November 10, 2011

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  
       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  
       Marylynn V. Yates, (Environmental Sciences), Academic Personnel (CAP)  
       Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

FR:    Mary Gauvain, Chair  
       Riverside Division

RE:    Executive Council Agenda, November 14, 2011

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, November 14, 2011 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>Information 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Approval of the agenda for November 14, 2011 and minutes for October 24, 2011.</td>
<td>2 (pp. 6-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest Statements – Academic Computing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CODEO, Distinguished Teaching, UNEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:45</td>
<td>II.</td>
<td><strong>PRESENTATION BY DON CASKEY, CAMPUS ARCHITECT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF APM POLICY 668</strong> <strong>NEGOTIATED SALARY PROGRAM</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss Committee Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 1:55</td>
<td>III.</td>
<td><strong>BOARS TRANSFER ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss Committee Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:55 – 2:25</td>
<td>IV.</td>
<td><strong>CHANGES TO CHARGES BYLAW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be received by EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25 – 2:35</td>
<td>V.</td>
<td><strong>UPDATES FROM SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 – 3:00</td>
<td>VI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
OCTOBER 24, 2011

PRESENT:
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Kenneth Barish (Physics and Astronomy), Graduate Council
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Jang-Ting Guo (Economics), Committee on Committees (COC)
Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)
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
Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Marylynn V. Yates, (Environmental Sciences), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Jodie S. Holt (Botany and Plant Sciences), Jr. Representative to the Assembly
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee

GUESTS:
Isgouhi Kaloshian, (Nematology) CNAS Executive Committee
Jose Wudka (Physics), UCEP (Chair)
Susan Allen Ortega, AVC/Dean of Students

AGENDA:
The agenda and the minutes from the October 10, 2011 were unanimously approved as written.

The Conflict of Interest Statements of the Senate Committees were noted as received.
ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:
The following announcements were made by the Chair:

Chair Gauvain reminded the EC members that Provost Lawrence H. Pitts will be visiting the campus on November 7, 2011 to discuss the UC Online Education Project, now in its pilot phase, as well as the Negotiated Salary Plan – APM 668. The meeting has been scheduled for 10:15 in HMNS 1500. She encouraged the EC members to attend.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE POLICY ON STUDENT CONDUCT AND DISCIPLINE:
The EC discussed the current policy on student conduct and discipline. There was discussion of the proposed changes and Susan Allen Ortega, Dean of Students, provided an update to why the changes were being made. The major reasons were as follows:

1. Expediency. The Dean of Students’ Office receives about 500 referrals regarding student conduct and discipline in one year. The office does not have enough staff to review each referral at the initial stage within the prescribed 10-day period, so the period of initial review has been changed from 10 to 15 days,
2. Faculty review. Selection and criteria for appointing faculty to Academic Integrity Committees is changed. Selection is now through the Senate Committee on Committees instead of being nominated by the College Executive Committee,
3. The Graduate Division wants to be responsible for reviewing any referrals regarding the conduct of graduate students and most of the changes to the policy were made in this area.

After some discussion, it was agreed that Dean Allen Ortega would submit a brief summary explaining the changes as well as provide the changes in a two-column format with the old and new presented side by side for Senate review. The Dean also indicated that she would be available to meet with College Executive Committees to discuss any concerns they might have about the proposed changes. Dean Allen Ortega was asked to try and finalize the corrections before the winter division meeting scheduled for February 21, 2012.

UNIVERSITY ONLINE EDUCATION PROJECT:
Prof. Jose Wudka, the Chair of UCEP, gave a brief update on the University Online Instruction Pilot Program. He indicated that the Project is a statewide initiative to explore the use of online courses in UC’s undergraduate curriculum. The courses will include traditional courses that are fully online as well as hybrid courses with that integrate traditional classroom and online instruction. Originally the intent was to offer 40 courses systemwide, but to date only 25 courses have been proposed and approved, two of which are from UCR. An evaluation of the Pilot Project will be conducted by an evaluation center at UCSB. Prof. Wudka indicated that the call for a blue-ribbon panel is going out right now, and its role will be to evaluate the evaluation component of the courses and Pilot Project. The project is funded by a loan of $7,000,000 from the UC. Prof. Wudka also mentioned that if we enroll UC students, it is revenue neutral, and the only way for this project to become a money-making venture is to enroll non-UC students. The Senate wants to ensure that, if a course is offered for UC credit, the content and instructor will be reviewed and approved by the faculty and the Senate. Many issues in the development of this project are
unresolved. He also mentioned that UCR’s Committee on Courses has prepared some
guidelines for remote learning courses that may be helpful in this process. Regarding
faculty rights, faculty will own the intellectual property and retain the copyright and they
can use the materials if they leave UC. UCEP does not deal with intellectual property issues
and this is one area that they are concerned about. Another issue of concern is how to
proctor exams.

