January 5, 2012

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
    Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
    Kenneth Barish (Physics and Astronomy), Graduate Council
    Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
    Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
    Walter Clark, (Music), Academic Personnel (CAP)
    Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
    Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
    John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
    Jang-Ting Guo (Economics), Committee on Committees (COC)
    Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)
    Jodie S. Holt (Botany and Plant Sciences), Junior Representative to the Assembly
    Martin Johnson (Political Science), Educational Policy (CEP)
    Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Preparatory Education
    Umar Mohideen (Physics and Astronomy), Planning and Budget (P&B)
    Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative
    Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)
    Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
    David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
    Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
    Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

FR: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, January 9, 2012

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, January 9, 2012 at 1:00 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><strong>I.</strong> Approval of the agenda for January 9, 2012 and minutes for November 14, 2011.</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1:10 – 1:15</strong> Conflict of Interest Statements – Academic Freedom, Scholarships and Honors, Preparatory Education</td>
<td>2 (pp. 7-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:45</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:15</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:45</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 2:50</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50 – 3:00</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 14, 2011

PRESENT:
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Kenneth Barish (Physics and Astronomy), Graduate Council
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Jang-Ting Guo (Economics), Committee on Committees (COC)
Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)
Jodie S. Holt (Botany and Plant Sciences), Jr. Representative to the Assembly
Martin Johnson (Political Science), Educational Policy (CEP)
Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Preparatory Education
Umar Mohideen (Physics and Astronomy), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)
Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Marylynn V. Yates, (Environmental Sciences), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

____________

ABSENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative

GUESTS:
Prof. Bob Heath, Botany and Plant Sciences
Don Caskey, Campus Architect
Tim Ralston, Associate Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning

AGENDA:
The agenda and the minutes from the October 24, 2011 were unanimously approved as written.

The Conflict of Interest Statements of the Senate Committees were noted as received.
Chair Mary Gauvain had to attend an emergency meeting regarding campus security issues.

**PRESENTATION BY DON CASKEY, CAMPUS ARCHITECT**

Don Caskey, the Campus Architect updated the EC as follows:

Projects in Programming and Planning:
- Commons Mall and Bookstore Renovation – Career center will relocate to lower floor of the bookstore
- Aberdeen and Inverness and Common Areas remodeling
- Student Health Center renovation

Projects in Design:
- Expansion of the Student Recreation Center
- Environmental Health and Safety

Projects in Construction Bidding:
- Boyce Hall/Webber Hall Renovations

Projects in Construction
- Glen Mor II Student Apartments
- School of Medicine Education Building
- Materials Science and Engineering Building
- UCR Track Replacement

Projects Recently Completed:
- UCR Medical School Research Building
- UCR Practice Center
- Hinderaker – Advancement Div. Relocation
- HUB Environmental signage

Regarding the University Club, Mr. Caskey indicated that there needs to be a viable and sustainable business plan before any actions can occur. Currently, the University Club is housed in the barn. Significant discussion ensued; the main concerns were that all building proposals so far were doomed by their size or location not to be sustainable operations. An interesting question raised, but not answered, was how it was decided which operations on campus had to be self-sustaining.

**SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF APM POLICY 668 – NEGOTIATED SALARY PROGRAM**

The Executive Committee reviewed the Senate’s response which was prepared by Chair Mary Gauvain. Overall, the EC understood the need to devise ways to increase faculty salaries and felt that for approval of APM 668, there will need to be clearer statements guiding implementation processes. They were also concerned about the potential for abuse as currently written, and the need to provide a clarification on what constitutes “good standing”. The EC also discussed the need to create an Advisory Committee similar to the one used in APM 670.
UCR Review Summary:

Although we see merit in efforts to devise ways to increase faculty salaries to competitive levels that may aid in faculty recruitment and retention as well as provide an incentive for faculty in obtaining extramural funds, we have several serious concerns about this proposal.

1. **Public impression**: If the faculty at large is seen by the state as willing and able to fund part of their own academic year salaries, this action may have the negative and unintended effect of lowering state support for the UC because less state money will be deemed necessary to support the ladder-rank faculty of the university.

2. **Conflicting areas of support**: There is substantial concern that the funds used to increase salaries will be taken from areas that are vital to the research mission, e.g., if the funds are diverted from support for graduate students and postdoctoral researchers the process will negatively impact research productivity along with the integration of teaching and research that is critical to the UC. On this point, the proposed program may create a conflict of interest for faculty in terms of increasing their own salary versus supporting the student researchers with whom they work.

3. **Negotiation process in the department**: It is unclear how the negotiation process at the departmental level will occur and what the consequences will be for departmental functioning and morale. In addition, the proposed plan will change the relationship between faculty and department chairs by putting control over some portion of faculty salary in the hands of the department chair. Also, the need for an annual review of the negotiation puts additional burden on the department personnel process.

4. **Campus disparities**: Access to eligible funds would make the program open to some faculty and not to others in a way that does not reflect the merit of the scholarship. As a result, disparities in salary will increasingly reflect the regulations and practices of governmental agencies rather than academic merit, which is the linchpin of the UC merit and promotion process. This issue is especially problematic given current disparities in salary among UC faculty, which reflect status characteristics (as documented in the recent UC Pay Equity Report), market differences across the disciplines, and the availability of extramural support. The proposed plan would exacerbate these disparities, resulting in a less equitable and stable workplace and lower campus morale.

