February 9, 2012

TO:    Kenneth Barish (Physics), Graduate Council
       Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
       Walter Clark (Music) Academic Personnel
       Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
       Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
       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. Rep to the Assembly
       Martin Johnson (Political Science), Educational Policy (CEP)
       Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Preparatory Education
       Umar Mohideen (Physics), Planning and Budget (P&B)
       Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)
       Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative
       Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
       Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
       David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
       Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
       Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
       Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
       Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

FR:    Mary Gauvain, Chair
       Riverside Division

RE:    Executive Council Agenda, February 13, 2012

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, February 13, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220, Floor University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong> 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of Interest Statement – GSOE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Issues under review – Items currently under review</em></td>
<td>2 (pp. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong> 1:10 – 1:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. PRESENTATION BY VICE CHANCELLOR PETER HAYASHIDA VC UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong> 1:45 – 2:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. DISCUSSION REGARDING UNIVERSITY CLUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong> 2:00 – 2:05</td>
<td>3 (pp. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. BYLAW CHANGE FOR COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND HONORS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be received by the EC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion</strong> 2:05 – 2:25</td>
<td>4 (pp. 9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Assembly/protest on the UCR campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Morton will lead discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong> 2:25 – 3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. UPDATES FROM COMMITTEE CHAIRS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESENT:
Kenneth Barish (Physics), Graduate Council
Walter Clark (Music) Academic Personnel
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)
Martin Johnson ( Political Science), Educational Policy (CEP)
Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Preparatory Education
Umar Mohideen (Physics), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative
Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
Jodie S. Holt (Botany and Plant Sciences), Jr. Rep to the Assembly

GUESTS:
Chancellor Tim White

AGENDA:
The agenda and minutes were approved as written. The Conflict of Interest Statements of the Senate Committees were noted as received.

PRESENTATION BY CHANCELLOR WHITE:
Chancellor White indicated that the search for the Vice Chancellor for Research is on-going and that there were some potential candidates. Chancellor White discussed the events that took place on January 3 while the UC Regents were meeting at UCR. Protests were expected and the Chancellor stated that there was extensive planning as to how to handle
the protests and also secure the safety of the Regents. By prior arrangement, approximately 105 police officers from the other UC campuses, except for Davis, Santa Cruz and Merced, were assisting on our campus during the Regents visit. As the crowd involved in the demonstration on January grew larger, 40 officers from the Riverside Police and 50 deputies from the Riverside County Sheriff's Department were called onto campus to assist. The Chancellor said that the police detained three people during the protests. One of these individuals was released without charge and the other two people were arrested and booked on suspicion of felony assault on a police officer. Because of the UC Davis incident in November, the police were advised not to use pepper spray. However, a UCR police officer fired rubber pellets toward protesters who were trying to break through police lines in the rear of the HUB building. In total, Chancellor White indicated that nine UC police officers sustained injuries, including bruises, cuts, and scratches. In response to a question from an EC member who wanted to know why the meeting was declared an unlawful assembly, Chancellor White responded that it was a tactical decision to keep the building secure.

Chancellor White also discussed the open comment session during the Regents meeting. He noted that apart from those who set out to be disruptive, the students and others who spoke expressed legitimate concerns about affordability and access to UC, as well as the quality of the educational experience. Chancellor White also mentioned the contribution of one of our undergraduate students, Chris LoCascio, who presented to the Regents a different approach to funding UC. This student worked for nine months with other students, as well as UCR and UC finance people to design a plan they call FixUC. The Chancellor said that all the Chancellors and the Regents are deeply concerned about the budget difficulties at UC and are working towards finding some form of solution.

Chancellor White also answered questions regarding the UCR medical school and indicated that he is in the process of discussions to secure funding for the Medical School that will enable the school to get accreditation.

He also mentioned that with regards to rebenching as of the last meeting held, the agreement was that ANR funds would not be considered as part of general campus funds.

**BYLAWS OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE** were received by the Executive Council as written.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:**

**Academic Integrity Policy:** Responses were received from CNAS, GSOE, SoBA, CHASS, BCOE, R&J, CEP, and Graduate Council. The SoBA, CHASS and GSOE Executive Committees approved the Policy as written. The remaining committees were not satisfied with the attempt to clarify the changes and CEP in particular noted that the intent of the proposed changes focused on two issues: the recruitment of members for Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) hearing panels, especially those held during the summer, and the removal of graduate student academic integrity reviews from the SCAIP office to Graduate Division, to be overseen by the Dean of the Graduate Division. They had no objections to these revisions, however, they felt that the Dean of Undergraduate Students should revert to the original language of the Academic Integrity Policy and make changes to that as necessary to implement the
proposed substantive changes. Graduate Council on the other hand felt that the policy as written does not include graduate students and that it was inappropriate to have undergraduate students sitting on graduate review panels. The Chair of Graduate Council indicated that if there is no agreement on the revisions as proposed, then an attempt should be made to prepare another policy that deals only with Graduate Council. After further discussions, it was agreed that the Chair of Educational Policy and the Chair of Graduate Council would meet to formulate an appropriate policy and to include the Executive Committees of the Colleges in the discussions at an earlier point.

**iEval:** The EC members discussed the provision of incentives to students in order to get them to complete online teaching evaluations. Many members argued that incentives should not be taken away. The Chair of CAP indicated that his committee discussed the issue of iEvals and they felt that incentives should be made to students because the weight of iEvals in the review process is important. It was noted however, that the APM spells out multiple forms of criteria for evaluation, and it would be erroneous for CAP to depend only on iEvals. Another member expressed concern that students who did not complete the ieval for a class and received their grade later than other students might be disadvantaged in knowing what courses to enroll in the following quarter. In such instances, this member noted that the current incentive could be construed as a form of coercion. Based on the majority support for the current system of incentives, Chair Gauvain dropped the matter.

**Defining Academic Freedom:** Prof. Tom Morton, Chair of Academic Freedom and Sr. Representative to the Assembly raised the issue of Academic Freedom. He indicated that in his opinion, the Committee on Academic Freedom should be the one to discuss and opine on issues related to spontaneous campus demonstrations and not an ad hoc committee or a taskforce. Chair Gauvain indicated that it was important for the Senate to think about these issues and that Prof. Morton and his Committee should deliberate on this issue and report back to the Executive Council. The Chair also said that she would consult with some of the EC members regarding the establishment of an ad hoc committee to look into similar matters.

**Other Executive Council & Committee Business:**

David Parker (Environmental Sciences), Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

- Professor Parker informed the EC that WASC had indicated that Learning Outcomes was no longer required for General Education but that they will have to do graduation competencies for outgoing seniors. These will be administered by departments.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Selbyna Ehlers
Executive Director,
Office of the Academic Senate
2011-2012 Conflict of Interest Statement

If a committee member’s personal affiliation with an organization or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member should bring this fact to the attention of the committee. The committee member may be asked to provide information, as appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Executive Council - (A/I or I)</th>
<th>Division Due Date</th>
<th>Systemwide Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Review of the UC Observatories</td>
<td>COR, P&amp;B AND PHYSICS DEPT</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(updated 02/09/12)
COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND HONORS
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
FEBRUARY 21, 2012

To be adopted:

Present:

8.22.1 This committee consists of eight members of the Division; one undergraduate student representative; Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, ex officio; and the Director of Financial Aid, ex officio. (Am 4 Feb 88) (Am 20 Feb 03)

Proposed:

8.22.1 This committee consists of eight members of the Division; one undergraduate student representative, who shall not have the right to vote; Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, ex officio, who shall not have the right to vote; and the Director of Financial Aid, ex officio, who shall not have the right to vote. (Am 4 Feb 88) (Am 20 Feb 03)

8.22.2.4 Report to the Division, at least twice annually, on deliberations and recommendations of the committee.

8.22.2.4 Report to the Division annually on deliberations and recommendations of the committee.

Justification:

At its October 7, 2010 meeting, the Committee on Scholarships and Honors unanimously approved changes to its bylaws. First, the Committee eliminated the voting rights of ex officio members (and one of the two ex-officio members was present for this vote). We voted to do so because ex officio members do not regularly attend meetings and since at any given meeting there are always one or two other absences, were someone to call for a quorum, the Committee would be unable to conduct business. Second, the Committee changed the wording of the bylaws to clarify that the student representative has no voting rights, as per Academic Senate regulations. Finally, for many years (except for this year), the Committee has met only once; when it selects the recipients of the awards it oversees in early spring. The Committee reports to the Division annually and has done so for quite some time, not at least twice annually as stated in the bylaw. The Committee felt this needed to be clarified and corrected in the bylaws.

Effective: upon approval

Approved by Committee on Scholarships and Honors: 10/7/2010

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 1/6/2011

Received by the Executive Council:
February 8, 2012

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair, UCR Academic Senate

From: Tom Morton, Chair, Cmtee on Academic Freedom

RE: CAF & UC Davis graduate student positions regarding academic freedom

At its January 31 meeting, UCR’s committee on academic freedom (CAF) voted unanimously to send the following statement to the EC for comment.

"The right of assembly and expression of views shall not be suppressed. Such assemblies and expressions, however, shall not interfere with the lawful conduct (and public safety) of others on the University."

Independently, graduate students at Davis recently formulated their view of academic freedom, as summarized on the attached page extracted from their 7 page report. They have transmitted this "proposition" the the Davis CAF, which has, in turn, circulated it to the membership of UCAF. In my view, their proposition expands the scope of academic freedom beyond the ambit of APM10, but it does provide a basis for discussion of academic freedom at the upcoming EC meeting.

Thank you.
There is no single source from which a definition of academic freedom can be obtained, as it pertains to graduate students at the University of California, Davis (UCD). That is true because federal and state laws and regulations supersede University and individual campus authority and policies; thus, definitions, obligations, articulated freedoms and restrictions from those sources are, *de facto*, part of the definition of academic freedom as it pertains to the University--whether or not they are specifically written into University definitions and policies. The proposition below is an attempt to form a single definition of academic freedom as it uniquely pertains to graduate students at UCD, drawing from many disparate sources which are provided in, and hyperlinked from the references section.

Academic freedom for University of California, Davis (UCD) graduate students is a set of rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, federal and state law, and University policies. Academic freedom is the right to inquire; to critically examine knowledge and values, including the right to take a civil and reasoned exception to the data or views offered in any course of study; to practice free speech on or off campus, including the freedom to express a wide range of viewpoints, and also the presentation of controversial material which is relevant; and to exercise the rights of assembly and free exchange of ideas. Graduate students have a right to expect faculty to encourage and protect the following: The right to engage in scholarly inquiry; the right to engage in the free exchange of ideas; the right to critically examine, present and discuss controversial material; the obligation of faculty members not to perceive graduate student inquiry as adversarial; and, the obligation of faculty members not to treat graduate students in an arbitrary manner. Further, graduate students may expect the University to insure that these rights are not abridged.