entitled to vote under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw. This requires at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of all Senate faculty who have achieved the Associate Professor rank or its equivalent to vote on the cases in question under the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 6 of Article B of this Bylaw.

- The extension of voting privileges to each class of non-Senate faculty should be considered separately. Voting privileges with regard to rank and step would apply equally to Senate faculty and non-Senate faculty. In departments that have adopted these voting privileges, the Chair shall report separately the votes of Senate and non-Senate faculty.

- Any extensions of the voting privilege under this Article E must remain in effect for at least one calendar year (twelve months); thereafter, any Senate faculty member who has achieved the Associate Professor rank or its equivalent may request reconsideration. Following a request for reconsideration, and prior to any subsequent vote on personnel matters, the Chair or other appropriate departmental officer shall put the question of renewal of voting privileges to a vote. In this case, an extension of voting privileges will be renewed only upon at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of all Senate faculty who have achieved the Associate Professor rank or its equivalent.
March 18, 2014

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

From: George Haggerty, Chair
      Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

At its meeting on March 10, 2014, CAP discussed the proposed revised amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 and supports the enactment of version 2.
April 4, 2014

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

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

Re: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

At its meeting on March 31, 2014, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity discussed the proposed revised amendment to Senate Bylaw 55. While it supports the enactment of version 2, the committee suggests that further clarification be provided regarding which classes of career qualify as (i.e. >50% effort) non-Academic Senate members.
March 14, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Georgia Warnke  
Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

At its meeting on March 11, 2014, the Committee on Faculty Welfare discussed both proposed revised amendments to Senate Bylaw 55. While it supports Version 2, it recommends further clarification on which titles on campus qualify as “career” (i.e. >50% effort) non-Academic Senate” members. The Faculty Welfare committee also thinks Division members should know how many qualifying members are at UCR before voting for a change.
March 18, 2014

To: Jose Wudka  
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Helen Henry  
       Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re: Revised Proposal to Change Senate Bylaw 55

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure reviewed the revised version of the proposed amendment to Bylaw 55 put forward by the San Diego Division. Overall our view has not changed the since we discussed in the fall, i.e. that the proposal should have full formal consideration. Those who responded were unanimous in the view that the policy, if approved, should apply to all disciplines and not be limited to the Health Sciences.
April 8, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Michael Allen, Chair
       Committee on Research

RE: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The Committee on Research reviewed and discussed the revised proposal to amend Senate bylaw 55.

The committee strongly opposes option one of the new proposal as it applies only to Health Science faculty, and thus excludes, for example, Cooperative Extension Specialists. The committee supports formal systemwide review of option two of the new proposal.
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

April 4, 2014

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

From:      Ziv Ran, Chair  
            Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Re:        Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

R&J considered the revised proposal and finds that it fails to address the principal concern it had about the original proposal, to wit, that the proposed rule-change would diminish the Academic Senate by allowing non-Senate faculty to vote on merits and promotions involving Senate members.
April 7, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Riverside Division

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

RE: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The BCOE Executive Committee had no objection to version 1 of the Amendment to Senate Bylaw 55 only because it applied exclusively to a department or school in the Health Sciences. The amendment is designed to “address the disenfranchisement felt by a large and growing number of contingent faculty who support UC’s teaching mission substantially, but lack the privileges and protections of Senate membership”. The Exec. Committee observed that while teaching is an important component of the personnel file of a faculty member, other factors such as research productivity play an equally important role in the evaluation of faculty members being considered for appointments, merits, and promotions. A person whose primary responsibility is teaching is unlikely to be in position to evaluate these other factors in casting a vote in the personnel action of a faculty member. The justification offered by Health Sciences to extend voting privileges on personnel matters to non-senate faculty members has limited relevance to the BCOE. The committee is concerned that a positive vote on version 1 of the amendment might create the momentum for requesting similar voting privileges in other colleges.

We do not support version 2 of the amendment for the reasons given the previous paragraph. Once voting privileges are granted, it will be difficult to withdraw them. Removal of these privileges, for some reason, after 12 months will lead to severe morale problems in addition to the “feeling” of disenfranchisement this amendment is supposed to address. Separating the votes of Senate and non-senate faculty members in reporting them creates a situation in which some members are considered to be “more equal” than the others, and defeats the objective of enfranchising non-Senate faculty.
April 3, 2014

TO: Jose Wudka, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Erica Edwards, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The CHASS Executive Committee reviewed the revised version of the proposed amendment to Bylaw 55 put forward by the San Diego Division and is satisfied with both versions of the document. The committee prefers, though, that the proposed amendment be applicable to the health sciences exclusively.

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:  March 25th 2013

RE:        Systemwide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The CNAS Executive Committee did not have a meeting scheduled before 
comments were due on the revised proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 55, so 
comments were solicited by email. The following four sets of comments were received:

1) “The proposed changes to the revision require each Department to make the decision 
by secret ballot and allow a review of the decision after one year. This provides adequate 
safeguards in cases where voting by non-Senate members is problematic. I also like the 
requirement that the votes of the senate faculty must be recorded separately from the 
votes of the non-senate faculty, and both get reported to CAP. If the two groups do have 
different expectations and make different decisions, this will now be evident to the 
Department and to CAP. Exposing such conflicts paves the way to solving them.

     I see no reason to restrict this to the Health Sciences, so I prefer version 2.”

2) “Concerning the proposed changes to non-Academic Senate Faculty in Health 
Sciences my concern is that it seems arbitrary that this is a special case for only health 
science faculty and the proposed change further highlights the inequity of non-senate 
status and excluding from voting rights cooperative extension faculty in the Agricultural 
Experiment Station. Nationally, I believe the lower status of cooperative extension 
faculty (relative to other faculty) is unique to California/UC.”

3) “The revised proposal to amend Bylaw 55 seems improved from the previous 
submission. Particularly have only Associate and above vote on the department 
preference and having both votes (on promotion and such) sent to CAP.”

4) “In regard to the Systemwide Revised Proposal to Amend Bylaw 55, I don’t see much 
effect. You will probably hear some concerns about having non-academic senate 
members comment on academic senate members’ files, but this is already happening at
UCR. In my own department, our non-academic senate colleagues in Cooperative Extension cast ‘advisory’ votes on all files (even those above their level). This has been going on since about 1985. The world has not yet come to an end as a result. Interestingly, the academic senate members cast votes that count (non-advisory) on all the Cooperative Extension faculty. Speaking for myself, becoming aware of what everyone else is doing has had a positive effect on establishing cooperative research projects, not to mention the esprit-de-corps in the department.”
March 18, 2014

To: Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division

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

Subject: System-wide Review of Revised Proposal to Amend Senate Bylaw 55

The Graduate School of Education Executive Committee as well as all GSOE Senate faculty have had an opportunity to comment on the two versions of the amendment to Senate bylaw 55. Because of the time limit, GSOE executive did not partake in a face-to-face discussion. There was little discussion among GSOE faculty on these proposals. Three views were expressed. One view was insistent that only senate faculty should have voting rights in GSOE, while Health Sciences could be enabled to extend voting rights (as in Bylaw amendment 55 Proposal Version 1). The second view was that voting rights should be extended to specific groups of non-senate faculty throughout the university (as in Bylaw amendment 55 Proposal Version 2). The third view expressed the need for universality of voting rights across the UC and within all units. That would mean the revision of Bylaw 55 so that the identical voting rights apply to all (whether there are exclusions or not).
To Jose Wudka, Chair Riverside Division  
From: Ameae Walker, chair SOM executive committee  
Re: Changes to bylaw 55, revised

The SOM executive committee reviewed the revised version of the proposed changes to bylaw 55 and this committee response was circulated for approval prior to submission.

While there is general support for the principle behind the changes to bylaw 55, without further clarification there are some concerns about implementation of the revised proposal. Proposed is separate recording of senate and non-senate votes in the department transmittal to the committee on academic personnel (CAP). However, it is unclear what this actually means in effect. If reported separately, how will CAP view the votes? For example, if a department has more non-senate than senate faculty, could the non-senate vote outweigh the senate vote? Also, one assumes the Chair would be required to address any discrepancy between the two votes, just as any minority opinion must be addressed now. How Chairs and CAP deal with the votes needs to be clarified in the document.
Student-led courses at other UC campuses

UCLA

The courses that are taught by students at UCLA are in two areas: the Collegium of University Teaching Fellows (http://www.oid.ucla.edu/training/cutf) and the Undergraduate Student Initiated Education (http://www.uei.ucla.edu/usie.htm). Both involve much preparation and there is a faculty of record: working with the student preparing a syllabi, attend part of the classes (a task shared with the program leader from the Office of Instructional Development) and involvement in the grading process. That is how the officer of instruction requirements are met.

UCI

These are controversial and are just in the process of being reviewed by the division of undergraduate education (the senate has never before reviewed them but since they actually provide curriculum they now have to).

UCB

These are housed in the DeCal program http://www.decal.org/

This is much more prescribed, regulated by the UCB Senate A230. For example:

- The role of the Committee on Courses of Instruction involvement in all courses is specified (A230.3.3)
- The academic standing of participating students is specified A230.4.2
- Various limitations are allowed A230.4.5

More details in the UCB CoCI manual regulation 2.4.1

UCB’s courses came from the free-speech movement and they have a a tradition of quality control

At UCR there is one course being offered and has been featured in the student newspaper (see R’Courses are classes led by students, now offered in spring quarter.)
R’Course Governing Board
UCR Academic Senate

February 2014

Charge
The Governing Board is charged with providing direction and oversight of R’Course offerings. It is responsible for reviewing and approving proposals for R’Courses. It has the responsibility for setting the educational standards for R’Courses and for ensuring that these standards are maintained. If issues come up in the administration of R’Courses, the Governing Board will adjudicate those issues. The Governing Board will work with UE staff to publicize R’Courses and to provide training sessions for R’Course leaders. The Governing Board has the authority to choose among proposals, to review courses for educational quality, and to ensure that student leaders are adequately trained. It has the authority to end offerings of courses that do not meet the educational standards required of an R’Course.

Membership of the R’Courses Governing Board

The Governing Board will have five members appointed in the following manner.

- The Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education (VPUE) will appoint two members who are tenure-track faculty. Preferably, one member will be a former member of the Committee on Courses (COC), and the other member will be a former R’Courses instructor of record.

- COC will appoint one current member.

- The Assistant Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and the Coordinator of Educational Initiatives are non-voting ex-officio members to help administer the program within the Office of Undergraduate Education.

The faculty appointments by the VPUE are for two years with the option to renew. The COC appointment is for one year with the option to renew. The activities of the R’Courses Governing Board will be reported to COC by their representative on an annual basis.