November 4, 2010

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, November 8, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, November 8, 2010 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>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of the November 8, 2010 Agenda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and October 25, 2010 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest Statement – CODEO</td>
<td>2 (pp. 8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information 1:10 – 1:40

II. Issues under review – Items currently under review

Action/Information 1:40 – 2:00

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

III. 1. Update Academic Council Meeting held on 10-27-2010
2. Update on Chancellor’s Leadership Retreat 11-1-2010 to 11-2-2010

Information 1:40 – 2:00

3. Departmental Visits

Action/Information 2:00 – 2:10

IV. PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.8.2.1 – COMMITTEE ON COURSES:
Review and endorse

Action/Information 2:10 – 2:20

V. PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.27.2 – COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED CAMPUS SERVICE
Review and endorse

Action/Information 2:20 – 2:30

VI. PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.8.8 – COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
Review and endorse

Action/Information 2:30 – 2:40

VII. NEIL A. CAMPBELL LEARNING LABORATORY:
Discuss the naming request from Dean Thomas Baldwin, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

Action/Information 2:40 – 2:45

VIII. REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY
Formal response due at Council on – 11-10-10
Action – review response to Academic Council – to be distributed at EC meeting

Action/Information 2:45 – 3:00

IX. OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS
PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
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)
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 R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
David S. Pion Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research
Erik Rolland (AGSM), AGSM Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)

ABSENT:
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative

AGENDA:
The agenda was unanimously approved as written. The minutes from the October 25, 2010 meeting were amended to include the word to in the 5th paragraph of page four to read as follows:

Finally, Chair Gauvain indicated that one of the things that is important for people to understand is that although the changes to PEB are often cast as only impacting individuals who are hired after 2013, the changes to PEB will affect everyone on the campus.

With this amendment, the minutes were approved unanimously.
The Conflict of Interest Statements for the Committees on Academic Freedom, Charges, Courses, Graduate Council, PRP, Preparatory Education, P&T, Scholarships and Honors, SOBA Executive Committee and Research were accepted as written.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
Chair Mary Gauvain discussed the Flow of Information Chart that was provided with the agenda. The Chart was inspired by a question raised by Prof. Thomas Morton, Junior Representative to the Assembly, regarding a proposal to rename fees as tuition that had come for review from the Systemwide Academic Senate. This request was routed to the appropriate Senate Committees after which the Divisional response was sent directly to Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons. The matter was never discussed at the EC. The purpose of the Flow Chart is to provide EC members with information about how reports from the Systemwide Senate, the campus Administration, or senate committees flow through the Senate. Also attached was a list of pending items for review, which will be included in every agenda packet to keep EC members up-to-date. If an EC member would like to discuss any item on the list of pending items at an EC meeting, they are welcome to bring it up at the meeting.

The Chair also made two other announcements that were not included in the agenda. First, she informed the EC that since their last meeting, at which time the campus Off-scale policy was discussed, she had met with VP David Bocian. The Chair told the VP that the EC would like an opportunity to meet with him regarding the Off-scale policy. VP Bocian will be scheduled to attend an EC meeting early in 2011.

The second announcement pertained to SoBA. Chair Gauvain said that at her regularly scheduled meeting with the EVC/P, the EVC/P indicated that they were completing their interviews with every staff and faculty member in the School. Once the interviews are done, the Chancellor and the EVC/P will make decisions about the School.

ATHLETICS AND DANCE – PROPOSED NAME FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION BUILDING:
The naming request from Stan Morrison, Director of Intercollegiate Athletics and Dean Stephen Cullenberg, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences was unanimously approved by the Executive Council.

REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW – POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS:
Chair Gauvain indicated that she had received several responses from Senate Committees regarding Post-Employment Benefits. She also distributed an email that she received early that morning from Academic Council Chair Simmons regarding President Yudof’s decision on the PEB, which indicated that the President will recommend to the Regents that they adopt a modified version of Option C with a consistent 2.5 percent age factor for all employees, an employer contribution of 8.1 percent of covered compensation, and an employee contribution of 7.0 percent. The total normal cost of the new-tier plan is 15.1%, which is slightly below the total normal cost of revisions to the CALPERS benefits included in the recent State budget. The new-tier benefits will apply to employees hired after July 1, 2013. The Chair indicated that this did not mean that the time spent by Committees in reviewing and responding to the proposed changes to PEB was unnecessary because there would be discussions on Wednesday the 27th at Council and with President Yudof about this issue. She stressed that what will be important in the discussions will be underlying principles of the PEB plan as well as the related issue of salary increases. While the
President’s decision was a very good step forward, without salary increases, overall remuneration would remain uncompetitive. Chair Gauvain indicated that the committee responses and the EC discussion would provide talking points for her to use at the upcoming Council meeting.

After discussions, the EC decided that the following should be included on the PEB response to Systemwide.

Options A, B, and C:
- Of the proposed three options, there was unanimous support for Option C.
- Options A and B were deemed unacceptable. The fact that both are integrated with Social Security benefits in a non-obvious way makes them difficult to understand and hard for members of the retirement plan to predict their benefits at retirement – and therefore make sound decisions as to when to retire.
- Option C was preferred. It is not integrated with Social Security and, therefore, it is easier to implement and less exposed to any risks associated with Social Security.

Option to stay in the current plan:
- A 7% cap for employee contributions is strongly recommended for any current employees who choose to stay in the current retirement plan.
- More information about the choice to stay in the current plan is needed. The lack of detailed information about staying in the current plan makes it difficult for vested employees to evaluate fully the pending changes. It is important that this information be made available as soon as possible.

Competitiveness of Total Remuneration:
- The erosion of retirement benefits and increased employee contributions endanger the quality of UC by decreasing the competitiveness of total remuneration for faculty and staff.
- Given the pending changes to PEB, the only way to maintain the quality of UC is to raise faculty and staff salaries to competitive levels over the next three years before any changes to PEB are implemented.

REQUEST FOR SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY
Chair Gauvain indicated that she had received very thoughtful committee responses regarding the document that came from Academic Council. The following issues were discussed:

1. Downsizing – It was apparent in the committee reports that there was concern about how our campus would juggle plans for growth in the context of downsizing the university. Most committee reports also wanted to know how downsizing would be implemented. Would it be specific to each campus? Would the whole system have the same downsizing approach and expectations or would some campuses be expected to downsize more than others?
2. Some EC members felt that a Systemwide downsizing plan that treated campuses similarly would be better for developing and smaller campuses. They also felt that if downsizing is done differentially across the campuses that it will be very difficult to implement.
3. EC members were concerned about the elimination of “moribund” programs as referenced in the document. Who determines what program is moribund? Also in regards to closing down programs, some EC members felt that this could possibly have an adverse effect on
student diversity. UCR has traditionally had a student body whose mean family income is lower than that of students on other campuses. Downsizing by way of closing programs may have a major impact on these students who often choose campuses close by to their family homes. If the nearest UC campus does not offer a full palate of majors, these students may not seek a UC education.