5. **Role of the Senate**: It is unclear what role the Academic Senate will play in the process if the program is approved, e.g., will these negotiations be reviewed by CAP and, if so, what is its authority and how often will reviews occur?

6. **Use of funds**: Although it is interesting to consider how the funds returned to the campus in these negotiations will be used, there is concern that the funds will be used for purposes by either the department chairs or the deans that do not advance the academic research mission of the units from which the funds emerge.

7. **Long-range consequences**: The proposed program is an offspring of the HSCP, therefore, it is important to examine how the HSCP has been implemented. It is especially important to recognize that the HSCP, which was originally intended to
increase faculty salary for competitive purposes, has resulted in the expectation that health sciences faculty will, on a regular basis, pay a portion of their academic year salary.

**BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal:**
Prof. Steve Clark, Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee led the discussions on the BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal. He indicated that in principle, the proposal had a lot of merit, but the three areas they were concerned with were:

Lower Division Transfer Students – the proposal states that “applicants who are not prepared to complete their chosen major within approximately two years will not be admitted regardless of their GPA”. This policy as written would exclude some very qualified applicants;

Common Core Curriculum – It is difficult to have a uniform curriculum within the UC system, and the committee had reservations about the feasibility of achieving transparency through the development of major-specific common core curricula for all UC campuses;

Workload and Resources – The committee raised concerns about workload and resources required to develop a common core curriculum and also to develop new admissions requirements for transfer students.

**Changes to Charges Bylaw**
The changes to the Charges Bylaw were received as written and will be forwarded to the November 29, 2011, Division meeting.

**Updates From Senate Committees:**
Umar Mohideen, Chair, Planning and Budget indicated that OP anticipates there will be a $100,000,000 cut to the UC and if the cut is one-time, OP will absorb it.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sellyna Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Office of the Academic Senate*
November 2, 2011

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Thomas Morton, Chair
      Committee on Academic Freedom

The Committee on Academic Freedom has readopted the Conflict of Interest statement originally adopted in 1994-95, which is as follows:

If a member of the Academic Freedom Committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict to the attention of the chair. The chair will convene the committee, except for the individual with the possible conflict, and those present will decide by majority vote if a conflict exists. If the decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicted matter and will not vote on that matter.

If the chair is the individual in question, he/she will appoint an acting chair to consider the matter. The committee may ask the person in question to testify, but the person would not be present at other parts of the discussion or at the vote.
December 12, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
     RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: BROWNWYN LEEBAW, CHAIR
     COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Preparatory Education adopted the following conflict of interest statement:

   In any situation, as determined by the Chair in consultation with other Committee on Preparatory Education members, wherein the personal affiliation of a committee member could be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member will be expected to exclude him/herself from making, seconding, or voting on any motion, made in the course of the deliberation. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Preparatory Education.
November 10, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: CAROLE-ANNE TYLER, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND HONORS

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2011-2012

The committee on Scholarships and Honors adopted the following conflict of interest statement.

The Committee on Scholarships and Honors has adopted the following policy for situations where the close personal or professional affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual nominated might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. The committee member will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair will ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
To be adopted:

Proposed change in Bylaw 8.9.3.5 - 8.9.3.8 -- Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present:</th>
<th>Proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.9.1 This committee consists of at least seven members, including the Associate Vice Chancellor Computing and Communications or his/her representative and the University Librarian of the Riverside campus as <em>ex officio</em> members. (Am 5 Feb 98)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither <em>ex officio</em> member may serve as Chair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chair normally also serves on the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunication Policy. (Am 19 Nov 81)(Am 2 Feb 89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.9.2 This committee shall advise the Division and the Chancellor on all matters relating to academic computing and information technology, including instructional technology. (Am 9 Feb 89) (Am 5 Feb 98)  
No Change

8.9.3 It is the duty of this committee to:  
8.9.3.1 Review Faculty and student use of the campus Computing and Communications unit for instruction and research;  
No Change

8.9.3.2 Recommend ways to improve the functioning of the campus Computing and Communications unit to meet Faculty and student needs; (Am 5 Feb 98)  
No Change
8.9.3.3 Participate in long-range planning for computer and information technology use and development;  
No Change

8.9.3.4 Recommend ways to improve education in the use of the computer and information. (Am 5 Feb 98)
No Change

8.9.3.5 Solicit and rank requests for grants for Innovative Uses of Computers in Instruction. (En 9 Feb 89) (Am 3 Feb 00)
8.9.3.5 Solicit and rank requests for grants for supporting and expanding the use of computing and information technology in research and instruction. (En 9 Feb 89) (Am 3 Feb 00)

8.9.3.6 Assess the state of campus instructional technology support and readiness to meet future needs. (En 5 Feb 98)
No Change

8.9.3.7 Recommend ways to improve campus instructional technology support to meet Faculty and student needs. (En 5 Feb 98)
No Change

8.9.3.8 Participate in long-range planning for instructional technology. (En 5 Feb 98)
No Change

8.9.4 This committee shall consult with the Divisional committees on Planning and Budget, Courses, and Educational Policy, and with other Senate and administrative committees, whenever appropriate to its tasks.
No Change

JUSTIFICATION

Due to the budget cuts, funds are no longer available for Innovative Uses of Computers in Instruction; therefore the Committee will not be soliciting and ranking IUC requests. Should funding become available at a later date, the Committee will be responsible for this task, as before.

Approved by the Committee on Academic Computing & Informational Technology: 11/17/11
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 11/28/11
Received by the Executive Council: