January 10, 2011

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
    Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
    Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
    Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
    Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)
    Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
    Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
    Christine Gailey (Women’s Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
    John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
    Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
    J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare (FW)
    David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
    Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative
    Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
    Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
    David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences) CNAS Executive Committee
    David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
    Erik Rolland (AGSM), AGSM Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
    Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
    Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative
    Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

FR: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, January 10, 2011

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, January 10, 2011 at 1:10 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220, 2nd Floor, University Office Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action/Information</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Approval of the January 10, 2011 Agenda and November 8, 2010 minutes.</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>List</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>II. Conflict of Interest Statement – Library, International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>III. Issues under review – Items currently under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 1:55</td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:5 – 2:05</td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>• Update on Council meetings held on November 22 and December 15, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>• Update on recruitment of international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>• Update on Budget meeting via teleconference with Provost Lawrence H. Pitts held on 12-17-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>• Interim Executive Committee for Public School of Policy – see attached background material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>• Reception to honor Profs. Helen Henry and Tony Norman – January 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05 – 2:15</td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>V. PROPOSED CHANGES TO REGULATIONS OF THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION R.1.1.1 GRADING SYSTEM:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:35</td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>VI. SOBA BYLAW CHANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:35 – 3:00</td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>VII. EARLE ANTHONY ENDOWMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>Proposal to use the Earle Anthony Endowment to fund graduate student travel and research proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>VIII. EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AUTHORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>Enclosures: Executive bylaws and discussion in email correspondence, sample Agenda from Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action/Discuss</td>
<td>IX. OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL &amp; COMMITTEE BUSINESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 8, 2010

PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Christine Gailey (Women’s Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
David S. Pion Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

ABSENT:
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Erik Rolland (AGSM), AGSM Executive Committee

GUESTS:
Prof. John Briggs, Director of University Writing Program

AGENDA:
The agenda for November 8, 2010 and the minutes from the October 25, 2010 meeting were unanimously approved as written.

The Conflict of Interest Statements for CODEO was accepted as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Chair Mary Gauvain indicated that she had four main issues on which she wanted to brief the EC.
First, Chair Gauvain informed the EC that the Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs Lawrence H. Pitts is organizing a series of budget meetings via teleconference to be held one time per month. The first meeting is scheduled for Friday November 12, 2010 and Chair Gauvain will be one of the regular participants.

Second, Chair Gauvain indicated that UCAP, UCFW, and UCPB have proposed a recommendation to restore faculty salary scales, which was approved by the Academic Council at the October 27, 2010 meeting. Two motions were approved; the first was a recommendation for an increase in the form of a 3% range adjustment plus market adjustments equivalent to 2% of the faculty salary budget to try to return to a viable salary scale. The second motion requested that President Yudof appoint a Joint Senate Administration Task Force to resume work on restoring the faculty salary plan with the aim of achieving competitive faculty salaries. Both recommendations will be passed on to the President.

Chair Gauvain indicated that the Academic Council also consulted with the President at the October meeting and the following issues were discussed:

- President Yudof discussed a proposal for a student fee increase that was to be submitted to the Regents this month.
- President Yudof noted that in the budget $72 million has been set aside for faculty and non-represented salary increases.
- President Yudof indicated that he will raise the ceiling of the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan to include families with incomes of less than $80,000.
- The Holistic review process will be presented to the Regents soon. There was discussion of the recent Texas A & M cost-benefit analysis that analyzed faculty work and was reported in the Wall Street Journal. The President indicated that he did not favor any such cost-benefit analysis at UC.
- The President said that he is aiming that by the year 2020, the UC will have a 26% graduate student population systemwide.

Council also had a long discussion with Executive Vice Chancellors about salary issues. Most of the discussions focused on the fact that merit increases have become meshed with COLAs. This is a concern because it undermines the concept of a merit.

Chair Gauvain also attended a two-day leadership retreat sponsored by the Chancellor that included the EVC/Provost, the Vice Chancellors, the Deans, Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor William Kidder, and herself. Two issues were discussed. The first issue was how to grow the research/creativity enterprise and the graduate professional schools on the campus. The second issue was the budget. Vice Chancellor Charles Louis moderated the discussions on the growth of research/creativity enterprise and indicated that the extramural funding for our campus will have to triple in the next decade. Discussions pertained to how this would occur and the need to increase the number of large multi-disciplinary problem-focused grants on the campus.

There was also discussion about changing the ratio of graduate and undergraduate students as well as the development of new professional graduate masters programs. Chair Gauvain indicated that she stated that there was a need for the inclusion of more faculty in these discussions. Chair Gauvain also reminded the group that professional masters programs must maintain the profile of
a UC campus. There were questions about how the Senate could be centrally involved in the key decisions on this front in the future. There were also questions about incentives for the faculty to pursue the types of projects that could enhance revenue streams to the campus, which led to the discussion about changing the CALL. However, there were no details about what this would entail.

The second item of discussion involved the budget. Chair Gauvain was included in the subcommittee that presented budget ideas, including how to make budgetary information more transparent and accessible to the faculty. Examples included the web-based UC Berkeley Budget Primer and A Bird’s Eye View of UC Santa Cruz. The subcommittee also proposed the need for more transparent budget management tools such as the one currently used by UCLA (Hyperion) that allows people on campus to trace out budget processes and decisions. The subcommittee also proposed the establishment of a standing budget advisory committee that would include faculty, staff, and the administration. These suggestions were received quite positively. A question was raised by an EC member about why this advisory committee would not be the Senate's Planning and Budget committee. Chair Gauvain indicated that the Administration wants a committee that includes other than Senate members and that the members would serve for a period of at least three years.

Chair Gauvain was asked to make a presentation about faculty participation. She pointed out that the faculty is directly affected by changes that happen on campus, e.g. when there are more students than have been budgeted this affects the classrooms and the faculty experience. The furloughs and lack of a salary scale also affect the way faculty engages with the institution. Chair Gauvain pointed out that there was a need for the Administration to be sensitive to the faculty experience. Although changes can be made by the Administration, for them to work, there is a need for the faculty to be involved in and support them. Chair Gauvain also reminded the Administration that the participation of the faculty must be authentic; that faculty should not just be witnesses to change, they must be true participants in the decision making.

Regarding Senate committee participation, Chair Gauvain indicated that the Senate needs to think about what kind of faculty model will work in these discussions. Chair Gauvain felt that it was not useful or appropriate for one person to represent the entire faculty community and as such, there is need to find a way or ways to include as many faculty as possible. One proposal would be that Chairs of existing committees are represented in any new Administration-Senate committees that are formed. Chair Gauvain acknowledged that it is important not to overwork the current chairs, and suggested that perhaps a representative from a Committee could be included if the Chair is unable to be involved.

Thirdly, Chair Gauvain indicated that she is in the process of making departmental visits. During these visits, she is talking about the Senate, asking the faculty what the Senate can do for them as well as what they can do for the Senate in an effort to get more faculty to participate in the Senate.

Lastly, Chair Gauvain indicated that the Council approved the PEB proposal. It was given to the President and he will be presenting it to the Regents in mid-November.

**PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.8.2.1 – COMMITTEE ON COURSES:**
The change to the Committee on Courses bylaw was unanimously endorsed by the Executive Council.
**PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.27.2 – COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED CAMPUS SERVICE:**
The change to the Committee on Distinguished Campus Service bylaw was unanimously endorsed by the Executive Council.

**PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.8.8 – COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES:**
The proposed change to the Committee on Committees bylaw was removed and returned to the committee for the reason that they already have, in the Sturgis Code of Parliamentary Procedures, the ability to remove an ineffective committee member. R&J suggested that any bylaw change to this effect should recognize the current powers of COC in the justification. R&J members agreed that establishing an explicit process in our bylaws for removal of ineffective committee members was a good idea.

**NEIL A. CAMPBELL LEARNING LABORATORY:**
The request to approve the name for the Dynamic Genome Learning Facility located on the first floor of the University Laboratory Building to the Neil A Campbell Learning Laboratory, as proposed by CNAS Dean Thomas Baldwin, was approved. The EC also made the suggestion that the name might be augmented to make it clear that it is a science laboratory.

**REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY**
As agreed at the October 25, 2010 Executive Council meeting, Chair Gauvain distributed a copy of a letter addressed to Prof. Daniel Simmons, Chair of Academic Council that was drafted after the EC discussions. Below are the contents of the letter that was drafted for onward transmission to UC Academic Council.

The UCR Division agrees with several points in the document, specifically that the current situation requires serious readjustment of priorities, the importance of maintaining the quality of the University, and budgetary decisions pertaining to retaining and recruiting faculty should be jointly made by the Administration and the Academic Senate. However, the Division takes issue with several of the recommendations, these are discussed below.

1. **Plan Specifics.** The document fails to provide a clear and strategic plan of action that insures the University will not only weather the current storm, but also be in a position to benefit from any future improvement in the economic climate of the State and the country. The faculty body might need to contract, but allowing this to happen without a strategic plan for the institution would be disastrous.

2. **Campus Differences.** Downsizing the university will have different consequences for larger and more established campuses relative to developing and smaller campuses. Given this variation it is important that each campus be allowed to make any such changes in ways that will enable it to meet its own goals. Therefore, we strongly recommend that objective criteria be adopted to govern the downsizing that do not by design favor one campus over another. Moreover, the process to select the criteria must be thoughtful and not expedient, and allow room for campuses to devise their own strategic approaches to downsizing.
3. **Programmatic Changes**
   a. **New programs.** New programs should be approved only if they are academically sound and have identified revenue streams to support them.
   b. **Moribund programs.** Campuses must make strategic decisions for the future on their own, which may include shutting down unproductive programs and allowing for growth in other strategic areas. The status of tenured faculty in such circumstances needs to be clarified.

4. **Student Diversity**
   a. Closing some programs with the aim of emphasizing campus strengths or having major area specializations on some campuses may have an adverse effect on student diversity. Low-income students, many of whom are the first in their family to attend college, often do not know what they want to study before they enter college. These students are served better when a full range of majors is offered on each campus.
   b. Caution should be used with proposed tuition and fee increases as they impact affordability and access. The greatest negative effects will be on students from families at the lowest socio-economic levels.

5. **Future Enrollment Plans and Expectations.** Reducing faculty at a time when UC enrollment is rising dramatically would seriously undermine the quality of the institution. Resisting the impulse to downsize is particularly important at those campuses that have room to grow and that perform a special role in serving the public good. As a case in point, UCR and Merced are the only federally designated Hispanic Serving Institutions in the UC system.

6. **Allocation Formulas.** Several campuses have been disadvantaged by the formulas used at Systemwide to allocate funding. If major efforts are expended in downsizing the University, it is an appropriate time to examine these formulas so that any such disadvantages are reduced or eliminated.

7. **Contributions to the State.** The document lacks discussion of the benefits provided by the University to the State, and it needs a plan to insure that taxpayers are aware of these benefits and how they will be met if any changes are implemented. Any public outreach needs to emphasize both the economic and social benefits that the UC provides to the State.

8. **Public Perception.** Although the salary scales at the UC are not currently competitive with those at other comparable institutions, the manner in which this issue is presented in the document is insensitive. Even if the target audience of these documents is the UC faculty, we should not come across as petty or self-serving.

**OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

**Writing Across the Curriculum Proposal:**
The Executive Council discussed the proposal for the Writing Across the Curriculum, which was presented by Prof. John Briggs, Director of the Writing Program. The one fundamental change was that last time when it was last proposed, it was a campuswide proposal. This has been changed so that each college can choose to endorse it or not. The proposal will be submitted to the Division for formal vote on November 30, 2010.
General Education Alternative Concentrations – proposed regulations:
The General Education Alternative Concentrations were unanimously endorsed by the Executive Council. This concentration will be discussed at the November 30, 2010 Division meeting for formal vote.

Prof. Steven Clark, Chair, Undergraduate Admissions
The formal proposal to change the Comprehensive Review of admissions criteria for freshman admissions, to be implemented for the fall 2012 admissions cycle, will be distributed on Tuesday, November 9, 2010 to all the Executive Committees and the committees on Educational Policy and Preparatory Education.

Prof. Jose Wudka, Chair, Educational Policy
Chair Wudka informed the EC members that Office of the President has now sent to the Executive Vice Chancellors a request for UC faculty participation in the Letter of Intent (LOI) phase of a two-phase Pilot Project to evaluate the effectiveness of online instruction in delivering a UC-quality undergraduate education.

Chair Gauvain informed the EC that there was no meeting on November 22nd as the systemwide Academic Council will be meeting on that day, and also mentioned that the next Division meeting was scheduled for November 30, 2010. Chair Gauvain also mentioned that there will be a meeting between herself, Vice Chair Walker, Parliamentarian Ozer, and Director Ehlers to find a way of making the division meeting less tedious.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
November 10, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: J. C. LAURSEN, CHAIR
   COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Library and Scholarly Communication Committee has re-adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement covering the Committee’s business for 2010-2011.

If personal affiliation of individual committee members with departments, programs, or with individuals bringing business before the Committee may be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, such member(s) shall not participate in the relevant discussion and shall be recorded “not voting” in the event a vote is taken on that issue. Determination of such possible conflict of interest shall be made by the affected member him/herself or by the majority vote of the Committee.
November 23, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: Y. YE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

RE: 2010-11 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

At its meeting of November 19, 2010, the Committee on International Education adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement:

The Committee on International Education has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Executive Council - (A/I or I)</th>
<th>Division Due Date</th>
<th>Systemwide Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

updated 11/3/2010
November 29, 2010

TO:   MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
      RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM:   CHRISTINE GAILEY, CHAIR  
      COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

RE:   Potential faculty to serve on an interim Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy

The Committee on Committee has provided the following list of names as potential faculty to serve on the interim Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy:

- Michael Allen, Plant Pathology, CNAS
- Ruth Chao, Psychology, CHASS
- Mark R. Matsumoto, Environmental Engineering, BCOE
- Joseph Norbeck, Environmental Engineering, BCOE
- Georgia Warnke, Philosophy, CHASS
- Kirk R. Williams, Sociology, CHASS
- Marylynn V. Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS
H. F. WAY, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

The new College of Engineering does not yet have a faculty, executive committee, or regulations and therefore has no existing mechanism for processing course changes or other issues affecting the College. To deal with this temporary situation, the Dean of the College has requested appointment of an Interim Executive Committee to serve until such time as a sufficient number of faculty is in place to constitute an Executive Committee of the College of Engineering.

The College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences Faculty Chair, R. Luben, and the Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate both agreed that the appointment of such an interim committee was an appropriate solution and they recommended that the Committee on Committees appoint the interim executive committee after inviting Dean Hackwood to provide a slate of nominees, some of whom may be selected from the members of the Engineering Planning Group.

C. W. Coggins, Chair of the Committee on Committees has informed me that the Committee on Committees would like to receive a ruling from the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction as to its authority to make such an appointment. They also ask if they have the authority to appoint the chair of the Interim Committee or should the chair be elected by the appointed committee.

C. W. Coggins and I will appreciate receiving your judgment on this matter at your earliest convenience.

Marvin Nachman, Chairman
Riverside Division

cc: C. W. Coggins, Chair, Committee on Committees

NOTE TO FILE:

Per Frank Way on 5/25/90, the appointment by the Committee on Committees is in order and should be carried out. The Advisory Committee and the Chair of the Division have the authority to make this request. The Committee on Committees should also appoint the Chair of the Interim Executive Committee.

Monica Pyle
May 10, 1990

C. W. COGGINS, JR., CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate recommended that your committee appoint an interim Executive Committee of the College of Engineering. It is anticipated that the interim committee would eventually be replaced by future faculty appointees in the College of Engineering.

Dean Hackwood has provided a slate of names for your consideration. I am appending the Regulation which describes the size and composition of each of the executive committees of our other two colleges and two schools for your information.

Marvin Nachman, Chairman
Riverside Division

cc: Chancellor R. S. J. Schraer
Dean of Engineering S. Hackwood

Attachments [addressee]
June 26, 1990

TO: MARVIN NACHMAN, CHAIRMAN
RIVERSIDE DIVISION, ACADEMIC SENATE

FROM: CHARLIE COGGINS, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

SUBJECT: Interim Executive Committee, College of Engineering

At the request of the Advisory Committee of the Academic Senate, we have appointed an interim Executive Committee of the College of Engineering. To compensate for lack of perfect attendance, we have constituted a somewhat larger committee than suggested in the April 23, 1990 Advisory Committee minutes. In making appointments, we took College of Engineering majors, Dean Hackwood's recommendations, and NAGS Dean's Office changes into consideration.

We recommend that the designated committee serve through August 1991. Between now and the time the College of Engineering has developed to the point of having by-laws and a large enough faculty to determine Executive Committee membership by election, we recommend continuation of the procedure used this year for deciding membership of the interim Executive Committee. In view of the developing nature of the College of Engineering, you should invite Dean Hackwood to request that we reconsider the composition of the committee at times she thinks are appropriate.

Appointments
Interim Executive Committee, College of Engineering

Professor Andrew C. Chang, Soil and Environmental Sciences
Professor Michael F. Dunn, Department of Biochemistry
Professor Glen E. Everett, Department of Physics
Professor Brian A. Federici, Department of Entomology
Professor Lawrence L. Larmore, Department of Computer Science
Professor Emeritus John A. Moore, Department of Biology
Professor Charles L. Wilkins, Department of Chemistry

(Chair to be elected by above committee members--all of the above have agreed to serve.)

Dean Susan Hackwood, ex officio
Professor Frank Ordung, ex officio
Associate Dean Gordon Van Dalen, ex officio
## CHANGES TO BYLAWS/REGULATIONS

## REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
February 15, 2011

**To Be Adopted**

**Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.1.1.1 The grade GD (Grade Delay) shall be entered on the student’s record: a) when administratively the faculty member is not able to assign a grade or b) when disciplinary proceedings are in progress. The GD shall not itself be calculated in any way in the student’s grade-point average. The GD shall be changed to a grade, or an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor, or if unavailable, the program chair, to indicate that the student situation has been resolved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once an instructor has decided to proceed with disciplinary proceedings, he or she will refrain from assigning a course grade for the student. If the course concludes before the charge has been resolved, the instructor will assign a grade GD and indicate as a note that this GD is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Integrity”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.1.5.1 A student who has been referred for a pending academic integrity violation may not drop or withdraw from the course to escape the consequences of the misconduct. If a student drops or withdraws from the course prior to the resolution of the case brought to Student Conduct, they will be re-enrolled in the course. Students are encouraged to attend and engage fully in the course during the academic integrity review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:** The purpose of this proposal is to suggest for consideration two additions to the UCR Grading Policies, so that the grade policies are in line with current practices and policies on campus. 1) The grade GD currently is utilized administratively and during academic integrity reviews; however, the GD grade is not defined as an official grade in the UCR Grading Policy and 2) The Committee on Educational Policy requested and approved in 2005 the Academic Integrity at the
University of California, Riverside policy which includes language that a student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course until the determination of responsibility is made and any sanctions are imposed. This policy and the Grade Policy for withdrawal do not appropriately match and therefore, the proposal requests the addition of a regulation to address withdrawals in the case of academic integrity.

Approvals:

Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: 11/17/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: 10/13/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of COE: 10/27/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: 10/11/2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: 10/05/2010
Approved by Graduate Council: 10/18/2010
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11/5/2010
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 10/29/2010, 12/2/2010
Reviewed by the Executive Council: Date
December 8, 2010

TO:  MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
     ACADEMIC SENATE

FR:  JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
     COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE:  GRADE DELAY REGULATION PROPOSAL-REGULATION R 1

In response to the November 9, 2010 memo from R&J suggesting that “the last sentence in paragraph 1 of the proposal should be removed ("The GD shall be changed to a grade, or perhaps to an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor which indicates that the student has clarified the situation."). As written, the rule may be very difficult to adhere to and limits the authority of a colleague, department chair or even a Dean to act on behalf on an instructor if necessary., the CEP offers the revised wording to the proposed regulation (please see attached). The CEP was equally concerned about the possible unavailability of the instructor and suggests that since it is common practice for a program Chair to be given authority to turn in grades for an absent or incapacitated instructor that R&J amends this gap in Regulation 1.8.1 which states only: “The instructor in charge of an undergraduate course shall be responsible for assigning the final grade in the course.”
November 9, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Kambiz Vafai, Chair
      Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction discussed the above referenced item on November 5, 2010 and finds that the regulation change falls under the purview of Bylaw 6.

In addition, the Committee suggests that the last sentence in paragraph 1 of the proposal should be removed ("The GD shall be changed to a grade, or perhaps to an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor which indicates that the student has clarified the situation."). As written, the rule may be very difficult to adhere to and limits the authority of a colleague, department chair or even a Dean to act on behalf on an instructor if necessary.
September 29, 2010

TO:    DAVID PARKER, CNAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
        DAVID HERZBERGER, CHASS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
        JAY FARRELL, BCOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
        ERIK ROLLAND, AGSM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
        MELANIE SPERLING, GSOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
        DANIEL STRAUS, BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
        MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR, GRADUATE COUNCIL
        JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR, CEP
        CHAIR, RULES AND JURISDICTION

FM:    MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
        RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:    Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

Attached for your review are proposed changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division – R.1- Grading system.

Please discuss with your committee and let me have your response by Friday October 29, 2010.

Enclosure
DATE: October 13, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain
    Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: David Parker
    Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

RE: Proposed Changes to R1.1

On October 12, 2010, the CNAS Executive Committee voted unanimously to endorse the proposed changes to R1.1 concerning the appropriate use the "GD" (grade delay) grade.

We note, however, that our reading of Riverside’s bylaw 6 is that such a regulation change only requires a majority vote at a regular meeting of the Division, and does not require preapproval by either the executive committees or the faculties of the various colleges. Moreover, obtaining approval from the CNAS faculty cannot be readily accomplished any earlier than our regular, annual meeting that will take place in April.

We encourage the Division to move forward with this legislation without unnecessary delays and approvals.
Hi Sellyna,

I hope you are well. Both of the regulations have been approved. Have a wonderful day.

Thank you,
Gabrielle
Date: October 27, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain
   Chair of the Academic Senate
   University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell
   Chair of the Faculty
   Bourns College of Engineering
   University of California, Riverside

RE: Reg 6.1.1.1.1 and 6.1.1.5.1 Grade Delay

The BCOE Executive Committee concurs with the proposed text.
October 11, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: ERIK ROLLAND, CHAIR, Executive Committee
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION/AGSM

RE: Regulation 6, Campus graduation requirement changes

During its October 1 meeting of the Fall Quarter 2010, the Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management/School of Business Administration met and discussed Regulation 6 changes. The committee voted unanimously for the changes.

Erik Rolland
Sellyna,

The GSOE Executive Committee approved changes to R.1 Grading System on October 5, 2010.

Melanie Sperling
Professor
Chair, GSOE Executive Committee

Dear All:

Attached for your review is a proposed change to regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 – Grading system.

Please submit your response by October 25, 2010.

Thanks.

S

Sellyna Ehlers

Executive Director
Academic Senate
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
Tel: 951-827-2544
Fax: 951-827-5545
Email: mailto:sellyna.ehlers@ucr.edu
senate.ucr.edu

Remember, we all stumble, every one of us. That's why it's a comfort to go hand in hand. ~Emily Kimbrough!
October 29, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division

FROM: Daniel Straus, Chair
      Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee

RE: Request for review of the Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee reviewed and approved the Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System.
OCTOBER 15, 2010

TO:        MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
           RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM:     MORRIS MADURO, CHAIR
           GRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSED CHANGES TO REGULATIONS OF THE RIVERSIDE
      DIVISION R.1 GRADING SYSTEM

At its meeting on October 14, 2010, the Graduate Council reviewed the proposed
changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 – Grading System and
unanimously approved of this change.
October 29, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: GRADE DELAY REGULATION PROPOSAL-REGULATION R 1

During its October 28 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the proposal on regulating Grade Delay. Our committee was in agreement with the proposal (8 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions). In addition, we made editorial corrections in the proposal and they are highlighted in the attached.
November 9, 2010

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Kambiz Vafai, Chair
      Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Riverside Division R.1 Grading System

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction discussed the above referenced item on November 5, 2010 and finds that the regulation change falls under the purview of Bylaw 6.

In addition, the Committee suggests that the last sentence in paragraph 1 of the proposal should be removed ("The GD shall be changed to a grade, or perhaps to an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor which indicates that the student has clarified the situation."). As written, the rule may be very difficult to adhere to and limits the authority of a colleague, department chair or even a Dean to act on behalf on an instructor if necessary.
**Proposed Changes to Anderson Graduate School of Management Bylaws**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1 Membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOBA1 Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1.1</strong> The Faculty of the Graduate School of Management, Riverside consists of (a) the President of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the Graduate School of Management; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the department(s) assigned to the Graduate School of Management; (f) designated Senate members from other colleges and schools, the number and departmental affiliation of such members to be specified by the Faculty of the school at a regular meeting in each case; (g) such other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Division.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA1.1</strong> The Faculty of the School of Business Administration consists of (a) the president of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the School of Business Administration; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are assigned to the School of Business Administration; (f) designated Senate members from other colleges and schools, the number and departmental affiliation of such members to be specified by the Faculty of the School at a regular meeting in each case; and (g) such other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Riverside Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M1.2</strong> Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote in the Faculty of the Graduate School of Management.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA1.2</strong> Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote in the Faculty of the School of Business Administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2 Officers</td>
<td>SOBA2 Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1</strong> The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair and a secretary.</td>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1</strong> The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair, a vice chair and a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secretary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.1</strong> The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a two-year term and is</td>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.1</strong> The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a two-year term and is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. The election is</td>
<td>not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. To assure orderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducted in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws. If</td>
<td>transition, the Chair of the Faculty shall remain in office until the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Chair is unable to complete the term of office, the Secretary-</td>
<td>successor assumes office. The election is conducted in accordance with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentarian of the Division shall within two months conduct an election</td>
<td>procedure prescribed in these bylaws. If the Chair is unable to complete the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws for the</td>
<td>term of office for which he/she has been elected, the Secretary-Parliamentarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unexpired term provided that the unexpired term is longer than six months.</td>
<td>of the Division shall, within one month, conduct an election in accordance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the interim or in the event the vacated term is less than six months,</td>
<td>with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws for the unexpired term, provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the secretary of the Faculty will serve as Chair.</td>
<td>that the unexpired term is longer than six months. In the interim or in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>event that the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty will serve as Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.2</strong> The secretary of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive</td>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.2</strong> The Vice Chair of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee from among its membership. The term of office is two years.</td>
<td>Committee from among its membership. The term of office expires at the end of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>committee membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.3</strong> The election of the Chair of the Faculty shall be conducted as</td>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.3</strong> The secretary of the Faculty is chosen by the Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided in chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division.</td>
<td>Committee from among its membership. The term of office expires at the end of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his or her term of committee membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M2.1.4</strong> The Chair assumes office on the first day of September following his/her election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The secretary takes office immediately upon appointment. (Am 20 Nov 07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.4</strong> The election of the Chair of the Faculty is conducted as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOBA2.1.5</strong> The Chair assumes office on the first day of September following his/her election at a regular election, or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The vice chair and secretary take office immediately upon appointment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**M3 Meetings**

M3.1 Meetings may be called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Executive Committee. At the written request of four voting members of the faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. **He must call at least one meeting each regular term in each year.**

**SOBA3 Meetings**

**SOBA3.1** Meetings may be called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Executive Committee. At the written request of five voting members of the Faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. **Regular Meetings of the faculty are scheduled on the Friday of the second week of class in the fall term, the first Friday in February in the winter term, and on the Friday of the tenth week of class in the spring term.** At least two weeks prior to each scheduled Regular Meeting, the Chair shall issue a solicitation of requests for agenda items to the faculty, which items, at the discretion of the chair, may be included in the meeting agenda. At least one week prior to a scheduled Regular Meeting, the Chair shall distribute the agenda for the meeting. The Dean of the School of Business Administration may schedule a Special Meeting. Special Meetings are intended for the purpose of addressing a limited agenda (normally one item) and require at least one week prior notice to the faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M3.1.1</td>
<td>A quorum consists of one-half the members of the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA3.1.1</td>
<td>A quorum consists of one-half of the members of the Faculty of the School of Business Administration who are members of the Academic Senate and not emeritus faculty. A quorum is necessary to conduct any official business at such meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3.1.2</td>
<td>A motion to submit a measure to mail ballot has precedence over a motion for a vote in a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA3.1.2</td>
<td>A motion to submit a measure to mail ballot has precedence over a motion for a vote in a meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3.1.3</td>
<td>The Chair must send, at least five days before each meeting, copies of the call for the meeting together with all pertinent documents to each member of the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA3.1.3</td>
<td>The Chair must send, at least five business days before each meeting, copies of the call for a meeting together with all pertinent documents to each member of the Faculty. The Faculty shall not change curricular requirements or regulations of the school or its departments or change these bylaws at the meetings at which such proposals for change are first made or make any other main motion, unless notice is previously given to all members of the Faculty in a call to the meeting. Any main motion introduced by a member of the faculty at a meeting and not previously announced in the meeting agenda shall be either tabled until the next meeting or vote on the motion by mail ballot with balloting to close no sooner than one week after the meeting when the motion was introduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3.1.4</td>
<td>These bylaws constitute primary rules of order for meetings of the Faculty and of the committees of the faculty. The order of business is that prescribed in chapter 4 of the bylaws of the Division. Questions of order not covered by these bylaws or those of the Division are covered by Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA3.1.4</td>
<td>These bylaws constitute primary rules of order for meetings of the Faculty and of the Standing Committees of the School of Business Administration. The order of business is that prescribed in Chapter 4 of the bylaws of the Division. Questions of order not covered by these bylaws or those of the Division are covered by The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure (4th Edition).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### M3.1.5
The minutes of every meeting of the Faculty shall be sent within ten days by the secretary to every member of the faculty.

### SOBA3.1.5
The minutes of every meeting of the Faculty, the Executive Committee and every School of Business Administration Standing Committee shall be sent to every member of the Faculty within ten business days after the meeting.

#### M4 Committees

**M4.1** There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of five voting members and up to two non-voting members. The voting members shall be the elected Chair of the Faculty, the Dean of the school, and three elected members of the Faculty to be distributed as follows: one member elected from each of the departments. The Chairs of the undergraduate Business Administration and Master of Business Administration programs shall be non-voting members of the Executive Committee unless, in either or both cases, he/she is an elected member.  
(Am 25 Jan 79)(Am 27 May 93)(Am 30 May 06)

**M4.1.1** The election is held as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division. For purposes of these elections, members of the Executive Committee are considered Officers of the Faculty of the School. Members of the Executive Committee take office on the first day of September following their election, or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election.  
(Am 30 May 06)

#### SOBA4 Committees

**SOBA4.1** There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair of the Faculty, the Dean of the School, and the elected members of the Faculty as provided in SOBA4.1.1, as voting members, and the associate Dean(s) of the School as ex officio members unless he/she is an elected member. An elected member is not eligible for immediate reelection unless he/she has completed a term of fewer than 18 months. Eligibility is reestablished after one year of non-service. The Chair, vice Chair, and secretary of the Faculty occupy corresponding offices in the Executive Committee. The Vice Chair and Secretary are elected by the Executive Committee from the existing elected Faculty members of the Executive Committee whenever a vacancy arises.

**SOBA4.1.1** The elected membership of the committee shall include one member chosen from each designated academic area in the School. The five currently designated academic areas are Accounting and Information Systems, Finance, Management Science, Marketing, and Management. The election is conducted as provided in Chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Division. The first order of business of the Executive Committee, after the election of the Chair of the Faculty, will be to determine whether the representation formula needs change and to recommend appropriately to the Faculty.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M4.1.1.1</th>
<th>The term of office of members of the Executive Committee is two years.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.1.1.1</td>
<td>The term of office of members of the Executive Committee is two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2</td>
<td>The Executive Committee has the following functions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.1.2</td>
<td>The Executive Committee has the following functions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.1</td>
<td>The Executive Committee has general oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the school and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the committee deems advisable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.1.2.1</td>
<td>The Executive Committee has general oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the school and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the committee deems advisable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.2</td>
<td>The Executive Committee appoints all other standing committees and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.1.2.2</td>
<td>The Executive Committee appoints all other standing committees and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.3</td>
<td>The Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to students of the school in all cases which do not involve the suspension of regulations or that involve only minor adjustments in the curricula and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The committee will report all degrees approved to the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.1.2.3</td>
<td>The Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to students of the school, and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The committee will report all degrees approved to the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.4</td>
<td>The Executive Committee makes recommendations to the Faculty regarding the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of curricula, fields of interest, majors and minors within the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.5</td>
<td>The Executive Committee acts for the Faculty in making recommendations to the Division regarding courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.6</td>
<td>The Executive Committee reviews and makes recommendations to the Dean of the Graduate School of Management regarding proposals for the establishment of new departments or modifications of existing departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.7</td>
<td>The Executive Committee establishes and maintains liaison with the Executive Committees of the other colleges and schools in the Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.1.2.8</td>
<td>The Executive Committee assists the Dean on his/her request in matters relating to the administration of the Graduate School of Management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M4.2 The Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program will be guided by a committee consisting of the program Chair selected from the Faculty of the Graduate School of Management and five Faculty members, of whom at least one each shall have appointment in the Departments of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology, and at least one shall have appointment in the Graduate School of Management. The Deans of the Graduate School of Management and of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences will be ex officio members of the committee. (En 5 May 77) | SOBA4.2 The School of Business Administration academic programs shall be guided by two Standing Committees, one for masters’ level graduate programs and one for the undergraduate programs. The master’s level Programs Chair will be selected from the Faculty of the School of Business Administration. The undergraduate Academic Programs Chair will be selected from the Faculty of the School of Business Administration. The Dean of the School of Business Administration will be an ex officio member of the committees. |
<p>| M4.2.1 | The members of the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program Committee will be appointed by both Executive Committees. (En 5 May 77) |
| M4.2.2 | The Chair of the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program Committee will be appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School of Management after consultation with the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program Committee and approved by the two Executive Committees. (Am 8 Jun 78) |
| M4.2.2.1 | The term of office of the Chair of Business Administration/Administrative Studies is two years (En 5 May 77) |
| M4.2.3 | Changes or revisions in the Business Administration/Administrative Studies curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committees of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and the Graduate School of Management. (En 5 May 77) |
| SOBA4.2.1 | The members of the School of Business Administration academic programs committees will be appointed by the Executive Committee and shall have representation in all academic areas as defined in 4.1.1. |
| SOBA4.2.2 | The chairs of the master’s level Academic Programs Committee and the Chair of the undergraduate Administration Academic Programs Committee will be appointed by the Dean of the School of Business Administration and approved by the Executive Committee. |
| SOBA4.2.2.1 | The term of office of the master’s level Academic Programs Committee is two years. The term of office undergraduate Academic Programs Committee is two years. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.2.2</td>
<td>Changes or revisions in the masters level graduate programs curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committee. Changes or revisions in the undergraduate programs curriculum, including proposals for new courses or deletion of existing courses, must be approved by the Executive Committee. (Suggestion was made that all new programs be approved by the faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA4.3</td>
<td>The Executive Committee may appoint additional committees as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4.2.4</td>
<td>Changes in the bylaws or regulations of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, which affect general degree requirements within the college, will automatically apply to degree requirements within the Business Administration/Administrative Studies Program. (Am 8 Jun 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>Revisions and Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5.1</td>
<td>These bylaws and regulations can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Division. (En 24 Apr 75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA5</td>
<td>Revisions and Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA5.1</td>
<td>These bylaws and regulations can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Division.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUSTIFICATION:

These proposed bylaws have been in revision by the school’s faculty for the past two academic years, and are now being proposed to be compatible with the school’s needs as well as with the numerous changes in organizational structure that have taken place over the past 3 years.

Approved by the Executive Committee of SoBA: 10/21/2010

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11/29/2010

Reviewed by the Executive Council:
Academic Senate Graduate Students Travel and Research Awards

Eligibility: Earle C. Anthony Travel and Research funds are available for graduate students in the biological, physical, agricultural, engineering, mathematics, and health sciences and interdisciplinary approaches to these fields, to obtain a scientific education or to pursue scientific research or experiments. Graduate students who are enrolled and have advanced to candidacy, and meet the eligibility requirements, may apply for travel and research awards offered by the Riverside Academic Senate.

Earle C. Anthony Travel Award

The Academic Senate-Earle C. Anthony (AS-ECA) Travel Award provides up to $1,000 for Ph.D. students who have advanced to candidacy to present at professional conferences. Funds may be used for transportation (airfare, train ticket, etc.) and registration fees (excluding meals). Other travel expenses, such as lodging, meals, and parking, are not eligible. Participation in the meeting should be directly relevant to the applicant's research and beneficial to his/her future career. Each student may receive only one travel award as a degree candidate. For the first year, 3 – 5 proposals will be awarded. The total number of travel awards per year is based on the availability of funds. Applications are accepted year-round, however funds are limited and students are advised to apply as early as possible.

Earle C. Anthony Student Research Awards

The Earle C. Anthony Student Research Award (ECASRA) is available to registered Ph.D. students who have advanced to candidacy and are conducting research for their dissertation. Funds are awarded based on scholarly merit, originality and significance of the research. Funds are awarded based on the project budget submitted, up to a maximum of $2,000 over a one-year period. For the first year, 3 – 5 proposals will be awarded. The total number of awards per year is based on the availability of funds.

Eligibility Requirements:

- Registered Ph.D. students who have advanced to candidacy (summer travel is eligible if applicant intends to enroll in the upcoming Fall quarter)
- In good academic standing with no outstanding fee balance
- Presenting a paper or poster at a professional meeting
- Students with fellowships providing a research budget or education allowance must expend those funds completely to be eligible for these awards
- Students should seek support from Research Advisors, Principal Investigators, Graduate Programs, and Schools before applying for the Academic Senate’s travel and research awards

Allowable Expenses: Transportation and Registration Fees only.

Application Deadline: At least 10 business days in advance of the proposed departure date.
Application Procedure:

• Application Form
• Confirmation of participation in the meeting (i.e. acceptance of paper or poster)
• Conference announcement listing official dates, location and fees
• All proof of payment (registration, airfare)

Award Payments: Academic Senate-ECA Travel Awards are paid as reimbursements of actual expenses incurred by awardees for approved expenses. Awardees are required to provide the Graduate Division with original documentation of expenses within 10 days of the conclusion of their trips:

• Proof-of-payment of registration fees (credit card statement in the applicant's name or verification from conference that payment has been received and processed)
• Proof-of-payment of airfare (EXACT COST) or other travel costs. E-tickets are acceptable as long as they show that the applicant's credit card has been charged. Note: Travel must be conducted in the least expensive and most direct way possible
• ORIGINAL boarding pass stubs as proof of completed travel
EARLE C. ANTHONY TRAVEL AWARD APPLICATION

Student Name: ___________________________ SS# ___________________________

Address: __________________________________________________________________

Email: ___________________________ Phone: ___________________________

Program: ___________________________ Date Advanced to Candidacy: ________

Proposed Title of Dissertation: ____________________________________________

Name of Meeting: _________________________________________________________

Dates: ___________________________ Location: ___________________________

Have you had a paper or other presentation accepted for the program of the meeting? _____________

Title of paper or presentation: _____________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Exact expenses: Registration Fee (excluding meals): __________________________

Round Trip Transportation: ___________________________

(airfare, train, bus, or car, etc. - Exact cost excluding ground transportation)

TOTAL: ___________________________

**Attach copy of invitation to present, proof of payment of registration fee, and proof of payment of airfare**

Other Sources of Support:

Dept/Source: ___________________________ Amount: _________

Dept/Source: ___________________________ Amount: _________

__________________________________________________________________________

Phone: _____________

Research Advisor or Program Director Name (Print)

__________________________________________________________________________

Date: _____________

Research Advisor or Program Director Signature

__________________________________________________________________________

Date: _____________

Student Signature

Submit form and supporting documents to:

UC RIVERSIDE, 900 UNIVERSITY AVE, 231 UOB, RIVERSIDE, CA 92521

Academic Senate Approval:

Amount: ___________ Signature: ___________________________ Letter Sent: ___________
FUND NAME: ANTHONY, Earle C. Fund

Allocation by The Regents, July 12, 1974

Location: One-half of the annual income to the Berkeley Campus, and one-half to University-wide (excluding Berkeley)

Purpose:

1. One-half of the annual income to be assigned to the Berkeley campus, so much thereof as may be needed as determined by the Chancellor to be used for loans to students who have graduated from the Berkeley campus and who show special aptitude, to enable them to pursue further and advanced studies or experiments at institutions engaged in the development of the sciences of or related to electronics, engineering, or chemistry related to nuclear fission, and the remainder to be used to aid graduate students or other personnel of the University in the biological, physical, agricultural, and health sciences (except for interns and residents) engineering, and mathematics to obtain a scientific education or to pursue scientific research or experiments;

2. The remaining one-half of the annual income to be distributed among all of the University’s other campuses upon the basis of a biological, physical, agricultural, and health sciences (except for interns and residents), engineering, and mathematics to aid graduate students or other personnel of the University in those fields to obtain scientific education or to pursue scientific research or experiments, provided, however, that during an initial three-year period, no campus shall receive less than $10,000 or the 1973-74 allocation, whichever is greater;

3. Not more than 20 percent of the funds allocated under provisions 1 and 2 above (except for loans) to be used for faculty research grants;

4. The name of Earle C. Anthony to be included in the designation of all forms of aid (e.g., loans, fellowships, awards) provided from proceeds of the Earle C. Anthony Funds; and

5. These revised terms to be reviewed not later than three years from the date on which income is assigned for fiscal year 1974-75.

Type of Fund Fund functioning as endowment.
Hello Kambiz, Chair of the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (cc Parker, Gauvain, Palmer):

As Secretary Parliamentarian of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, I have a question that has come up in some of our CNAS Executive Committee meetings and related discussions, for which I hereby request the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to provide a ruling.

We have noticed that there are inconsistencies in the routing of curricular and related legislative items through the Executive Council as part of the process of developing Division Agendas. While routing through Executive Council for approval is clearly procedurally correct for items that require action on behalf of the Division (7IIN through 7IIS), there were also several items on the 30 November 2010 Division Agenda that contained within the approval lines what appear to be unauthorized actions by the Executive Council. Furthermore, during the prior two years the dates of immediate precedents to Executive Council actions ("requests from Faculty bodies") sometimes were within thirty days of the Division meeting. From Division Bylaw 8.5 (pasted below) it appears that there are two procedural issues to address:

1) According to Bylaw 8.5.2 "The Executive Council has only the powers enumerated by these bylaws". The powers that are listed do not include endorsement, review or receipt of agenda items related to matters of curriculum or related legislation that proceed in a timely manner through the paths mandated by Division Bylaws 9, 10 and 6. Furthermore, Division Bylaws 9, 10 and 6 do not state any necessary involvement of the Executive Council for curricular or related legislative matters. Therefore, passage of such matters through the Executive Council seems to be both unnecessary in relation to Bylaws 9, 10 and 6 and contrary to the limitations of power imposed by Bylaw 8.5.2. Examples of apparently unauthorized Executive Council actions on the 30 November Agenda were 10A ("endorsed by"), 10B ("endorsed by"), 10C ("received by"), 10D ("reviewed by"), 10G ("modifications endorsed by"), 10H ("endorsed by").

2) According to Bylaw 8.5.3, it seems that any request for Executive Council action which is made less than 30 days prior to the next Division meeting cannot be acted upon by the Executive Council (though the wording of 8.5.3 could be improved to address the period between publication of the Agenda and the date of the Division meeting). There were no breaches of this prohibition period on the 30 November Agenda, but in prior years such breaches occasionally occurred. We hope that the operating procedure of the current Executive Council will continue to conform to the prohibition of late action defined by Bylaw 8.5.3.

Our basic question is whether or not the Executive Council is empowered to take action (endorse, not endorse, etc.) curricular or related legislation matters that proceed according to Bylaws 9, 10 and 6 in a manner such that the Executive Council has not been "requested by the Faculty of a school or college and with the advice of the appropriate Divisional
committees to act upon a course, curriculum or legislation." The issue of prohibitive period defined by 8.5.3 is a somewhat peripheral, though potentially related, question.

I suggest that the standard operating procedure of Executive Council should be reviewed and, if necessary, adjusted to conform fully to Bylaw 8.5. Such adjustments could potentially reduce the time burden on Executive Council members by restricting the usual Executive Council agendas to matters that are within the jurisdiction of Executive Council, while also helping to clear up and avoid misunderstandings about the approval process for ongoing and future curricular matters.

If a formal letter on UC letterhead is required, please let me know, otherwise I hope this email method of requesting a ruling on the limit of power of Executive Council will suffice.

Thanks.

Timothy J. Close
CNAS Secretary Parliamentarian

8.5 Executive Council (Am 20 Nov 07)

8.5.1 This committee consists of the Chair of the Division, who is also Chair of this committee, the Vice Chair, the Secretary-Parliamentarian, the senior representative to the Assembly, the Chairs of the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology, Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Committees, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Graduate Council, the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Physical Resources Planning, the Committee on Research, the Undergraduate Council, the Committee on Preparatory Education, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity and the Executive Committees of the colleges and schools at Riverside. (Am 8 Jun 78)(Am 5 Nov 87)(Am 27 May 93)(Am 9 Feb 95)(Am 29 May 97)(Am 5 Feb 98) (Am 21 Feb 06)(Am 30 May 06)

8.5.2 The Executive Council has only the powers enumerated in these bylaws. It advises the Chancellor of the Riverside campus, and it advises the Chair of the Division in his/her exercise of responsibility to coordinate the work of all standing and special committees of the Division, to submit the budget for the work of the Division, and to prepare the annual report of the work of the Division office. It further advises the Division’s representatives to the Assembly and to Senate committees.(Am 20 Nov 07)

8.5.3 At the request of the Faculty of a school or college and with the advice of the appropriate Divisional committees, this committee may act upon courses, curricula, and legislation. However, it shall not act if the matter can be included in the agenda of a regular Divisional meeting to be held within thirty calendar days from the time of the request. Each such Executive Council action must be reported to the Division at the next regular meeting.(Am 20 Nov 07)
AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Senate Officers’ Announcements <em>(10:00 – 10:10 am)</em></td>
<td>1 (p. 4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair</td>
<td>2 (p. 6-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Report on the December 13 Regents’ meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Rebenching committee appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Approval of the Agenda <em>(10:10 – 10:15 am)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Approval of today’s agenda items and priority.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Action requested: Approve the agenda.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Consent Calendar <em>(10:10 – 10:15 am)</em></td>
<td>3 (p. 8-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Approval of the November draft minutes</td>
<td>4 (p. 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. UCEP resolution on general education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Action requested: Approve the consent calendar</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/Action</td>
<td>Salary scales <em>(10:15 – 11:00 am)</em>—At its meeting on December 1, the Academic Assembly approved a motion to postpone the Council resolutions on faculty salaries, and referred them back to Council in view of ongoing budgetary developments and the discussion held at Assembly.</td>
<td>5 (p. 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Daniel Simmons, Academic Council Chair</td>
<td>6 (p. 17-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Action requested: Adopt a recommendation to President Yudof on salary increases</td>
<td>7 (p. 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Consultation with the Office of the President – Senior Managers <em>(11:00 am – 1:00 pm)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Mark Yudof, President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Lawrence Pitts, Provost and Executive Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>General Discussion <em>(1:00 – 1:30 pm)</em>—Council members will discuss items of interest emerging from the consultation with Senior Managers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/</td>
<td>Task Force for Implementation of the Powell Committee Report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Action (1:30 – 2:00 pm)—At its November meeting, Council requested that members of the subset of Council who participate in monthly budget teleconferences convened by Provost Pitts join together to draft a charge for a task force of Council. The charge should be to examine the report of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC and assess the fiscal impact of its recommendations based on data to be supplied by the administration. The task force will be constituted by the Senate members of the Provost’s Budget Group.

Action requested: Endorse the draft charge establishing the Academic Council Task Force for Implementation of the Powell Committee report.

Discussion VIII. Presentation on UCLA’s “Challenge 45” (2:00 – 2:30 pm)—UCLA divisional chair Ann Karagozian will make a presentation on “Challenge 45,” UCLA’s initiative to reduce the number of units required for undergraduate majors.

Action requested: Determine next steps

Discussion/Action IX. Oversight of ANR (2:30 – 3:00 pm)—UCPB has submitted a resolution to establish a Senate Special Committee for oversight of ANR, similar to ACSCOLI. A special committee would provide consistent oversight of ANR decisions that have an effect on academic programs.

Action requested: Endorse the resolution to establish a Special Committee on ANR

Discussion/Action X. BOARS Resolution on Individualized Review and Holistic Admission (3:00 – 3:30 pm)—BOARS has submitted a letter supporting President Yudof’s proposed resolution to the Regents on individualized review and holistic admission and asking him to strengthen language on outreach to achieve diversity goals.

Action requested: Endorse BOARS’ motion on individualized review and holistic evaluation.

Information XI. Negotiations with Nature Publishing Group (3:30 – 4:00 pm)—UC is currently renegotiating its journal license with the Nature
Publishing Group. In conjunction with these negotiations, UC and NPG are discussing an entirely new model which UCOLASC’s Chair, Rich Schneider, will describe.

- Rich Schneider, UCOLASC Chair

Discussion XII. New Business (4:00 – 4:30 pm)

AGENDA ENCLOSURES:
1. Letter from President Yudof to Chair Simmons thanking him for Senate input on Post-Employment Benefits (p. 4-5), 2 pgs.
2. Letter from Provost Pitts to Senate faculty encouraging letters of intent for the online pilot project (p. 6-7), 2 pgs
3. Draft November Council minutes (p. 8-14), 7 pgs.
4. UCEP resolution on general education (p. 15), 1 pg.
5. Council resolutions of September 29 and October 27, 2010 on restoring the salary scales (p. 16), 1 pg.
6. Draft notes of the December 1 Assembly discussion of resolution on faculty salaries (p. 17-18), 2 pgs.
7. Text of APM 620-18, Adjustment of off-scale salaries (p. 19), 1 pg.
8. Resolution to establish a Senate Special Committee on ANR (p. 20), 1 pg.
9. President’s recommendation to the Regents on individualized review and holistic admissions (p. 21-22), 2 pgs.
10. BOARS’ resolution on individualized review and holistic admissions (p. 23), 1 pg.

Meeting Arrangements

Location
The meeting is in Classroom 2 of the CSU Oakland Professional Development & Conference Center, 1000 Broadway, Oakland. Access the building on 11th Street between Broadway and Franklin Streets.

Parking
Parking is available under the Franklin Street building on the 12th Street side. The rate is $11 per day if you enter the parking structure before 9 a.m. Daily parking is also available at several lots and garages within the vicinity of the Franklin Street Building. Hourly parking is also available at: AMCO system Parking (Broadway & 11th); Douglas Parking (Broadway & 12th); Allright Parking (Franklin & 12th); and Merchant’s Parking (Franklin & 14th).

BART
If taking BART, get off at the 12th Street station and take the stairs or escalator to the 11th Street exit.

Travel Expenses
To arrange travel, please see the 2010-11 Senate Travel Policies and Procedures at:
http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregs_2010-11_booking.pdf

For reimbursement policies and procedures, please refer to:

Request for reimbursement of meeting expenses should be submitted with a local campus travel expense voucher or the Systemwide Academic Senate travel expense voucher at:

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/tev.xls

Please submit completed and signed travel voucher with original receipts to:

Business Resource Center - Team Blue
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street 9th floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Account/Fund Number: M-430384-19900-3