4. A member indicated that major area specializations for particular campuses would be detrimental for students who are the first in their family to attend college, which is the case for many UCR students. Such first-generation college students often do not know what they want to study before they enter college; by offering a full range of college majors, these students are better served.

5. EC members stressed that any downsizing efforts need to take into consideration the undergraduate enrollment, graduate enrollment, and faculty hiring plans outlined in the Strategic Plan.

6. It was pointed out that UCR has as a campus been disadvantaged by the formulas used at Systemwide to allocate funding. We should insist that those formulas be examined so that such disadvantages are reduced or eliminated.

7. As a final point, it was noted that to achieve AAU status, UCR will need to hire more faculty and that this aspiration seems contradictory to downsizing the university.

Chair Gauvain indicated that she would assemble what was discussed and that the draft response will be available for the November 8, 2010 meeting.

With regards to a question raised by an EC member regarding the formation of a Campus Size and Shape Committee, Chair Gauvain indicated that she will do some research on this and report back at the next meeting

**OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

**Prof. Christine Gailey, Chair, Committee on Committees**
Committee on Committees will be addressing the issue of bylaw changes to allow for language to remove committee members who are not participating in or attending committee meetings. Chair Gauvain added that this is important because the Senate needs to be able to conduct its business efficiently and effectively, as well as reap the benefits of representation from across the campus. She added that committee business should never be delayed due to lack of a quorum for a vote; such situations make the Senate appear ineffective.

**Prof. Morris Maduro, Chair, Graduate Council**
Prof. Maduro informed the EC that the Graduate Council has approved a proposal to remove the approval of new courses and course changes out of the Graduate Council as a routine business matter.

**Prof. David Herzberger, Chair, CHASS Executive Committee**
CHASS Executive Committee is working on placing a moratorium on the Interdisciplinary Studies major because they are working on disestablishing the program.
**Prof. David Parker, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee**

Prof. Parker indicated that the CNAS Executive Committee recently received a regulation change regarding grade delay and was concerned over the time it would take to review it if it went out to the entire faculty. Prof. Daniel Ozer, the Parliamentarian, clarified that curriculum issues are voted on by the entire faculty whereas a change in regulation requires action only at the Executive Committee. The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction is currently reviewing the matter in question.

**Prof. Erik Rolland, Chair, AGSM Executive Committee**

Prof. Rolland informed the EC that AGSM is changing the School’s Bylaws and that these changes will be sent to the Senate for review soon. The School is also cutting down enrollment in its undergraduate program and trying to increase internal funding by developing programs that generate revenue. On this latter point, the School has forwarded a proposal for a new MBA program for people who are fully employed that will be taught in the evenings and weekends.

**Prof. Steven Clark, Chair, Undergraduate Admissions**

Prof. Clark said that the Undergraduate Admissions Committee has been working hard to develop a proposal to change the comprehensive review process for admitting undergraduate students. This has been motivated by over-enrollment over the last couple of years and the change in the eligibility construct of the UC. In particular Eligibility in the Local Context will expand from the top 4% of the graduating high school class to include the top 9%. This change will be implemented in fall 2012 and, therefore, our revised comprehensive review procedure needs to be in place by then. He stated that the proposal will need to be voted on at the February 15, 2011 Division Meeting and, therefore, they need to get the proposal out to the College Executive Committees as well as Educational Policy and other committees as soon as possible. He would like to organize a meeting between the Chairs of the Executive Committees, the Associate Deans, and the Chair of Educational Policy to devise a plan to move the proposal forward.

**Prof. Daniel Hare, Chair, Faculty Welfare**

Prof. Hare said that open enrollment for employees benefits was going to start soon. There are concerns about changes in healthcare providers, but these changes pertain to other regions and do not affect UCR. He added that if anyone has issues that they need Prof. Hare to take back to the Systemwide FW Committee that he would like to know about them.

**Prof. Ameae Walker, Vice Chair**

Vice Chair Ameae Walker inquired whether the Division meetings can be organized in a way that would be more attractive to faculty as a way to get more people to attend. Prof. Ozer indicated that there is no requirement that information included in the agenda has to be read as part of a script and that a lot of this information can be dispensed with at the meeting. The Chair and Vice Chair plan to work with Prof. Ozer, the Secretary/Parliamentarian on this idea.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sellyna Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Office of the Academic Senate*
October 25, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: M. MARTINS-GREEN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2010-2011

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

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


Dear Mark:

I attach a resolution adopted by the Academic Council at its meeting on October 27, 2010, commenting on the recommendations of the Post Employment Benefits Task Force. Although the Council is aware of your recommendation supporting a modified Option C, it constructed its resolution to memorialize its opinion of the Task Force recommendations following the extensive review of the Task Force options conducted on each of the campuses and by the standing committees of the Senate. I will transmit the comments received in November. I anticipate that the Council also will adopt a formal resolution regarding your recommendations at its November meeting for communication to the Regents as part of their December deliberations on the Task Force recommendations. This process will give Senate agencies a brief opportunity to directly consider your modifications to the originally proposed options.

The resolution of the Council stresses the need for a plan to implement competitive compensation for faculty and staff in light of increased contributions and benefit reductions, indicates that cost to current employees for continuing plan benefits should not exceed 7 percent of covered compensation, supports the recommendations of the Finance Work Team to fund the annual required contribution to UCRP, favors Option C, rejects Option A and B and integrated plans in general, recommends against separating faculty and staff in separate plans with either lower employer normal cost or lower age factors, and recommends the provision of adequate inflation protection for retirees.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Simmons, Chair
Academic Council

Encl (1)
Copy: Academic Council
    Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
    Lawrence Pitts, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
    Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice Provost, Business Operations
    Peter Taylor, Chief Financial Officer
    Randy Scott, Executive Director, Talent Management & Staff Development
    Gary Schlingem, Director, Pension and Retirement Programs, Human Resources
A RESOLUTION OF THE UC ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RESPONDING TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE

PRESIDENT’S POST EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS TASK FORCE

Adopted October 27, 2010

Whereas:

• Agencies of the Academic Senate have carefully reviewed the recommendations of the Post Employment Benefits Task Force Report;
• Senate agencies have reached a substantial consensus on almost all aspects of the PEB Task Force recommendations;
• A competitive pension plan that allows employees a comfortable, secure retirement is a crucial element of the University’s benefit structure;
• Adequate protection against the erosion of purchasing power by inflation is an essential aspect of retirement security;
• Retirement benefits are a significant component of each employee’s total remuneration;
• The University cannot recruit or retain an excellent workforce without competitive retirement benefits;
• Current cash compensation is seriously uncompetitive across almost all groups of University employees;
• A pension plan’s provisions must be clear enough so that employees can make informed choices in their retirement planning;
• The University’s practice of providing identical retirement benefits to faculty and staff has made a substantial contribution to employee morale, recruitment and retention;
• Benefits accrued to date within UCRP cannot be reduced, and the University must eliminate the unfunded liability within UCRP over time;
• The choice among the three Options makes little or no difference to the cost of UCRP to the University’s operating budget for the next twenty years, and a modest difference after twenty years; and
• Although President Yudof has announced a decision recommending a modified Option C, the Academic Council wishes to provide a complete response to the report of the President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits;
Be it Resolved that:

- The Academic Council advises that increased employee contributions to UCRP require implementation of a plan for competitive faculty and staff salaries, with the understanding that prior to the implementation of benefit reductions or increases in employee contributions, there shall be offsetting or larger increases in cash compensation;
- The Academic Council opposes an employee contribution in excess of 7% for current employees who stay under the current plan terms;
- The Academic Council supports the recommendation of the Finance Work Team to quickly fund the Annual Required Contribution, using STIP borrowing and other appropriate means, to manage the negative impact on the operating budget of the amortization of the unfunded liability;
- The Academic Council supports Option C as the superior design for a new tier benefit plan for new employees;
- The Academic Council opposes Option A, on the grounds that it is severely uncompetitive across essentially all employee groups;
- The Academic Council recommends against adoption of any pension design integrated with Social Security, despite the theoretical merit of such plans in providing level income replacement, because the complexity of the plans and the uncertainty about the future evolution of Social Security prevents employees from making informed choices in their retirement planning; thus, the Council recommends against Options A and B;
- The Academic Council recommends against separating staff from faculty, in a plan with a lower employer normal cost, because of the risk to employee morale, and because there is no competitive justification for providing a lesser pension benefit to staff;
- The Academic Council recommends against separating staff from faculty, in a plan with lower age factors, because of the risk to employee morale, and because staff have clearly expressed a desire to have higher retirement benefits, with the cost born by higher employee contributions; and
- The Academic Council’s support of a new tier pension plan is contingent on the provision of adequate inflation protection to retirees, either by adopting the reduced annual COLA and guaranteed ad hoc COLA provisions specified in Option C, or by retaining the full guaranteed annual and nonguaranteed ad hoc COLA provisions currently in UCRP.
To be adopted:

**Proposed change in Bylaw 8.8.2.1 -- Committee on Courses**

**Present:**

8.10 Courses

8.10.1 This committee consists of a minimum of seven members, normally with at least one member representing each of the areas: humanities, social sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences, and each of the colleges/schools. One member of the Committee on Courses is also a member of the Committee on Educational Policy. (Am 22 May 86)(Am 25 May 95)

8.10.2 Subject to the provision of 8.10.3, the Committee has authority for final approval of all courses of the Riverside Division, except those courses in University Extension above the 200 series, giving due consideration to the findings of the Graduate Council, the Committee on University Extension, Executive Committees of the colleges and schools, and officers at Riverside. The committee will report its actions to the next regular meeting of the Division. (Am 28 May 81)

8.10.3 By a petition signed by any five voting members of the Division, all matters concerning the approval or disapproval of courses may be referred to the Division for final action. In conformity with Bylaw 6.1, the petition shall then be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the Division. Pending consideration by the Division, the filing of a petition shall not affect the status of any approved course. Nor shall the disapproval of any course by the Division affect the status of any approved course in which instruction is currently being offered. (En 28 May 81)

8.10.4 The committee shall, after consultation with the department(s) concerned, have the authority to delete any course which has not been offered for four consecutive years. (En 30 May 85)

**Proposed:**

8.10 Courses

8.10.1 This committee consists of a minimum of eight members, normally with at least one member representing each of the areas: humanities, social sciences, biological sciences, and physical sciences, and each of the colleges/schools. One member of the Committee on Courses is also a member of the Committee on Educational Policy. (Am 22 May 86)(Am 25 May 95)

8.10.2 Subject to the provision of 8.10.3, the Committee has authority for final approval of all courses of the Riverside Division, except those courses in University Extension above the 200 series, giving due consideration to the findings of the Graduate Council, the Committee on University Extension, Executive Committees of the colleges and schools, and officers at Riverside. **The Committee has authority for approval of associate-instructors for upper-division and graduate courses, and for instructors of University Extension courses numbered below 200.** The committee will report its actions to the next regular meeting of the Division. (Am 28 May 81)

8.10.3 By a petition signed by any five voting members of the Division, all matters concerning the approval or disapproval of courses may be referred to the Division for final action. In conformity with Bylaw 6.1, the petition shall then be placed on the agenda of the next meeting of the Division. Pending consideration by the Division, the filing of a petition shall not affect the status of any approved course. Nor shall the disapproval of any course by the Division affect the status of any approved course in which instruction is currently being offered. (En 28 May 81)

8.10.4 The committee shall, after consultation with the department(s) concerned, have the authority to delete any course which has not been offered for four consecutive years. (En 30 May 85)
JUSTIFICATION:

8.10.1
According to its by-laws, the Committee on Courses normally includes at least one member representing each UCR college or school. With the recent formation of the Division of Biomedical Sciences, it too should be represented on the Committee, thereby bringing its membership to a total of eight, rather than seven, members.

8.10.2
Assignment to conduct instruction in an upper division or graduate course or course section may not be made except with the approval of the Committee on Courses according to Statewide Regulation 750 of the Academic Senate; Statewide Regulation 800 addresses the approval of courses and instructors of Extension courses “in the case of lower division, "100" series upper division, and "200" series graduate courses bearing the prefixes "X," "XB," "XSF," etc., shall be endorsed by the Committee on Courses”. Therefore, we have included this change to more accurately describe the duties of this committee.

Approved by the Committee on Courses: 12/5/08 and 10/25/10

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 10/27/2010

Endorsed by the Executive Council -
To be adopted:

Present:

8.27.2 This committee nominates annually for election by the Division at its spring meeting, two members of the ladder rank faculty at UCR to receive this award, which is designed to recognize exceptional effort and achievement in service to the UCR Campus. These awards are presented by the Chancellor each year during the Commencement ceremonies.

Proposed:

8.27.2 This committee nominates annually for election by the Division at its spring meeting, one or more members of the ladder rank faculty at UCR to receive this award, which is designed to recognize exceptional effort and achievement in service to the UCR Campus. These awards are presented by the Chancellor each year during the Commencement ceremonies.

Statement of purpose and effect:
Effective July 1, 2010 the Administration reduced the number of Distinguished Campus Service awards given per year from two to one due to the budget. The wording was changed to “one or more” to address the Administration’s change and to allow for flexibility if the award is ever changed back to a two recipient award.

Events Management is the deciding body for the activities allowed at Commencement. After the first year, they deemed that Commencement is for student related awards only. Since then this award has been distributed at the Spring Division meeting. This language needs to be removed from the bylaw to avoid confusion or falsely promise recognition at Commencement.

Effective: upon approval
Approved by Committee on Distinguished Campus Service: – 10/21/2010

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: October 25, 2010

Endorsed by the Executive Council: – __________
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
Proposed change in Bylaw 8.8 -- Committee on Committees

REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 30, 2010

To be adopted:

Proposed:

8.8.8 Any Senate Committee may by a two-thirds vote, recommend to the Committee on Committees that it revoke a previously made appointment for inadequate participation. Prior to consideration of revoking an appointment, the Committee on Committees shall give notice to the appointee, including reasons for the proposed revocation. No one shall be dismissed unless he or she is afforded the opportunity to lay evidence before the Committee on Committees, in the presence of the Chair of the Senate and the Chair of the committee concerned. (En ---2010)

JUSTIFICATION:

• Timely accomplishment of committee business is crucial and lack of participation can jeopardize or subvert this.
• Lack of participation can create problems with a quorum when this is critical for committee operations.

Approved by the Committee on Committees: 10/26/10

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

Endorsed by the Executive Council:
October 28, 2010

Chair Gauvain
Academic Senate

RE: Campus Naming Committee – Room Naming Opportunity

Dear Mary:

As Chair Designee of the UCR Committee on Naming Campus Properties, Programs and Facilities, I am requesting the review and approval by the Academic Senate Executive Council for this naming opportunity.

- *Neil A. Campbell Learning Laboratory* is the proposed name for the Dynamic Genome Learning Facility located on the first floor of the University Laboratory Building. This naming opportunity has been recommended by the Dean, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Thomas Baldwin.

Please review the attached request and summary details. This proposed name needs approval by the Academic Senate before it is endorsed by the Campus Naming Committee. Please respond with your recommendation by Friday November 12th, 2010.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gretchen Bolar
Vice Chancellor

Attachments

xc: Vice Chancellor Hayashida
Dean Baldwin
Executive Director Ehlers
Assistant Dean Preble
Campus Space Manager Pippert
SUMMARY INFORMATION

UCR: NAMING CAMPUS PROPERTIES, ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, AND FACILITIES

Proposed Name: Neil A. Campbell Learning Laboratory
In the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

Building Background:
- Official Building Name: University Laboratory Building
- Building Name (12-byte): UNIV LAB BLD
- Capital Asset Account Number: P5263
- Building Basic Gross Square Feet: 13,355 gsf
- Room Numbers: 0101, 0102, 0103, 0104
- Room Assignable Square Feet: 3,645 sf

Description: Rochelle Campbell will be contributing $500,000 to a renovation project on the first floor of the University Laboratory Building for Dynamic Genome classes. In recognition of the Campbell gift, the renovated space will be named the Neil A. Campbell Learning Laboratory.

See attached Background Information.

Gift Amount: $500,000
Gift Agreement (bequest) executed: Payment expected December 31, 2010

Site Map:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
FOR
NEIL A. CAMPBELL LEARNING LABORATORY
UCR College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

INITIAL REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO NAME/ESTABLISH A PROPERTY, PROGRAM OR FACILITY
This form is to help review gifts for compliance with academic plans and priorities, and to facilitate campus review procedures for namings.

Upon completion of this request form, the Dean/Unit Head forwards it for signature to the Associate Vice Chancellor, Development and Vice Chancellor, University Advancement. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Development or designee will submit the request, with draft gift agreement and supporting documentation to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning & Budget for campus review. If approved for recommendation, the EVC&P’s Office follows the appropriate procedure for Naming of Properties, Programs and Facilities.

I. Background Information:
   A. Submitted by:
      Name: Thomas Baldwin
      Title, College/Unit: Dean, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
   B. Type of Gift and Comments:
      ➤ Property:
      ➤ Program:
      ➤ Facility/Building: University Laboratory Building
   C. Proposed name (if any, involving gift): Neil A. Campbell Learning Laboratory
   D. Honorary naming (no gift involved):
   E. Proposed use(s): Dynamic Genome classes

II. Academic Information: (please attach explanation)
   A. Academic Justification: Explain how the proposed gift or endowment fits into the College/Unit’s Academic Plan.

   In September 2010, Dr. Susan Wessler joined the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences as a Distinguished Professor of Genetics in the Department of Botany and Plant Sciences. To ready for her arrival and provide a dedicated teaching laboratory space for the innovative undergraduate teaching program she brings to UCR, the college began renovating current space on the first floor in the University Laboratory Building. An internationally-renowned plant biologist and member of the National Academy of Science, Dr. Wessler is revolutionizing science education. She brings to our college a laboratory-intensive learning program she initially developed while on faculty at the University of Georgia and as a prestigious Howard Hughes Medical Institute Professor. This program, which Dr. Wessler will continue strengthen at UCR, has already earned national acclaim. We anticipate that this program and classroom facility will become a training magnet for high school teachers and university professors across the globe.
   
   B. Resources: Describe the resources that will be necessary to support the proposed Property/Program/Facility (e.g., other funding.) Please refer to the College/Unit Academic Plan as appropriate.

   To be funded by the college. As of October 2010, the anticipated cost to renovate this space is $600,000 — with an additional $300,000 in auxiliary costs to
relocate faculty and their offices currently housed in this space, and to meet accessibility requirements.

II. Contribution Information:
A. Total amount of private funds expected to be committed (or being discussed):

Over the past year, the college has been actively seeking a $500,000 leadership gift in support of this high-impact project with the hope of naming the space in honor of the late Neil A. Campbell, a beloved alumnus of this university and celebrated author of the best-selling textbook, Biology. Pearson Education, the long time publisher of Biology, had been approached but declined this funding opportunity. On October 20, Dean Tom Baldwin and Assistant Dean of Development Holly Preble met with Dr. Campbell’s widow, Rochelle Campbell, to review new potential donors. During this meeting, Mrs. Campbell expressed great disappointment with Pearson and announced that she had decided to fund this leadership gift personally.

Upon receipt of this gift, we wish to name this space the Neil A. Campbell Learning Laboratory. Dr. Campbell graced our campus for many years with enthusiasm and dedication to the furtherance of the sciences, Mrs. Campbell sees this naming as a perfect acknowledgement of his legacy. Additional background about Dr. Campbell is attached.

B. Form of private contribution (s):

( ) Outright Gift
( ) Written Pledge (Expected beginning date: ____________ Fulfillment Date: ____________)

C. Initial contribution/pledge payment expected $500,000 by December 31, 2010.

D. Source(s) of private contribution(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor(s)</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochelle Campbell</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Will this gift/pledge be anonymous (donor requests no publicity)? ( ) Yes (X) No

It is the intent of the college to publicly celebrate any naming as a way to encourage other donors to give. Mrs. Campbell has expressed a wish that any celebration be modest.

IV. College/UCR/UC Commitment:
A. Will any additional college, campus-wide or system-wide resources be sought/required (e.g., space, special facilities, equipment, etc.)? How will they be funded? A donor sign will be placed on the external wall in front of the main entrance to the laboratory purchased and installed using funds from the donor’s gift.

B. If Property, Program or Facility, has consultation with appropriate campus/UC entities occurred?

The funding proposal for this naming was developed by the CNAS Assistant Dean of Development in collaboration with the Dean, Dr. Susan Wessler, and members of the college’s Space Planning Committee. Solicitation approval was cleared by the Associate Vice Chancellor for Development.
V. College/Unit/Faculty Consultation

This naming has been reviewed by and received approval from the Divisional Deans of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, the Chair of the Department of Botany and Plant Sciences, and Faculty associated with the named laboratory.

Submitted by:

Thomas O. Baldwin, Dean
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

Joel Munson, Associate Vice Chancellor, Development

Peter Hayashida, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement

Date

10/22/10
10/28/10
10/28/10
Background Information

Dr. Susan Wessler, a plant molecular geneticist, has dedicated her academic life to studying transposable elements, or “jumping genes,” which are found scattered through plant and animal genomes. Researchers have now come to realize that these transposable elements, short segments of DNA previously viewed as “junk,” play a vital role in evolution.

A graduate of Bronx High School of Science, Dr. Wessler earned her bachelor’s degree in 1974 in biology from the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and her Ph.D. in biochemistry from Cornell University in 1980. Following a postdoctoral fellowship at the Carnegie Institute of Washington in the Department of Embryology from 1980-1982, she joined the faculty at the University of Georgia as an assistant professor of botany. She became a full professor in 1992, a Distinguished Research Professor in 1994, Regents Professor in 2004, and the University of Georgia Foundation Chair in the Biological Sciences in 2008. In 2006 she was named a Howard Hughes Medical Institute Professor, and is currently a professor at large at the Keck Graduate Institute, one of the Claremont Colleges. In addition to her membership in the National Academy of Science, Sue Wessler is a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, a member of the Board of Directors of the Genetics Society of America, Associate Editor of The Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Genetics, and on the editorial boards of Science, BioMedCentral Evolutionary Biology, and Current Opinions in Plant Biology. Her appointment at UC Riverside begins September 2010.

During her groundbreaking career at the University of Georgia, Dr. Wessler’s laboratory was the first to demonstrate that transposon elements could function as introns, that miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements (MITEs) predominate in normal genes, and that plant retrotransposons are the major cause of spontaneous insertion mutations. In short, she unraveled some of the most persistent mysteries surrounding evolution and adaptation.

While at the University of Georgia, Dr. Wessler had an epiphany — rapid progress in modern biology was overwhelming students who had to absorb all this knowledge, often in very large lecture halls. The widening gulf between the optimism and enthusiasm in research laboratories and the frustration and lack of interest in undergraduate biology classrooms, prompted her to take action. From her almost 30 years of experience running a research laboratory, she realized that to understand and become energized about science one had to participate in the process of discovery.

The Wessler Laboratory at UC Riverside will continue to research how plant transposable elements contribute to gene and genome evolution, working with our most important crop plants like rice and maize, and using computational analysis of plant and animal genomes combined with traditional experimental approaches. Undergraduates will be intimately connected with this research through Dynamic Genome classes.
The CNAS Renovation Project will create the Dynamic Genome Learning Facility in the first floor of the University Laboratory Building, an existing building located directly across the street from the Genomics Building where Dr. Wessler’s research laboratory will be located. The design for the facility is modeled after the highly-regarded Dolan DNA Learning Center at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory in New York, the world-renowned research and education facility promoting DNA literacy. It will include the following functionalities:

- Two wet laboratories — each with a central island for demonstrations, six to eight staggered workspaces to accommodate four students each, lockable storage space, shelving, white boards, and wireless internet access;
- A computer laboratory with 28 computer stations, 24-28 Mac laptops, ActivBoard, white boards, and cabinets;
- Office space for faculty, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows; and,
- Laboratory support space.

Neil A. Campbell earned his doctorate in plant biology at UC Riverside in 1974, after which he taught at Pomona College, Cornell University, and San Bernardino Valley College before returning to the Riverside campus in 1989 to take an appointment as Visiting Scholar in the Department of Botany and Plant Sciences. As a specialist in biology education, he helped develop and evaluate new instructional media, continuing his research in desert and coastal plants.

His untimely death in 2004 came just after completing the manuscript for the seventh international edition of Biology, co-authored with Jane Reece and widely used in both high school and college-level classes. At the time, Pearson-Benjamin Cummings estimated that 67 percent of all U.S. biological scientists, physicians, biology teachers, and biotechnologists under the age of 37 had used Biology as their introductory text. He is also the author of three other textbooks for non-biology majors, and developed “Biology: Exploring Life,” as a program for high school students. His textbooks have been translated into eight languages and used by over six million students worldwide.

UC Riverside is honored to call Neil Campbell one of our own, and we recall with fondness his 2001 designation as Distinguished Alumnus, the highest award given by the UCR Alumni Association. He successfully established himself as an exceptional educator and a wonderful supporter of science education.

Legacy Naming. The College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences like to continue this tradition by linking his name with the Dynamic Genome Learning Facility where so much innovative science education will be continued. Naming a classroom on campus is a particularly meaningful and visible tribute to forever celebrate his life and accomplishments. He graced our campus with enthusiasm, overriding interest in young people, and dedication to the furtherance of the sciences.
April 16, 2010

To: David Herzberger, Chair  
CHASS Executive Committee

Jay Farrell, Chair  
BCOE Executive Committee

Erik Rolland, Chair  
AGSM Executive Committee

Ameae Walker, Chair  
Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee

Jose Wudka, Chair  
Educational Policy

John Cioffi, Chair  
Rules & Jurisdiction

George Haggerty, Chair  
ad hoc General Education Advisory Committee

From: Marylynn V. Yates  
Chair

RE: General Education Alternative Concentrations: proposed regulation

Attached is the text of a regulation being proposed by the CNAS Executive Committee for your review. The purpose of the regulation is to codify the pilot program on General Education Alternative Concentrations that was approved in May 2009. We intend to place this item on the agenda for the May 25, 2010 Academic Senate meeting. If you have any questions, please don’t hesitate to contact me at 2-2358 or by email at marylynn.yates@ucr.edu.

c: Cherie Pierce
To Be Adopted:

Proposed Change to Regulation 6.4: Campus Graduation Requirements

PRESENT:

R6.4.4 Concentration Option: Starting in Fall, 2009, the following concentrations are being offered as an alternative breadth requirement. (En 17 Feb 09 and 19 May 09)

Students who choose the concentration option, select one of the following concentrations:

A. California Concentration
   ENGL12B; AHS21; STAT40, MATH04 or MATH05 (12-13 units)
   Two of: BIO21, BIO31, GEO4 (8 units)
   ETST135 or ETST154 (4 units)
   HIST138 or HIST140 (4 units)
   POSC198I; HASS190 (8 units)
   Total units: 36-37

B. Climate Change/Sustainability
   GEO11 (4 units)
   Two of: ENSC2, BIO3, GEO2, PHY18 (8)
   Two of: ENGL12B, AHS21, CPLT25 (8)
   STAT40, MATH04 OR MATH05 (4-5)
   Two of: PHIL117, ANTH132 or ANTH137, GEO160 (8)
   GEO198I (4)
   GEO190 (4) Total units: 40-41

PROPOSED:

R6.4.4 Concentration Option: Starting in Fall, 2009, the following concentrations are being offered as an alternative breadth requirement. (En 17 Feb 09 and 19 May 09)

Students who choose the concentration option, select one of the following concentrations:

A. California Concentration
   ENGL12B; AHS21; STAT40, MATH04 or MATH05 (12-13 units)
   Two of: BIO21, BIO31, GEO4 (8 units)
   ETST135 or ETST154 (4 units)
   HIST138 or HIST140 (4 units)
   POSC198I; HASS190 (8 units)
   Total units: 36-37

B. Climate Change/Sustainability
   GEO11 (4 units)
   Two of: ENSC2, BIO3, GEO2, PHY18 (8)
   Two of: ENGL12B, AHS21, CPLT25 (8)
   STAT40, MATH04 OR MATH05 (4-5)
   Two of: PHIL117, ANTH132 or ANTH137, GEO160 (8)
   GEO198I (4)
   GEO190 (4) Total units: 40-41

R6.13 General Education Concentration Options: Concentrations are permitted during a five-year pilot period starting Fall 2009 as alternative general education breadth requirements, but not replacing the Ethnic Studies and University writing requirements. The availability of concentrations may differ by College, depending on approval as per Bylaws 9 and 10 (En 17 Feb 09 and 19 May 2009, Am 25 May 10). The Regulations of each College provide information about concentration options available in each College.
**Justification:**
The proposal on general education alternative concentrations was passed by Division vote on May 19, 2009, despite the fact that the CNAS Faculty had not approved of the curricular change as required under UCR Division Bylaws 9 and 10. Codification of the proposal was then initiated without undergoing faculty review and vote on new legislation as required by UCR Division Bylaw 6. The proposed deletion of Regulation 6.4.4, which now appears on the Academic Senate website, is justified as a means to remedy the lapse in legislative procedures that resulted in the appearance of Regulation 6.4.4 and its representation in the General Catalog for all Colleges. Regulation 6.13 is proposed to better codify the pilot program, while providing flexibility for each College to adopt (and modify) concentrations that are appropriate for their students.

Approved by CNAS Executive Committee: 4/13/2010
Approved by the General Education Advisory Committee: 5/3/2010
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 4/30/2010
CHASS Executive Committee: **Did not approve 4/28/2010**
Approved BY BCOE Executive Committee: 10/13/2010
Approved by AGSM Executive Committee: 10/11/2010
Approved by Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee: 5/6/10
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: 11/5/2010
Reviewed by the Executive Council
Writing Across the Curriculum: A Proposal to Diversify and Strengthen the Colleges’ Writing Requirements  
November 30, 2010  

Report to the Riverside Division  
Revised: October 11, 2010  

Background and Justification  

In recent years, Senate committees and task forces have called for strengthening and diversifying students’ options for satisfying the campus’s writing requirement. There has been strong Senate support for maintaining a three-quarter requirement. At the same time, the Senate has urged that the third quarter of instruction be diversified so that students are able to satisfy the requirement in a variety of courses and disciplines, not only by taking ENGL 1C or 1SC. One of the reasons the new University Writing Program was created in 2008 was to develop options for writing across the curriculum.

Senate Chair Martins-Green, reporting in 2005 on comprehensive Senate discussions regarding the UCR writing requirement, outlined the following recommendations resulting from that review:

“All committees (including the Executive Council) agreed that the first two quarters should be standard Freshman English Composition. However, for the third quarter, several alternatives were offered. Among the possibilities are:

- The existing courses, ENGL 1C, ENGL 1SC, ENGL 1HC;
- New or existing College-based courses approved by each of the respective Executive Committees with subsequent Senate approval;
- Adoption of “Writing Across the Curriculum” by identifying a specific set of courses, from which students of a given College can choose. If this is adopted the appropriate resources have to be put in place to assist the faculty teaching the courses targeted to fulfill “Writing Across the Curriculum.” (Senate Chair’s Memo, 2/17/05)

Following these consultations, a joint faculty and administrative Implementation Committee was formed to create the University Writing Program. According to the Charter of the new writing program, which became an independent unit in July, 2008, “[T]he development of the UWP acknowledges the continued growth” of the campus’s responsibility for “writing and composition instruction . . . as well as the need for the

---

1 The Implementation Committee consisted of faculty and administrators: Steve Cullenberg (Senate Representative and then CHASS Dean), Katherine Kinney (English Chair), Theda Shapiro (Senate Representative), Melanie Sperling (Senate Representative), Andrew Grosovsky (Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education), Gretchen Bolar (VP, Academic Planning and Budget), Betty Lord (Academic Personnel), Susan Hunter Hancock (CHASS Dean’s Office), Carolyn Stark (EVC Office), Dave Fairris (CHASS Dean’s Office) and Jim Sandoval (VP-Student Affairs).
campus as a whole to be engaged in the composition and writing instruction of its students." The University Writing Program was charged with developing various options and ideas for implementing alternatives to English IC.

There is widespread faculty interest in writing instruction that is closely related to the subject matters and methodologies of the disciplines. When students are writing in a variety of classes, the competencies they have developed in freshman writing courses are more likely to carry over into their writing and learning in the disciplines. An effective, targeted diversification of responsibilities for the writing requirement can thus strengthen the overall curriculum. Students are more likely to use writing as inquiry and communication in the upper division as well as the lower. They are more likely to achieve an articulate grasp of what they are studying, both in breadth courses and the required courses of their majors. They are more likely to master forms of written communication that are characteristic of particular disciplines. As a result they are likely to become more engaged, and more able to meet the faculty’s expectations in all their courses.

This proposal responds to the Senate recommendations and follows the charter of the University Writing Program. It proposes policies and strategies to involve and support faculty members across the campus in writing across the curriculum. It invites each college to allow its students to participate. It urges each college to offer WAC courses. It encourages, but does not require, the participation of all UCR colleges. Following the Senate recommendation to focus on the third quarter of the requirement, it sets out a template for alternatives to English IC. English IC would continue to be offered. Students in participating colleges would have the choice of taking a Senate-approved “W” course in place of English IC to satisfy the third quarter of the writing requirement.

This plan addresses the practical challenges of mounting such a program, particularly with regard to TA-training and workshop/tutorial services. It makes use of tutoring and workshop support that the UWP has been developing over the past year. It also provides logistical and advisory support to faculty developing and teaching writing-intensive courses. It will open the opportunity for the UWP to provide supplemental support for additional TA costs.

2 Departments so far expressing strong interest in offering one or more full-replacement courses are History, Religious Studies (RLST 7W and 12W), Comparative Literature (CPLT 40W), Political Science (POSC 5W), English (ENGL 102W), and BCOE (ENGR 180W). We are working with other departments that are in various stages of developing or experimenting with courses that might be full or partial alternatives to IC: these include Philosophy History, Anthropology, and Psychology. SoBA is looking into the feasibility of a “W” version of Business 100, its course in business communication. Some of the courses under discussion are restricted to majors. Some are not. We anticipate hearing about additional courses as we contact more departments and as other departments hear about the program.

3 Although exact savings are difficult to estimate, the enrollment of approximately one thousand students per year in an alternative courses would save the campus approximately $225,000 per year, over 50% of the cost of IC instruction for those WAC students.
In addition to its academic advantages, the proposal would reduce the campus’s costs of teaching the third-quarter writing requirement to students in participating colleges. The UWP would provide supplemental support in the form of workshops, tutorials, TA-training and financial support for additional TAs. But savings would be realized in the overall program because students could fulfill the third-quarter writing requirement while taking a course offered by a variety of departments.

The plan would be implemented as a five-year pilot program for students in colleges that chose to permit them to use WAC courses in place of English 1C. It would be evaluated by the Senate in its fourth year for its effectiveness in comparison to ENGL 001C for students who were eligible to take WAC courses but did not enroll in them. On the basis of that evaluation, the Senate would determine whether the program should continue.
Resolutions to be Voted on By the Academic Senate

1. The Senate approves the creation of a five-year pilot program in Writing Across the Curriculum, to be implemented by the University Writing Program according to Senate-approved policies and guidelines. The program will offer alternatives to ENGL 001C to students in participating colleges. During the pilot period, the University Writing Program will be responsible for continually evaluating 1C-alternative courses for their effectiveness in comparison to ENGL 001C results for WAC-eligible students (that is, by comparing 1C/WAC results within colleges that permit their student to participate in the WAC program). On the basis of that evaluation, and its own independent or cooperative study, the Senate will determine whether the program should continue.

2. The pilot program allows students in participating colleges to fulfill the third-quarter composition requirement by taking ENGL 001C (or with college approval, ENGL 001SC)\(^4\), or by taking a designated alternative course in another department or program. Departments and colleges will choose whether to propose such courses. Once proposed, such courses must be submitted for discretionary approval to the appropriate College executive committee as well as to the Academic Senate committee on Courses.

3. Designation and renewal of alternatives to ENGL 001C will be based on the kinds of writing assigned, the amount of writing, the feedback being provided, and other criteria listed in Appendix A. Appendix A shall serve as a checklist for Executive Committees and for the Committee on Courses. The University Writing Program will be responsible for establishing and publicizing these criteria.

4. If they permit their students to participate in the WAC program, College executive committees will have the option of setting eligibility standards (e.g. a “B” average in English 1A and 1B) for their own students’ access to alternatives to English 1C. The UWP will be responsible for implementing any eligibility rules, with the cooperation of faculty and advisors.

5. In order to implement these new writing-across-the-curriculum options, the following UCR Catalog and Divisional and College Regulations must be implemented.

\(^4\) The ‘S’ in English 001SC indicates “Science”. Thus English 001SC teaches English writing using science topics.
Proposed Changes in General Catalog

**Present**
Page 50, UCR 2010 Catalog: College Breadth Requirements

Courses taken in a student’s major discipline (including courses cross-listed with the major discipline) may not be applied toward satisfaction of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Ethnicity or the Natural Sciences and Mathematics requirements except for Biology majors in connection with the Biological Sciences requirement, English majors in connection with the English Composition requirement, History majors in connection with the World History requirement, Ethnic Studies majors in connection with the Ethnicity requirement, and Foreign Language majors in connection with language requirements. However, courses outside the major discipline, but required for the major, may be applied toward satisfaction of these requirements.

**Proposed**
College Breadth Requirements

Courses taken in a student’s major discipline (including courses cross-listed with the major discipline) may not be applied toward satisfaction of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Ethnicity or the Natural Sciences and Mathematics requirements except for Biology majors in connection with the Biological Sciences requirement, English majors in connection with the English Composition requirement, History majors in connection with the World History requirement, Ethnic Studies majors in connection with the Ethnicity requirement, and Foreign Language majors in connection with language requirements, and students permitted by their college to take a Senate-approved alternative to English 1C in order to satisfy the third-quarter writing requirement. However, courses outside the major discipline, but required for the major, may be applied toward satisfaction of these requirements.
**CHASS English Composition Requirements**

Page 61: English Composition

Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.”

Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry-Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C is completed with satisfactory GPA.

Page 61: English Composition

Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.” Courses that the Academic Senate designates as alternatives to English 1C may be applied toward satisfaction of the third quarter of the writing requirement if students earn a “C” or higher.

Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry-Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C (or an alternative designated by the Academic Senate) is completed with satisfactory GPA.

---

**CNAS English Composition Requirements**

Page 67: Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.” UCR’s sequence is ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, and ENGL 001C. ENGL 01HC or ENGL 01SC may be substituted for ENGL 001C, but only one of these courses can be taken for credit. Transfer students who have credit for one semester of English Composition from another institution must take two additional quarters (i.e. ENGL 001B and ENGL 001C).

No Change.
**BCOE English Composition Requirements**

Page 73: English Composition

UCR’s sequence is ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, and either ENGL 001C or ENGL 01SC.

No change

**SoBA English Composition Requirements**

Page 77: English Composition

Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.” Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C is completed with satisfactory GPA.

No change
English composition. Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English composition with no grade lower than C. Courses that the Academic Senate designates as alternatives to the sequence’s third-quarter course, English 1C, may be applied toward satisfaction of the third-quarter requirement if a student’s college permits its majors to substitute such a course for 1C, and if students have first passed English 1B with a “C” or higher. The grade in the alternative course must be no lower than a “C.” Individual colleges may set a higher GPA requirement in English 1A and/or 1B as a prerequisite to take Senate-approved alternatives to English 1C.

R6.1.1 Transfer students who have taken one semester of English composition at another college or university are required to take English 1B and English 1C, with the option of taking an alternative to English 1C approved by the Academic Senate if a student’s college permits its majors to substitute such a course for 1C.
APPENDIX A

Checklist of Criteria for Certification and Renewal of Alternatives to English 1C

The Academic Senate will designate alternatives to English 1C on the basis of the following criteria. Appendix A should be used as a checklist.

____ a) Writing is one major focus of the course. Writing is used as a method of inquiry as well as communication, for example by

- assigning written explanations of complex concepts, texts, or data sets;
- requiring writers to discover, assemble, and explain competing ideas or explanations;
- encouraging writers to weigh and evaluate competing ideas.

____ b) The course assigns an amount of writing roughly comparable to the amount assigned, graded, and returned to students in composition courses, adjusting for the fact that written communication in various disciplines takes a number of forms, and that assignments and exercises preliminary to formal assignments might qualify as part of that total.5

____ c) The course provides feedback to students on their writing in each assignment;

____ d) The course responds to students’ writing in terms of ideas, reasoning, development, and clarity in paragraphs and sentences as well as the assignment as a whole, in terms of

- commenting on the students’ subject matter by paying close attention to fact, reasoning, development, and clarity;
- commenting on representative passages in terms of grammatical correctness, the clarity of assertions and the logic of paragraphs, and the use of evidence;
- offering advice on these matters for the sake of revision or the writing of later assignments.

5 The volume of writing in Composition courses is based on word totals required by IGETC transfer agreements with the CSU and CC systems. The amount of writing in English 1C is 5000 words: 4-6 papers (none shorter than 750 words, and at least one paper of 1250 words or more), plus a final.
e) The course’s TAs participate in the required UWP training course, which focuses on writing instruction -- including attention to the process of writing as well as the intensive evaluation of student writing.\(^6\)

f) Materials relevant to these criteria have been provided by the proposing department for UWP and COC review.

g. The department offering the course commits to monitoring and evaluating the course’s conformity to these requirements in cooperation with the University Writing Program.

APPENDIX B

Methods of Implementation

1. Training TAs

TAs in the alternative courses will continue to be the responsibility of the faculty-in-charge of the alternative course – faculty in their home departments. TA-training will continue to be the primary responsibility of the home departments. Participation in the WAC program will require additional training conducted by the University Writing Program, which will coordinate with the home department to ensure that overall TA loads do not exceed an average of twenty hours per week. This additional instruction will focus on productive ways of responding to student writing (for example, by means of conferences, drafting, comments, and forms of evaluation that focus on methods of development and patterns of effective communication) and effective ways of embedding writing instruction in discussion sections.

2. Class size and ratio TAs to students

The UWP will work closely with departments and colleges to ensure that TA/student ratios permit adequate attention to students’ writing with the terms of the TA contract.\(^6\) Additional financial support from the UWP for additional TAs will be designed to address this priority.

3. Appendix A will serve as a checklist for Executive Committees and for the Committee on Courses in determining whether a proposed course should have a “W” designation. In its work with faculty proposing and teaching WAC courses, the

\(^6\) TA-training will take place in English 302 (meeting one hour per week) during the quarter the course is taught, or by alternative means approved by the UWP Director. TAs will remain under the charge of faculty in their home departments, and UWP training will take account of the 20-hour per week limit on TA activity. UWP instruction will focus on productive ways of responding to student writing (through, for example, conferences, drafting, comments, and evaluation that focus on methods of development and patterns of error) and effective ways of embedding writing instruction in discussion sections.
University Writing Program’s initial priority is to work out a productive schedule of assignments, effective designs for those assignments, and arrangements for workshop and tutorial support. The long-range priority of consultation with WAC faculty is to strengthen instruction and learning with the help of more rigorous and frequent writing assignments in the disciplines; more intensive interaction among faculty, TAs, and undergraduates about writing; and more focus on deepening and facilitating written communication not as an adjunct pursuit but as an activity at the core of what we do.

4. Ensuring that students transferring to other UC’s are not disadvantaged

Approximately 150 UCR students transfer to other UC’s each year, most of them to UCSD, UCLA, and UCI. Most would have no difficulty since many UC campuses do not require a third quarter of writing. Other UC campuses require a writing course in the upper division – a course that current UCR transfers to those campuses must take even after fulfilling UCR’s existing composition requirement. UCR’s new WAC legislation would not create a new inconvenience for most transfer students going to other UC’s. Only at Berkeley, where just 5% (7 students) go each year would the question of a UCR WAC course’s transferability be an issue. In that case, UCR could make a strong case that the WAC alternative to ENGL 1C should satisfy the requirement based on the criteria in Appendix A.

5. Accepting other campuses’ WAC courses for transfer to UCR

Associate deans and advisors, with reference to Appendix A and the UWP’s assistance, if needed, will be able to decide whether a WAC course taken on another campus satisfies the third-quarter writing requirement at UCR. As with other transferability questions, a body of precedents will develop.

6. Course Labeling for new “W” courses

The suffix “W” will be added to the course number of ENGL 1C alternative courses. The official course description of the “W” must also contain a statement to this effect: “Fulfills the third-quarter writing requirement.”

7. Course labeling for new “W” courses and the original non-W version of those courses, if there is one

The official course description of the “W” course – and the description of the original non-W version, if one exists – must contain a statement to this effect: “Only one version of this course can receive credit.”
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: April 8, 2009
Approved by the Committee on Preparatory Education: April 14, 2009
Approved by the Bourns College of Engineering Executive Committee: March 31, 2009
Approved by the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences: April 10, 2009
Reviewed by the Executive Committee of AGSM: Not approved May 26, 2009
Reviewed by the Executive Committee of CNAS: Not approved October 15, 2009

*Revised (11/4/09) to include Executive Council amendments approved June 22, 2009.
** Revised (11/16/09) to include clarifications of implementation from COC and CEP

Writing Across the Curriculum Approvals:
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 10-29-2010
Approved by the Committee on Preparatory Education: 10-27-2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: 10-13-2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of BCOE: 10-14-2010
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11/05/2010
Endorsed by the Executive Council: 11-08-2010
November 3, 2010

TO:    MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    GERHARD GIERZ, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE:    WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

At its October 27 meeting, once again, the Committee on Preparatory Education discussed the Writing Across the Curriculum proposal with CPE member and Director of the Writing Program, Professor John Briggs. We appreciated his thoughtful response this Fall to questions posed by the committee last Spring, and the revisions he made to the proposal based on these questions. We support the revised proposal. (8 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 1 *Abstention).

Committee members expressed concern regarding the availability of English 1C seats for students whose majors do not have an alternative, particularly non-seniors. We hope the senior Administration will recognize the pedagogical benefits of offering English 1C and WAC courses to students early in their academic careers at UCR. Satisfaction of the English composition requirement through English 1C produces a positive impact on students’ ability to write well in their upper division coursework. It leads to better performance, not only on papers and test essays, but on more challenging projects, such as research papers and senior theses, that come later in the undergraduate academic career. In particular, the CNAS curricula assume English 1C completion in the lower division. Committee members supported the CNAS position that English 1C (or its WAC equivalent) should be completed well before senior year.

*Professor Briggs refrained from voting since he is the author of the proposal.
October 29, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

During its October 28 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the revised Writing Across the Curriculum proposal and the responses which Professor Briggs provided to us this Fall. The Committee voted to approve the proposal by a vote count of 8 Yes, 0 No, and 0 Abstentions.

In addition:

- The Committee approved this program with the assumption that it will maintain the workable student-TA ratio stated in the proposal. CEP is very concerned that lack of funding might put this in jeopardy and will request periodic information on this point.

- The CEP believes that WAC can enhance the learning experience for participating students and would like to encourage CNAS participate. It is understood (as clearly started in the proposal) that allowing CNAS students to participate in no way requires the College to create WAC courses.