Chair Gauvain also mentioned that she and Martin Johnson (Chair of CEP) attended a
teleconference that included Daniel Greenstein, the UC Vice Provost for Academic Planning,
Programs, and Coordination, to discuss the online project. They commented that there are
many unanswered questions such as class management, how to handle teaching load, and
the financial aspects of the proposal especially in the context of rebenching.

**APM Policy 668 (Negotiated Salary Program)**
The EC members discussed the proposed APM 668 that would allow a flexible
compensation model for general campus faculty, similar to the Health Sciences
Compensation Plan, using non-state resources to provide additional compensation for
faculty. The plan is currently under committee review; however some concerns were raised
including:

- Impact on graduate and postdoctoral funding
- Creation of greater salary disparities among faculty in the sciences, engineering,
social sciences, and arts and humanities than currently exist
- Amount of power that will be given to department Chairs
- Lack of clarity about what “good standing” means in evaluating a faculty member

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sellyna Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Office of the Academic Senate*
October 21, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: PAULO CHAGAS, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Academic Computing and Informational Technology has re-adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement for the 2011-12 year:

In cases where a committee member's association with departments or programs, or with individuals bringing business before the committee might be considered as a conflict of interest, the committee member(s) affected may participate fully in all discussions of the business, but will refrain from any voting. Members of the Committee on Academic Computing and Informational Technology are asked to identify when they may have a potential conflict of interest on any items before any discussion.
October 26, 2011

TO:   MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:   MICHAEL OROSCO, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE:   CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2011-2012

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.”
October 21, 2011

TO: M. GAUVAIN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: C. AMRHEIN, CHAIR
   COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching unanimously approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2011-12:

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching has adopted the following policy for situations in which personal affiliation of a Committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in Committee deliberations. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The Committee Chair may ask the Committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
October 31, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: JOHN WILLS, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on University Extension approves the following conflict of interest statement:

If a course, credential program, certificate program, or other item/issue should come before the Committee on University Extension which affects the department of a committee member, the committee member will provide information, but will not vote on the item/issue. A Committee on University Extension member who is paid by University Extension for teaching or consultation with regard to a specific course, credential program, certificate program or other item/issue will provide information, but will not vote on the item/issue.
November 3, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Marylynn V. Yates  
Co-Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Comments on proposed new policy – APM 668 – Negotiated Salary Program

CAP discussed the proposed new policy – APM 668 – Negotiated Salary Program on October 12, 2011. As stated in the background material, “The Negotiated Salary Program (NSP) is designed to be one of several efforts through which the University maintains its competitiveness in general campus faculty compensation.” CAP concurs that mechanisms to increase faculty salaries to competitive levels is important in our efforts to recruit excellent new faculty and to retain existing faculty. In our review of the proposed policy, we found a number of potential positive aspects, as well as several negative ones.

Potential positive aspects:

- The NSP is a mechanism that could make UC salaries more competitive in a very short period of time
- The NSP may help to retain faculty
- The additional salary is not included in the UC Retirement Plan calculations
- Faculty must be in “good standing” to obtain the NSP dimension
- The NSP dimension to the salary will be reevaluated each year (or every two years)

Potential negative aspects:

- As the extra salary will come from an external source, funds that might have been used to support graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, etc. may be diverted to faculty salary, affecting the research mission of the University
- The NSP will likely result in greater disparities between the sciences/engineering and the humanities/arts, due to the relative availability of external funds. It will also create disparities within units, e.g., between faculty whose research allows them access to certain types of funds that could be used for salary
- The new and continued salary negotiation power appears to be given to the Departmental Chair. This will have has unforeseen ramifications on morale, etc., and changes the long-standing UC model of having Department Chairs closer to having Department Heads. It will also have impacts on the nature of the relationship between the Dean and the faculty members in her/his unit.
- The NSP will place the additional burden of re-evaluating this component of the salary each year by Chair, Dean, CAP, etc.
- It is not clear what the role of CAP will be in the process. Presumably, CAP will be important in determining the “good standing” – but CAP can’t realistically evaluate the faculty in the NSP each year.
- The definition of “good standing” in APM668-4 c) is very vague, and needs to be clarified.

Overall, CAP felt that there are a number of critical issues that needs to be resolved before this proposal can move forward in the review process.
November 4, 2011

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

From: Irving Hendrick, Chair
      Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: Systemwide Review of APM 668

Although the Committee appreciates the need for action to improve the serious competitive decline of University faculty salaries, we are not persuaded that this proposed adaptation of the Health Sciences Compensation Plan (APM 670) is in the best interest of the University faculty generally. The current proposal adds another compromising dimension to a merit based University salary structure that in large measure is the basis for the University’s strong reputation of long standing. When date of hire (off-scale salaries) and entrepreneurial skill (negotiated salaries) are taken together, the merit based system of compensation based on scholarly achievement is compromised.

Clearly, the proposed policy provides for maximum flexibility among campuses, flexibility between colleges and schools on a given campus, and even flexibility between “units” within schools and colleges. While the program is represented as providing a common administrative framework, the net result arguably features a fragmentation of decision making and quite likely a variety of unknown secondary outcomes. A system that attempts to maintain a common salary scale, an off-scale salary program administered in various ways, a diverse “unit” based negotiated salary policy, plus various approval plans for summer salary, pretty much defines a system lacking in cohesion. Within the sciences, it appears that research funding from some government agencies could be used to augment salaries, while a similar research grant from a different government agency could not be so applied. This condition would be independent of the quality of the research or the merit of the investigator. Before a negotiated salary policy is in place at UCR, the collective components for all units must be evaluated by a special Academic Senate committee.
We appreciate that Health Science schools require a significant presence of clinical practice and that this practice requires campuses with health sciences programs to provide a negotiated salary plan. That said, the desirability of extending the policy to letters, arts, and sciences, and even to some other professional schools, is less than clear to us. Faculty with knowledge and skills with market appeal have long been able to engage in limited consulting activity to augment their incomes outside of the University’s merit based salary framework. The Committee remains skeptical that the broader interests of the University’s quality and reputation would be well served by the proposed Negotiated Salary Program.
The committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the draft of the new Negotiated Salary Program APM 668. Many questions regarding the implementation of the APM were raised. One concern was regarding the opportunity to raise a larger fraction of the salary from grants and the impact of this on teaching time and quality. A second was the larger role allocated to department Chairs and Deans in the negotiation process. Here, the committee urges that the modifications be made to APM 668 such that the Committee of Academic Personnel be allowed to play its traditional role in recognizing and rewarding meritorious faculty performance. A third concern was that the APM 668 might exacerbate the salary gap between Health Science, Engineering and Business school faculty and the rest of the campus. The committee understands the motivations for the new policy of (a) codifying ongoing negotiated salaries in the Health Science and Business schools, (b) faculty retention and competitive salaries without use of state funds, and (c) bringing about equalization of compensation between the Life Science faculty in the Colleges of Science and Health Science faculty in the Medical Schools. Nevertheless, any implementation of APM 668 should be done in accommodation with the traditional steps in merit advancement that are presently followed.
TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: MICHAEL J. OROSCO, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE: APM-668, NEGOTIATED SALARY PROGRAM

The committee met on October 26, 2011 to discuss APM-668. The committee recognizes the steering committee’s recommendation that an additional compensation plan is needed to maintain university competitiveness in general faculty compensation. However, at this point it is difficult for the committee to determine how this will impact the university’s commitment on diversity and equal opportunity. Further research should be conducted to determine if an additional compensation plan would be appropriate and beneficial to all.
Date: October 28, 2011

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

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

RE: Negotiated Salary

The BCOE Executive Council discussed proposed Academic Personnel Policy 668, Negotiated Salary Program, at its meeting today. On the positive side, the proposal would provide a new mechanism to incentivize faculty to help bring additional financial resources to the UC campuses. However, it also raises various concerns:

- It implies the apparent expectation that faculty should fund their academic year salary. This could negatively affect state support for academic year salaries.
- It raises at least the appearance of a conflict-of-interest between faculty increasing their salary and funding graduate students.
- As the program does include a contingency fund and salary to be increased based on expectations, it allows new opportunities for abuse.

The program would require strong oversight.

- That oversight should start at the UCOP or campus level with a clear statement of expectations: “Prior to negotiating a salary increase, a faculty member must (i) supervise and fund N PhD students, or ....” This is to ensure that the preferred activities are being incentivized.
- The campus level contingency fund is potentially problematic. By definition, it will be used to cover miscalculations and therefore is a backwards incentive. It should be maintained as close to the faculty level as possible.
- Ideally, a faculty member’s salary increase would be funded from their own built up contingency fund, not from expected future funding.
To: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Undergraduate Admissions Committee:  
Steven Clark, Committee Chair (Department of Psychology)  
Kathryn DeFea (Biomedical Sciences)  
J. William Gary (Department of Physics and Astronomy)  
Mindy Marks (Department of Economics)  
Heejung Jung (Department of Mechanical Engineering)  
Adam Lukaszewski (Department of Botany and Plant Sciences)  
Christiane Weirauch (Entomology)  
James Sandoval (Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs)

Re: Undergraduate Admissions Committee Review of BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal

October 25, 2011

The Undergraduate Admissions committee met on September 28, 2011 and October 12, 2011 to discuss the BOARS Proposal for Transfer Student Admissions. To summarize the discussion, the Committee expressed general agreement with the principles of developing a comprehensive review process for transfer students similar to that for freshman, with the goal of removing barriers and expanding opportunities, and an emphasis on major preparation. However, the Committee was concerned about the implications of the proposed changes for the admission of lower-division transfer students, the lack of clear data at the level of individual majors indicating the nature of the problems to be solved by the proposed changes, the feasibility of developing Common Core Curricula, and the workload and resources needed to develop new admissions requirements for transfer students. Each of these is discussed in greater detail below.

Comprehensive Review  
The committee supports the general principle for comprehensive review described in the BOARS proposal, i.e., “the same Comprehensive Principles that guide the review of freshman applicants.”

Removing Barriers and Expanding Opportunities  
The purpose of applying Comprehensive Review principles to transfer student applications is to remove barriers and expand opportunities. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee shares this view.
Emphasis on major preparation

Majors at UCR in the College of Engineering, the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, and the School of Business Administration follow this principle, having explicit course requirements for students who apply to majors within those colleges. The admissions criteria for transfer students in the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, however, do not specify particular courses for transfer admission. The implications of the “major preparation” principle for these majors is not clear, and may depend on what is meant by “major preparation”, and to what extent it is defined in terms of specific courses.

Lower Division Transfer Students

The BOARS 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 appears to establish a policy by which lower division transfer students cannot be admitted to the University of California. The policy as it is stated, would exclude some very qualified applicants, specifically those who have taken a number of college courses sufficient to disqualify them as freshman applicants, but not enough college courses that they would be able to graduate within two years. Based on discussions with faculty at UCR last year, it is unlikely that this policy would have the support of UCR faculty.

Also, by making time-to-degree a consideration for admission, these assessments, which are normally performed by the academic advisors in specific colleges and majors, would shift to the admissions office. Such a shift would involve a shift in resources as well as a shift in expertise.

Common Core Curriculum

AB 2302 notes that existing provisions of the Donahoe Higher Education Act (of 1960) require the University of California to “develop, maintain, and disseminate a common core curriculum in general education courses for the purposes of transfer,” and that AB 2302 requests that the University of California work with California Community Colleges to design community college transfer degrees that provide students adequate preparation for entry into a major.” An Interim Progress Report on Implementing AB 2302 discusses the development of a UC Common Core of Major Preparation and summarizes discussions from the UC Transfer Streamlining Task Force. The Task Force expressed concerns about the development of a Common Core Curriculum for some majors, particularly for History (“there did not appear to be a common core of courses required at all campuses...”), Psychology (“This discipline was, in some ways, the most challenging,” the Task Force noting the considerable variation in Psychology programs across UC campuses), and Physics (“More than any other discipline that convened, the physicists were concerned with the ability of transfer students to adequately prepare for upper-division course work at UC if they focus on completing their general education requirements at the community college...”).

These concerns were echoed by members of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee. The Committee expressed considerable concern regarding the goal of establishing uniformity across campuses through the development of a common core curriculum. Although the Committee understands the need for transparency in communicating UC admissions requirements to transfer applicants, it has reservations about the feasibility of achieving transparency through the development of major-specific Common Core Curricula for all UC campuses.

Data and Policy Change and Policy Implementation
The Committee was concerned by the lack of clear data, at the level of individual majors, that describe the nature of the problem that is to be solved by the implementation of the new policy. In particular, there may be significant variability across majors such that some majors may be doing quite well in terms of admitting qualified transfer students, whereas others may be having difficulties that may or may not be addressed through the proposed changes.

**Workload and Resources**

The Committee raised concerns about workload and resources necessary for UC majors to develop a Common Core Curriculum and develop new admissions requirements for transfer students. This concern is related to the concern about the lack of data indicating that change is needed for specific majors.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Clark, Chair
Academic Senate
Undergraduate Admissions Committee
October 25, 2011

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: MARTIN JOHNSON, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: CEP Review of BOARS Transfer Admission Proposal

The Committee on Educational Policy discussed the July 2011 BOARS Transfer Admission Proposal at its October 7, 2011 meeting. The proposal anticipates the development of two additional pathways to admission for community college students, including the development of an Associates Degree for Transfer as well as the development of community college curriculum to satisfy requirements for transferring into majors at the University of California.

Members of the Riverside Division CEP expressed enthusiasm as well a caution about this proposal. Committee members were enthusiastic about this opportunity coordinate efforts with the CCC and the process of developing a clearer set of criteria for transfer into majors. Remaining issues include:

- The content of the curriculum for an Associates Degree for Transfer.

Members recognized similarities between the intent of this proposal and the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) program. While committee members representing the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences in particular remain enthusiastic about community college transfer students, we also recognize that satisfaction of IGETC is often insufficient preparation for STEM majors. In addition, many raised concerns about whether students transferring into the UC via these various pathways will arrive with too many units and thus facing limitations on what they can accomplish at the UC, given limitations on total number of units they can earn and the unit-demands of many of our programs.

In sum, we are unable to determine whether this proposal will operate as intended because of the linked concerns that the curricula could ultimately be both not enough and too much: insufficient preparation for specific majors and require students enter UCR with too many transfer units.
• The need for extensive advising both in the CCC and UC.

If optimally implemented, the proposal will require more extensive student advising, first at the community college level, through the transfer process at both institutions, and also at the UC where the student transfers. Students will need to understand these three major pathways to transfer quite early in their higher educational career, and optimally prior to beginning their higher education at a community college. Which pathway best matches their ambitions? How can they locally achieve the expectations of a CSU or UC transfer degree, IGETC, etc.? This will require information and advisement. Similarly, negotiating the move through one of these paths to UC will require more attention from advisers on campuses across the system.

Members of the Riverside division CEP were curious about the anticipated administrative costs of this proposal.

• Heterogeneity in the community colleges themselves.

The student experience and preparation of students at community colleges varies. Many of us would like BOARS to consider developing evaluations of community colleges akin to the Academic Performance Index that characterizes high schools. This would provide important information about the academic training of students and help us bridge their community college and UC experiences.
October 14, 2011

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Kevin Esterling, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Response to the BOARS transfer admissions proposal

The CHASS executive committee in principle is in favor of the policy’s goal of improving transparency and clarity for potential transfer students, and agrees that preparation should be a primary consideration in the application review.

The executive committee does have a concern that specifying a lengthy set of coursework requirements in preparation for a major has the potential to disadvantage those students most likely to apply to majors in CHASS. In particular requiring a detailed set of courses would seem to favor the students who 1) are pursuing majors that are more clearly vocation oriented and provide a more linear path toward completion (e.g., engineering, accounting, etc.); 2) more generally favor students who go to school knowing precisely what they want to major in at the expense of those who are less certain; and 3) favor students who have a better understanding of what college is about and how the process works at the expense of those who may be less familiar, perhaps because they are the first in their family to go to college.

In light of this concern, we urge the BOARS committee to include better guidelines for how departments should define preparedness. Certainly, departments should require transfer students to have completed any required gateway lower division classes that are prerequisites for upper division enrollment. As an example, the Sociology department requires SOC 001, and sometimes 004 and 005, with a grade of C or better, as a prerequisite for the department’s upper division courses. If a student has not already completed those courses, then she would need to spend at least a quarter and perhaps longer satisfying those requirements before taking upper division courses, and that makes it less likely the student will graduate on time. In addition, a number of CHASS departments have added unit requirements for the major and it is appropriate for departments to require that the student have enough credits that transfer to ensure that enough units mathematically can be completed in two years to satisfy the major.
That said, we think it might be appropriate for CHASS departments not to require any more specific course preparation beyond these practical, administrative requirements. A student who has strong research and writing skills, whether through focusing on art history or sociology or business at the lower division level, might very well make for a good political scientist or anthropologist or theater major. We recommend that the BOARS proposal explicitly include guidelines that address these concerns.

Kevin Esterling, Chair

UCR CHASS Executive Committee
Date: October 26, 2011

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

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

RE: BOARS Transfer Admission Policy

The BCOE Executive Committee reviewed the proposal at its Sept. 14, 2011 meeting. BCOE admits some of its best students as transfers from junior colleges. We are in favor of proposals such as this that facilitate the process while still acknowledging the need to selectively admit based on assessments of students’ level of preparedness.
Sellyna,

The CNAS Executive Committee approved the attachment in its entirety on 9/28/11. No comments were received.

Cherie Pierce
Undergraduate Academic Advising Center Assistant
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
1223 Pierce Hall
Riverside, Ca 92521
951-827-7294
Fax 951-827-2243
.pierce@ucr.
cnasstudent.ucr.

Please remember to bring your student ID card when you come to the office.

Office Hours
Monday – Friday*
9am-12pm & 1pm-4pm
*we will open at 10am on Wednesdays
10/25/2011

Dear Sellyna:

Our UG office looked at the proposal and we have no problem with it.

All the best,

Rami Zwick
Chair of the Faculty, School of Business Administration
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 29, 2011

Proposed Changes to Bylaws 8.7.3.1 & 8.7.4
Committee on Charges

To Be Adopted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.71</strong> This committee consists of seven members. (Am Nov 02)</td>
<td><strong>8.71</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.2</strong> Five members shall constitute a quorum.</td>
<td><strong>8.7.2</strong> No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.3</strong> It is the duty of this committee to:</td>
<td><strong>8.7.3</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.3.1</strong> Receive in writing, through the Chancellor, unresolved complaints regarding Faculty conduct;</td>
<td><strong>8.7.3.1</strong> Receive in writing, through the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee, unresolved complaints regarding Faculty conduct, as per procedures described in SBL336 and UCR Division Appendix 5; (Am Nov 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.3.2</strong> Determine whether the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of University policy regulating individual Faculty conduct; and</td>
<td><strong>8.7.3.2</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.3.3</strong> If answered negatively, recommend to the Chancellor that all references to the complaint shall be expunged from all records except that of the Charges Committee;</td>
<td><strong>8.7.3.3</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.3.4</strong> If answered affirmatively, request from the Chancellor any supporting evidence already developed and conduct an investigation to determine if there is probable cause to warrant a disciplinary hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The findings shall be submitted to the Chancellor. (Am 31 May 79)</td>
<td><strong>8.7.3.4</strong> No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.7.4</strong> The committee may appoint ad hoc hearing committees.</td>
<td><strong>8.7.4</strong> The committee may for the purpose of fulfilling the duty described in 8.7.3.4 appoint ad hoc investigative committees. (Am Nov 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justification:

**Chancellor’s Designee:** Current practice throughout all UC campuses except UCR is for the Chancellor’s designee to submit unresolved complaints regarding possible violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct to the appropriate Academic Senate Committee. Extension of this authority to the Chancellor’s designee will synchronize UCR Bylaw 8.7 with other procedures cited below and bring UCR into alignment with the rest of the UC system. Note that Division Appendix 5 carries the footnote, “… the Chancellor shall be taken to mean the Chancellor or appropriate Chancellor’s designee…”

**UC Senate Bylaw 336 (SBL336)** provides UC system-wide procedures for disciplinary cases related to violations of the Faculty Code of Conduct, including deference to Division policies for initial investigations and ascertainment of probable cause, “Procedures regarding the establishment of probable cause are determined by APM015/016 and Divisional policies.”

**UCR Division Appendix 5 (Policies on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline)** provides procedural instructions for the UCR Committee on Charges (Rules of Procedure for Implementation of Policies on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline at UCR; 5.3) with reference to UC Policy APM015 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline; 5.1), APM016 (The Faculty Code of Conduct; 5.2) and SBL336 (Privilege & Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Disciplinary Cases). The addition of cross-references to these documents, particularly UCR Division Appendix 5, will help clarify that the initial stages of disciplinary actions at UCR require scrutiny by the Committee on Charges, ensuring that the perspective of Academic Senate members becomes known to the Chancellor prior to formal hearings that may subsequently be initiated by the Committee on Privilege & Tenure. Division Appendix 5.3.2 Allegation Procedures and Channels states, “The channels for processing a matter involving allegations in violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct that do not pertain to allegations of research misconduct or sexual harassment shall be from the Department Chair (in those Schools and Colleges that have Chairs) to the Dean of the School or College to the Chancellor to the Committee on Charges of the Academic Senate.” Also Division Appendix 5.3.5 Inquiry by the Committee on Charges of the Academic Senate provides guidance on the proper series of events that may involve the Committee on Charges, “The Committee on Charges shall promptly determine whether the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of the University Faculty Code of Conduct. If the Committee on Charges determines this issue affirmatively, it shall ask the Chancellor for any supporting evidence from earlier stages in the procedure and shall conduct an inquiry to determine whether there is probable cause to warrant a disciplinary hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure of the Academic Senate. For this purpose, the probable cause standard means that the facts as alleged in the complaint, if true, justify the imposition of discipline for a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and that there is credible evidence to support the claim.” The issue is that as Bylaws 8.7 and 8.19 presently stand, one might mistakenly surmise only from juxtaposing their present texts that the duties of the UCR Committee on Charges merely duplicate those assigned to the Committee on Privilege & Tenure. This point of confusion can be remedied by adding a specific reference to UCR Division Appendix 5 within Bylaw 8.7. Doing so would neither add to nor subtract from the duties and authority of the Committee on Charges, but would clarify the distinct temporal role of the UCR Division’s Committee on Charges.

**Hearing vs. investigative.** Hearings are the purview of the Committee on Privilege & Tenure, once a case has reached that Committee. The more appropriate word for Bylaw 8.7.4 is “investigative”, in line with the exploratory, not adjudicative, role of the Committee on Charges.
Clearance and Endorsements Preceding Division Vote:

Endorsed by the Committee on Charges: November 1, 2011

Endorsed by the Committee on Privilege & Tenure: November 2, 2011

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: November 4, 2011

Additional Actions Related to this Proposed Legislation Change:

Received by the Executive Council:
November 4, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain  
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Victor Lippit  
   Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Re: Review of proposed bylaw change for the Committee on Charges

P&T has reviewed the proposed bylaw changes and endorses the amendment. However, this endorsement should not be seen as agreement to end ongoing discussions of other, potentially larger, bylaw changes.
November 4, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
    Academic Senate

From: Kambiz Vafai, Chair  
      Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Committee on Charges Bylaw Change

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction discussed the above referenced item and finds that the amendment appears to be OK. However, this report should have been reviewed by the Committee on Charges and the Committee on Privilege and Tenure in advance of it being presented to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction.