May 5, 2011

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
    Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
    Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
    Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
    Peter Chung (AGSM), Planning and Budget (P&B)
    Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
    Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
    Christine Gailey (Women's Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
    John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
    Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
    J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare (FW)
    David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
    Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council/CCGA Representative
    Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
    Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
    David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences) CNAS Executive Committee
    David S. Pion-Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research (COR)
    Richard L. Smith (SoBA), SoBA 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, May 5, 2011

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, May 9, 2011 at 1:10 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in 220 University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. 1:15 – 1:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td>2 (pp. 8-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. TIM RALSTON – Associate Vice Chancellor, Capital and Physical Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50 – 2:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 1:50 – 2:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</strong></td>
<td>Issues under review – no new items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 2:00 – 2:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Discussion</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 – 3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. DEGREE DELAY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL &amp; COMMITTEE BUSINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 – 3:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 25, 2011

PRESENT:
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
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
Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council
Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), 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)
Richard L. Smith (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy (CEP)
Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative

__________

ABSENT:
Rise B. Axelrod (English), Academic Personnel (CAP)
Christine Gailey (Women's Studies), Committee on Committees (COC)
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)

GUESTS:
Prof. Prof. Tom Perring, Associate Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education
Mr. Len Taylor, Director of Administration, Summer Session
EVC and Provost Dallas Rabenstein

AGENDA:
The agenda for April 25, 2011 was approved as written. The minutes of the April 11, 2011 meeting were approved with the following amendment:

“President Yudof indicated that one possible outcome could be that fees will go up 8% every year for several years.”
Presentation by Prof. Perring, and Director Taylor:
Executive Council members heard a presentation on the major changes for Summer Sessions for 2011. Mr. Taylor, Director of Administration, Summer Sessions indicated that the following changes to summer enrollment policies have been implemented:

- Summer enrollment will begin on May 16.
- Summer registration will use a “pay-as-you-go” enrollment system.
- The Deferred Payment Plan (DPP) will no longer be available to UCR students for their summer fees.
- Summer fees will be posted in the Summer Fees screen in GROWL, and will not appear in the Current Activity screen.

Director Taylor also indicated that there will be no cap on summer enrollment and that with the implementation of the DPP plan, the problems that were experienced last year when there was a large surge of summer enrollment applications will not occur.

Presentation by EVC and Provost Dallas Rabenstein:
EVC and Provost Dallas Rabenstein indicated that he wanted to give the EC members updates on the budget and SoBA.

UCR Budget: EVC and Provost Rabenstein presented the EC members with the budget cut target for the campus for FY 2011-12. The UCR share of the $500 million UC budget cut is $37.8 million. Added to this amount are a number of unfunded mandatory costs, including faculty merits that total to $1.5 million. In addition, there is the employer contribution to UCRP. In 2010-11, this cost was 4%, with the administration funding 2% permanently and 1% on a temporary basis; the units were responsible for the remaining 1%. For 2011-12, the cost goes up to 7% and the administration will fund the entire employer contribution centrally. This will cost UCR $8.5 million. It is anticipated that this cost will increase annually and reach about 17%; therefore, it will continue to be a liability to the campus. The EVC/P indicated that unfunded mandates also include graduate student fees. The administration will be providing funds through the colleges for a partial fee remission to graduate student TAs to cover the increase in fees, which will total about $2 million. These three items plus the $37.8 million comes to a total budget cut for 2011-12 of $49.8 million.

Of this total amount, $15 million is being allocated to the campus units. In explaining where the funding to cover the remaining $34.5 million came from, EVC and Provost Rabenstein indicated that we have revenue coming to the campus from increased fees and this will be a permanent source of revenue, and net of financial aid, it amounts to $7.2 million. In addition, in the 2010-11 budget there was funding for an increase in the number of students. We had about 3000 unfunded students and in the budget we received funding for an additional 831 students, which amounted
to about $13.2 million. The fee the students pay will generate an additional $13.1 million. We will also generate revenue by excising taxes for ground use to some of the units, for example, dormitories that are built on land owned by UCR. This action will generate approximately $1 million. These sources of revenue account for $34.5 million of the $49.8 million cut, which leaves the $15 million that is being sought from the campus units. EVC and Provost Rabenstein provided the EC members with a handout that listed each unit and a targeted 8.36% cut, which is being used as a starting point in determining the budget reductions for the units on campus. He stressed that this was not a fixed percentage but a starting point and that he fully expects that cuts will be differential and based on the plans of the units. All the units will have an opportunity to make a presentation to the Chancellor’s Budget Advisory Committee (CBAC) and the Academic Senate Planning and Budget Committee (P&B) to describe what cuts would occur in the unit and how it would affect progress as defined in the Strategic Plan. In this process, the administration will strive to preserve the academic enterprise and as such, the proposed budget cuts do not include the salaries of ladder-rank faculty.

EVC and Provost Rabenstein indicated that it was also important to note that the cut to the university might go up if the tax extension does not get approved. He also indicated that there was now talk of an all-cuts budget and speculation is that the cut to UC will increase to almost a billion dollars; UCR’s share in this total will be in the range of $90 million. At this point, the campus administration is not thinking of this scenario and is only dealing with the $50 million cut. EVC and Provost Rabenstein urged the EC members to engage in advocacy by writing to their assembly representatives and senators. Regarding the issue of unfunded students, EVC and Provost Rabenstein indicated that unfunded students were an important source of revenue for UCR. In response to a question regarding the quality of education, EVC and Provost Rabenstein indicated that the quality of education being provided to students may suffer with over enrollment but that the university needs to be practical at this time about each source of revenue.

EVC and Provost Rabenstein also responded to a question regarding the deficit in CNAS and CHASS. He has been meeting with the Deans and CFAOs and they are almost done with the planning. The deficits were caused by various reasons and he indicated that the administration has provided both to CNAS and CHASS temporary teaching funds to cover the increased cost of instruction. In response to a question about how much of the $13.1 million from unfunded students will go back to colleges for instruction and how much goes to discretionary funds, EVC and Provost
Rabenstein indicated that for next year, they will set aside $4.5 million to go to departments for temporary teaching.

Regarding faculty salary increases, EVC and Provost Rabenstein indicated that right now was not a good time to do this, however, once it is approved systemwide, the cost will come from campus budgets; it will not be centrally funded by OP. Everyone recognizes that there is a need for salary adjustment. We also have to remember that unrepresented staff has not had an increase since 2007 and there is great fear that these staff will be targets for unionization, which would be a major blow to the UC.

Finally, EVC and Provost Rabenstein discussed the issue of Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) as an alternative to hiring faculty so that they could teach more courses. Currently, UCR has two faculty members holding this title, and the administration is not in favor of increasing hiring LSOEs. EVC and Provost Rabenstein indicated that there are two ways to examine teaching load – one is to count the number of courses that a faculty member teaches and the other is to count the Student FTE/Faculty workload ratio. We are funded at 18.7 student FTE per one faculty FTE and examining workload based on student FTE is more useful when course enrollment goes up, as it is currently.

**SoBA:** Last spring, the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost met with the EC members and discussed with them their concerns about SoBA. Since that time, the Chancellor and EVC/ Provost has met with all the staff and faculty of SoBA and there were several recurring themes that were consistent across the staff and faculty. Several changes in SoBA will be implemented in response to these inquiries. One change is to disestablish/discontinue the three departments in SoBA, and a proposal to this effect is currently under Senate review. UCR is the only Business School in the UC system that has departments.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:**
Chair Gauvain indicated that the Assembly had its first face-to-face meeting on April 13, 2011 and that she and Prof. Albert Wang, Sr. Representative to the Assembly and Prof. Thomas Morton, Jr. Representative to the Assembly attended the meeting that was held in Oakland. Prof. Wang discussed the decision, which was announced at the meeting, for the Office of the President to stop funding the Discovery Grant program, which in his opinion was short sighted. The UC Discovery Grants (UCDG) promote collaborations between University of California researchers and industry partners in the interest of supporting cutting-edge research, strengthening the state’s economy, and serving the public good. UCDG research projects are jointly funded by a UC Discovery Grant and an industry sponsor matching contribution. Chair Gauvain indicated that this decision was part of the funding streams proposal model and that the UCDG was not the only program being cut. Under funding streams, the decision to fund such projects will lie with the Chancellor. Chair Gauvain indicated that this type of change makes discussions on “rebenching” very
important. It is hoped that “rebenching” will distribute the state funding in a more equitable manner across the 10 UC campuses than is currently the case.

**UCR Health Sciences Compensation Plan:**
A clarification was made regarding the base salary for faculty in the HSCP. It was noted that the base salary is the same as that of faculty on an 11-month appointment. Any payment above the base salary does not come from state funds. Clinical faculty will be paid out of their clinical income and not state funds. The EC members unanimously endorsed the proposed UCR Health Sciences Compensation Plan and a memo will be prepared by Chair Gauvain to send news of this endorsement to the VPAP office.

**Proposal to Disestablish/Consolidate Departments within the UCR School of Business (SoBA):**
The EC discussed the proposal to consolidate and disestablish SoBA's three departments. The EC members noted that the faculty of the School had also endorsed the proposal. The Committees on Academic Personnel, Educational Policy, Graduate Council, Faculty Welfare and Planning and Budget have also reviewed the proposal and all unanimously endorsed it.

The EC unanimously endorsed this proposal and it will be submitted to the Division for divisional vote.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Selwyn Ehlers
Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
To Be Adopted

Proposed Changes to Regulation 6 – Campus Graduation Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>R6.14</strong> (for undergraduates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In cases of student misconduct, the student’s College Executive Committee may defer or withhold his or her degree for a specified period of time. The Dean of Students may recommend such an action to the College Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:** At present the university does not have a policy that allows for deferral or withholding of degree. Students who are involved in serious violations of university policy in their final quarter of enrollment, academic or social, typically face no disciplinary consequences for their misconduct as they are able to complete their degree and leave the University before the disciplinary issue can be resolved. Through the Committee on Educational Policy, the Dean of Students and Director of Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Program propose amendment to Regulation 6 to provide a mechanism for the University to respond to serious violations of University policy in a student’s final quarter in a manner that is parallel to the response with students who are at a different point in their academic career. Similar policies are in place at several sister UC campuses.

Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: September 29, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: June 15, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of COE: October 27, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of SoBA: October 11, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: October 5, 2010
Approved by the Executive Committee of the Division of Biomedical Sciences: June 11, 2010
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: April 21, 2011
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: March 30, 2011
Endorsed by the Executive Council:
April 22, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
   Academic Senate

From: Kambiz Vafai, Chair  
   Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Degree Delay Legislation – R6.14

The committee on Rules & Jurisdiction has reviewed the revised language from CEP and has no objection to the proposed new language.
March 31, 2011

TO: SUSAN ALLEN ORTEGA
DEAN OF STUDENTS

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: DEGREE DELAY LEGISLATION

During its March 30 meeting, the CEP reviewed the proposed changes to Regulation 6. The Committee was supportive of the proposal, and saw merits in both of the proposed wordings. After some discussion the CEP agreed on the following alternative:

In cases of student misconduct, the student's College Executive Committee may defer or withhold his or her degree for a specified period of time. The Dean of Students may recommend such an action to the College Executive Committee.

The Committee approved this version with a vote of 9 in favor, 0 against and no abstentions.

cc: Mary Gauvain, Chair, Division
Date: October 27, 2010

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

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

RE: Reg 6.13

R&J makes several good points which the BCOE Executive Committee agrees with. We prefer reverting to text closer to the original text, but with minor adjustments.

A student’s degree may be deferred or withheld as part of the student conduct process for serious academic or non-academic violations, with approval by the student’s College Executive Committee. The Dean of Students may recommend such an action to the College.
October 11, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

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

RE: Regulation 6, Campus graduation requirement changes

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

Erik Rolland
Selleya

The GSOE Executive Committee approved changes to Regulation 6 13 on October 5, 2010.

Melanie Sperling  
Professor  
Chair of GSOE Executive Committee
Hi Sellyna,

I hope you are well. I have included the Conflict of Interest memo for the CHASS Executive Committee and Regulation 6 (also approved by the faculty) with this email. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thank you,
Gabrielle
June 15, 2010

To: Anthony W Norman
    Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

From: Marylynn V. Yates
      Chair

RE: Review Proposed Changes to Regulation 6 – Campus Graduation Requirement

The CNAS Executive Committee discussed the proposed language for Regulation 6 13 at its meeting of June 10, 2010. After considerable discussion, the Executive Committee voted unanimously to deny the proposed regulation as written.

The Executive Committee agrees with the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction’s assessment that the regulation is inconsistent with Bylaw 9.5, which allocates the decision-making authority over awarding of degrees to the college executive committees and the Deans of the faculty. We believe that the regulation should be re-written to include language that allows an executive committee to review and countermand the Dean of Students’ placing of a hold on a student’s records and degree (when that hold is for academic reasons), where they determined that this sanction is unwarranted.

c Jose Wudka, Chair, Educational Policy
June 11, 2010

TO: Anthony W. Norman, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Daniel S. Straus
Professor of Biomedical Sciences

RE: Proposed Changes to Regulation 6

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee reviewed the proposed change to Regulation 6, Graduation Requirement. I am substituting on the committee for Prof. Ameae Walker, who is out of town until June 18. We concur with the concerns raised by the R & J Committee in their memo of June 1. Therefore, we recommend that the proposal be sent back to its original author for revision in response to the concerns of R & J.
JUNE 1, 2010

TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOHN CIOFFI, CHAIR
RULES AND JURISDICTION COMMITTEE

RE: R & J Response to Regulation 6 (language change after college/school approvals).

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the proposed amendment of Division Regulation 6 to require withholding degrees pending the resolution of disciplinary charges. We have some additional concerns that we would like to bring to the attention of those considering the amendment. Bylaw 9.5 governs the award of degrees and thus the subject matter of the proposed regulation:

9.5 The executive or other appropriate committee and the Dean or other appropriate academic administrative officer of each of the colleges and schools, and of the Graduate Division, under the jurisdiction of the Riverside Division shall act finally for the Riverside Division (a) in the award of all degrees and certificates to students of the college, school or Graduate Division concerned, in all cases that do not involve the suspension of a regulation or that involve only minor adjustments in the curriculum . . .

The Bylaw allocates decision-making authority over the awarding of degrees to both the college/school executive committee and the Dean of that faculty. This raises the issue of whether the proposed regulation's delegation of enforcement power to the Dean of Students is consistent with Bylaw 9.5. Accordingly, the justification accompanying the proposed amendment should explain why this delegation from academic personnel to an administration official is advisable as policy and proper under the bylaws. One question that the proposed delegation raises is why delegation of non-discretionary enforcement authority is superior to enforcement by the Deans of the colleges and schools who already have a formal role in the awarding of degrees. An explanation of the reasons supporting the proposed enforcement role of the Dean of Students is also in order because the wording effecting this delegation, added after all but one of the college/school executive committees had approved the original proposal, is the central issue in the reconsideration and approval process.

R&J has several additional policy concerns regarding the potential consequences of the proposed regulation that we would like to raise for the benefit of those considering it:
1. The colleges and schools may be locking themselves into this delegation of enforcement authority, even if one or more of them later decides this was an ill-advised policy. By adopting a Division regulation approved by all executive committees, all the ECs may have to approve an amendment and get it adopted to restore their prior independent authority. An executive committee would not have the power to review and countermand the Dean of Students' placing of a hold on a student's records and degree where they determined that this sanction is unwarranted (at least on the face of the proposed regulation). These effects of the proposed regulation should be considered, if they have not been to date.

2. The CEP's rejection of the term "serious violations" does indeed avoid the possible arbitrariness of application that accompanies ambiguous terms and the difficulties inherent in trying to specify what is a "serious violation" in advance. However, this may have traded one problem for another: the current language lowers the threshold for placing a hold on a degree and may result in a sanction that is both rigid and too broadly imposed. Do the amendment's proponents want to withhold degrees for pending but trivial matters--and eliminate discretion in doing so? Is this procedure appropriate if the final sanction for a student infraction does not include withholding of a degree? In such a case, the procedure in the proposed regulation may impose a more severe penalty than called for by the academic integrity and discipline policy (as withholding degrees may threaten post-grad jobs, enrollment in grad programs, etc.). Because the Dean of Students is given no discretion in the matter and there is no authority granted to the college/school executive committees or Deans to grant the degree or withdraw the hold, the proposed regulation creates potential problems of rigidity, overinclusiveness, and fairness that should be considered.

These problems could be addressed by including language, currently lacking, that allows an executive committee to review the Dean of Students' withholding of a degree. This would also be consistent with the allocation of authority under Bylaw 9.5 and the language of the proposal's justification emphasizing the retained authority of the executive committees and the narrow delegation of enforcement powers to the Dean of Students.

Another way to avoid these problems would be to limit the non-discretionary withholding of degrees to cases in which the sanction for the violation would or could result in the degree not being awarded at that time (e.g., either due to expulsion, suspension, or insufficient credits). For lesser violations, the degree would be granted, though a provision could be adopted requiring a notation on the student's transcript stating that disciplinary charges are pending.

3. Finally, because Bylaw 9.5 gives them a role in approving the award of degrees, the Deans of the colleges and schools should be consulted during the consideration of the proposed amendment to Regulation 6.

R&J