October 22, 2007

TO: W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Vice Chair, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
    J. E. (Julian) Allison, Chair, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, (Department of
    Political Science)
    W. (Wendy) Ashmore, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Anthropology)
    C. (Chris) Chase-Dunn, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Department
    of Sociology)
    J. M. (John) Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of English)
    J. (John) Halebian, Chair AGSM Executive Committee, (A. Gary Anderson
    Graduate School of Management)
    A. S. (Andrew) Jacobs, Secretary Parliamentarian, (Department of Religious
    Studies)
    D. (Dan) Jeske, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology,
    (Department of Statistics)
    P. (Pierre) Keller, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of
    Philosophy)
    C. J. (Carol) Lovatt, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Botany and
    Plant Sciences)
    M. L. (Mart) Molle, Junior Representative to the Assembly, (Department of
    Computer Science and Engineering)
    A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)
    L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)
    T. C. (Tom) Patterson, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of
    Anthropology)
    R. (Rick) Redak, Chair, Faculty Welfare, (Department of Entomology)
    P. M. (Pete) Sadler, Chair, Undergraduate Council (Department of Earth
    Sciences)
    T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of
    Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)
    K. (Kambiz) Vafai, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of
    Mechanical Engineering)
    F. M. (Frank) Vahid, Chair, COE Executive Committee, (Computer Science &
    Engineering)
    A. M. (Ameae) Walker, Chair, Division of Biomedical Sciences, (Biomedical
    Sciences)
    __________, Chair, Committee on Research
    __________, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of
    Education)

FR: T. Cogswell, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA – OCTOBER 22, 2007

This is to confirm the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Monday, October 22, 2007,
at 1:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.

Please let me know your attendance plans. *A light lunch will be served!!*
Following is the agenda - please print out a copy and the attachments and bring them to the meeting.

1. **CONSENT CALENDAR:**
   
   Action items:
   - Approval of the agenda (page 1 - 2)
   - Approval of the September 24 2007 notes (Attached) (page 3 - 6)

   Information Items Only:
   - Conflict of Interest Statements: Biomedical Sciences, Distinguished Teaching Educational Policy, Faculty Research Lecturer, Faculty Welfare, Library, International Education, Rules and Jurisdiction, Undergraduate Council, CNAS Executive Committee, CHASS Executive Committee, AGSM Executive Committee, BCOE Executive Committee Courses, UNEX and Privilege and tenure, (Attached) (page 7 - 22)

2. **PROPOSED CHANGE TO BYLAW 2.6 – EXECUTIVE OFFICE (page 23)**

   In May 2007, the Executive Office bylaws were amended to clarify the role of the Secretary Parliamentarian. 2.6 should have been amended at the same time, but it was not. Action requested is for Advisory to approve this change for onward transmission to R&J and then the Division.

3. **PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL (Attached) (page 24 - 31)**

   Action requested is for the Advisory to review and approve or disapprove and recommend a name.

4. **PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION BYLAW 8.15.1 OFFICE (page 32)**

   There is no longer a position for the Vice Chancellor of International Programs. The replacement for this position will be the Dean of UNEX. International Services Center has changed its name to International Education Center.

5. **REPORT OF THE JOINT SENATE/ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO:**
   - RETIRED FACULTY AND SENIOR STAFF - (see Attached) (page 33 - 51)

   The joint task force was appointed by the EVCP and the Academic Senate on May 9 2006. The purpose of the task force is to find ways to re-engage retired faculty and senior staff in the campus community. Action requested is for the Senate to review and approve or disapprove and prepare a report for the EVCP.

6. **REPORT ON GRADUATE STUDENT FUNDING MODELS AND THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE EDUCATION (see Attached) (page 52 - 96)**

   Action requested is for the Senate to review and prepare a recommendation for the Administration.

7. **REMARKS BY THE CHAIR:**

   Revised Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Launched in September
   Follow-up to the retreat:
   - Efile Oversight Committee (Rick Redak, Tom Morton, Kathleen Montgomery, Paul Pavlou, 2 Executive Committee members)
   - Themes for the Campus to pursue – Environment, International Education
   - Visit by President Dynes and the Advisory Committee for the Chancellorial Search (10/29)
   - Faculty Survey
PRESENT:

T. (Tom) Cogswell, Chair, (Department of History)
W.P. (Ward) Beyermann, Vice Chair, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
Andrew S. Jacobs, Secretary-Parliamentarian (Department of Religious Studies)
J.E. Allison, Chair, Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity, (Department of Political Science)
Wendy Ashmore, Chair, Graduate Council, (Department of Anthropology)
C. Chase-Dunn, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Sociology)
J. Haleblian, Chair, AGSM Executive Committee, (A Gary Anderson School of Management)
D. Jeske, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Tech, (Department of Statistics)
P. Keller, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of Philosophy)
C. (Carol) Lovatt, Senior Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Botany & Plant Sciences)
A.W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)
L.P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)
T. Patterson, Chair, CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Anthropology)
R. (Rick) Redak, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare, (Department of Entomology)
P. Sadler, Chair, Undergraduate Council, (Department of Earth Sciences)
K. Vafai, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Mech Engr)
F. Vahid, Chair, BCOE Executive Committee, (Department of Computer Science & Engr)
A. Walker, Chair, Division of Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee, (Department of Biomedical Sciences)

ABSENT:

J. Ganim, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of English)
P. Green Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of Education)
M.L. Molle, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)

GUESTS:

Acting Chancellor Robert Grey

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Proposed Change to Bylaw M2 AGSM was approved unanimously.
Conflict of Interest Statement was readopted as written.

INTRODUCTIONS:  
Members of the Advisory Committee introduced themselves.

REMARKS BY THE CHANCELLOR:  
His priorities of the coming year will be addressed at the Chancellor’s Leadership Retreat scheduled for Tuesday, September 25, 2007.

Announced that former Chancellor Ivan Hinderaker had passed away yesterday, at the age of 91. A press release will be sent out.

Budget: There will be a 6% increase. The base budget news is good, .5% & 1%, UC fared well. At the Regent’s meeting last week, the plan for new faculty salary scales was approved to be effective October 1, 2007. The plan is estimated to cost $52 million in the first year, then 3 years to phase in the plan. Details need to be worked out. The Chancellor distributed information to the Committee from the Office of the President.

RE-89 – In a heated debate, the Regents voted 14-4 in favor of a policy that would serve as a three-part compromise to allow UC researchers to accept money from the tobacco companies. Exercise professional and ethical care when accepting money from the tobacco companies, requires the chancellors to approve of any tobacco industry grants, and requires an annual report on proposals and research.

School Fees: The Regents approved fee increases and it was argued that the fee increases will make UC less accessible.

The Presidential search has been launched and the full search committee met, E. Elliott will be a member of the committee with Regent Blum as Chair.

Chancellor search: President Dynes will Chair the committee, Regent Blum will be an ex officio. The committee will be comprised of 5 regents; 5 ex officio members representing ASUCR, GSA, staff, alumni, and the Board of Trustees, 5 faculty of which 3 will be from UCR, 1 from a UC campus and 1 from UC system wide. The committee will be here October 29, 2007.

CNAS Dean Search: They will restart the search. There are college structure issues and the Chancellor and EVC are meeting with the Interim Dean to discuss these issues.

REMARKS BY THE CHAIR:  
Chair Cogswell welcomed the Advisory Committee members to the first meeting of the year.
Report on Graduate Student Funding Models and Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Education (Childers Report).

Both of these reports were discussed. The Ad Hoc report (Childers) came out first in June 2007 and had some aspects of student funding. There was an interest from Administration in the report. The EVC asked for a separate report. The Graduate Student Funding Report (Russell) came out in August. After considerable discussion the Committee unanimously agreed to have the Senate Chair forward the reports to the EVC. Attention will be drawn to the Childers Report showing how these reports are complimentary. Copies of the reports were taken to the Leadership Retreat.

Faculty Survey – There were only 30% - 40% that responded to the survey, which wasn’t a large enough sample to accurately analyze the data. The Senate will conduct another survey and use whatever percentage responds, and will control the process. The Senate will control the questions and work with Wonderlic. The EVC has approved the funding for this additional survey. The Advisory Committee was pleased that the Senate would be composing the questions. Questions could be expanded; what are we trying to find out? The committee unanimously approved of the faculty survey.

CODEO Survey: The Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity has been working on an exit survey for faculty who have left UCR. The EVC declined to pay for the survey. J. Allison, Chair of CODE, met with Yolanda Moses and Marlene Zuk. They would lend their support to a CODEO proposal to the EVC for funding of a revised/simplified faculty exit survey to be administered by the Survey Research Center with data released to the committee. A draft proposal will be reviewed by the CODEO at their first meeting in October.

Senate Retreat: There has been a change in venue for the retreat. It will be held at Pentland Hills Bear Cave B107. Tom stated that if anyone needed a parking pass he would get temporary passes for that day.

Faculty Salaries: There will be a 5% pay increase across the board, a 4.8% range adjustment from high associates and low full professors. When the off scale has been exhausted, this will go into affect.

Administrative Searches: President Dynes will appoint the new Chancellor. If there is a new President, then he/she would make the decision on the new Chancellor. Chair Cogswell will speak with Chancellor Grey to extend an invitation for a visit from President Dynes. The Senate will have a role in the CNAS Dean search. Committee Chairs played a role in the last candidate search. There will be a staggered search next fall for the medical school Dean.
Compromise to RE 89: Discussed the situation with the tobacco compromise that the Regents are working on. (See Chancellor’s remarks.)

Medical School Update: Things have slowed down on the medical school proposal. Administration is interested in Senate opinions for the medical school meeting. Need maximum Senate representation.

Faculty Housing Plan: The Creekside property deal will not take place. There is some property downtown which could be utilized to make into apartment lofts. There is a proposal to receive bids.

Senate Reorganization: A committee is in the process of being selected to work on drafting a proposal on the senate structure. Chair Cogswell suggested a possible name change of the Advisory Committee to the Senate Executive Committee.

CAP is now settled in the Senate.. There will be more new photographs for the Senate conference rooms and we hope to have a reception in the fall.

The 2nd Annual Chili Cookoff will be held in November.

Chair Cogswell mentioned the possibility of a “Fast Walk” to raise money for student scholarships. More information to follow.

Accounting Issues: Would like to set up a meeting with Bobbi McCracken, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Financial Services to discuss issues. NRT money, 90% given back to the campus. Money goes to Graduate Council to reimburse the P.I. but not receiving it. Will track down where the money is.

Health Science Code Conduct: UCOP is asking for nominations of Senate faculty from which a member can be selected to work with Rory Jaffe, Executive Director, Medical Services to work on the proposed revision to the health sciences code of conduct so that it is consistent with the faculty code of conduct and statement of ethnical values. Chair Cogswell asked AC to send any nomination names to him and he will forward to Committee on Committees. Nominee(s) need to be submitted by October 5, 2007 to UCOP.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sue Stracener
Senior Analyst
September 24th, 2007

TO: Thomas Coggswell, Chair Academic Senate
FROM: Ameae Walker, Chair Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
RE: Conflict of Interest Statement

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee adopts the following policy on conflict of interest. If a member of the committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, said member should bring the potential conflict of interest to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will convene a meeting in the absence of the person with the potential conflict and those present will determine whether a conflict exists. If the decision is in the affirmative, the individual considered to have a conflict may be asked to absent him/herself during committee discussions of the subject matter in question and, should a vote be taken, will not vote on the issue. Should the Chair be the person considered to have a conflict of interest, the most senior member of the committee will serve the function of the Chair in the process outlined.
October 3, 2007

TO: T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: N. L. SCHILLER, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2007-08:

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 4, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: PIERRE KELLER, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: CEP 2007-08 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

At its first meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy on October 3, we unanimously adopted the following statement on Conflict of Interest:

The Committee on Educational Policy has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. It is the obligation of the committee member involved and any committee member aware of a potential conflict of interest of another member to bring the potential conflict to the attention of the Chair. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where 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.
October 3, 2007

TO: T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: R. ROBERT RUSSELL, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer approved the re-adoptation of the following conflict of interest statement for 2007-08:

If a member of the Committee on Faculty Research Lecturer believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call that possibility to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will then convene the committee, in the absence of the putative conflictee and those present will decide by a majority vote if a conflict exists. If the decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicting matter and will not vote on that issue.
October 5, 2007

TO:    THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    R. REDAK, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE:    CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2007-2008

The Committee on Faculty Welfare approved the following Conflict of Interest Statement:

The following policy has been adopted for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee on Faculty Welfare might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare are asked to identify when they may have a potential conflict of interest on any items before any discussion. The Committee member 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 on Faculty Welfare Chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
SEPTEMBER 20, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DAVID CROHN, CHAIR
LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION COMMITTEE

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Library and Scholarly Communication Committee has re-adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement covering the Committee’s business for 2007-2008.

If personal affiliation of individual committee members with departments, programs, or with individuals bringing business before the Committee may be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, such member(s) shall not participate in the relevant discussion and shall be recorded “not voting” in the event a vote is taken on that issue. Determination of such possible conflict of interest shall be made by the affected member him/herself or by the majority vote of the Committee.
October 9, 2007

TO: T. COGSWELL, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: E. H. RECK, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

RE: 2007-08 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

At its meeting of October 9, 2007, the Committee on International Education adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement:

The Committee on International Education has adopted the following policy for situations where the 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. The committee member 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 10, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION, ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: P. GORECKI, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT FOR 2007-2008

In accordance with Bylaw 8.2.4, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction re-adopted the following statement for handling potential conflicts of interest in the 2007-2008 academic year.

In cases where a committee member's affiliation with a department or program, or with an individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a potential conflict of interest, that committee member will identify himself/herself and the potential nature of the conflict. The other members of the committee will decide if a potential conflict does indeed exist. If so, the committee member may subsequently be asked to provide information on the business under consideration but will be excluded from participating in any consideration of said business. The committee member may be excluded from participation in substantive discussions, communications and deliberations concerning the matter, the making of motions, and/or voting.
The Undergraduate Council adopted, by unanimous vote, the conflict-of-interest statement below. The adoption was enacted for the 2007-08 academic year at the meeting of the Undergraduate Council on October 12, 2007. The conflict of interest statement is the same one under which the Council has been operating since April 17th, 2001.

“If a member of the Undergraduate Council has personal affiliation with a department or a program or an individual bringing business before the committee, this should be brought to the attention of the committee. The Undergraduate Council at that time will vote (1) to allow or disallow the member from participating in the discussion of the item of business in question or (2) to allow or disallow the member from voting on a motion(s) related to the item of business in question.”
Date: October 9, 2007

TO: Thomas E. Gogswell
   Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Leonard Nunney
      Chair, Executive Committee
      College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

RE: Conflict of Interest

   At its first meeting of Fall Quarter 2007, the Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences decided that if a member of the Committee perceives that a conflict of interest is present, he or she will bring it to the attention of the Committee. The Committee will then decide how the conflict of interest, if it is agreed that one exists, will be handled.

   The committee added a provision that, during the hearing of any student petitions, the student representative to the Committee will be excused from the meeting.

LN:ep
Executive Committee:
College of Humanities, Arts,
and Social Sciences

October 10, 2007

THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
Academic Senate

The Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences met on October 10, 2007 and discussed the issue of Conflict of Interest. The Committee decided that if a member of the Executive Committee sees a conflict arise, he/she will bring it to the attention of the Committee, and the Committee will deal with it at that time.

Thomas Patterson, Chair
Executive Committee, CHASS
October 1, 2007

TO: Thomas Cogswell
    Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: John Halebian
      Chair, Executive Committee
      AGSM

RE: Conflict of Interest

During its September meeting of the Fall Quarter 2006, the Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management decided that if a member of the committee perceives that a conflict of interest is present, he or she will bring it to the attention of the committee, and then recuse himself or herself from the discussion.
October 19, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: F. VAHID, CHAIR
    BCOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2007-2008

If the personal affiliation of a committee member with an organization or individual 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, and 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.
October 16, 2007

TO:     T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
         RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:     G. E. HAGGERTY, CHAIR
         COMMITTEE ON COURSES

RE:     CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Courses approved the following statement at their October 16, 2007 meeting:

If an issue comes before the Committee on Courses that emanates from the department or program of a committee member, he/she will provide information, but will not vote on the issue.
October 17, 2007

TO: T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: J. SILVA-RISSO, 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.
October 17, 2007

TO: T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FROM: J. D. HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

In accordance with Bylaw 8.2.5 of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure places on file for 2007-08 the procedures it will follow in order to mitigate possible conflicts of interest:

1. Bylaws 335.D.1, 336.D.1, and 337.B.1 of the Academic Senate establishes that, in formal hearings, no Committee member (either of Privilege and Tenure itself or of a Hearing Committee appointed by it) may participate in the hearing of a case brought by a member of his or her department or equivalent unit.

2. By standing practice, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure has always extended this principle to apply also to its "Prehearing Procedures," as defined in Bylaw 335.B, and will follow such practice during the current academic year.

3. Further, in accordance with the mandate of Divisional Bylaw 8.2.5, the Committee will expect each of its members to call to the attention of the Chair any "personal affiliation" with a party to any case brought before the Committee, if that Committee member has reason to believe that the relationship "might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations." Such a member may voluntarily abstain from participation in the case or may request that a decision as to participation or abstention be determined by a majority vote of the remaining members of the Committee.
Proposed change to bylaw 2.6 – Executive Office

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

2.6 Executive Office. The Executive Office of the Division is under the general supervision of the Chair and the administrative direction of the Secretary-Parliamentarian. It includes such analytical, administrative, and clerical employees as are made available to the Division and its committees. (Am 22 Oct 73) (Am 24 May 2005)

PROPOSED:

2.6 Executive Office. The Executive Office of the Division is under the general supervision of the Chair. It includes such analytical, administrative, and clerical employees as are made available to the Division and its committees. (Am 22 Oct 73) (Am 24 May 2005) (Am Nov ___)

Justification: The change in this bylaw is necessary to make it consistent with the change to bylaw 2.5.1 which was amended May 2007 to clarify the role of the Secretary Parliamentarian which clearly state that the Secretary-Parliamentarian does not direct the activities of the Executive Office.

Approved by the Advisory Committee: 

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

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER, 2007

Proposed change in bylaw 8.5 and 8.5.1
Advisory Committee

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

8.5 Advisory Committee
8.5.1 The Advisory Committee has only the powers enumerated in these bylaws.

PROPOSED:

Justification: While the Advisory Committee may once have been simply advisory, it now exercises considerable power; indeed in affairs of any consequence, the Divisional Chair cannot act without its approval. The name change would simply acknowledge this vital committee's power.

In addition, rebranding the Advisory Committee as the Executive Council will bring UC Riverside in line with UC Davis, UC San Diego and UC Santa Barbara.

Approved by the Advisory Committee: ______

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: __________
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

UCB - DIVISIONAL COUNCIL
Composition: The Divisional Council shall be composed of fifteen members as follows:

A. The Chair and the Vice Chair of the Division, who are also Chair and Vice Chair of the Divisional Council.
B. Chairs of the following Committees:
   - Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
   - Educational Policy
   - Budget and Interdepartmental Relations
   - Graduate Council
   - Committees
   - Research
   - Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities

C. Six At-Large members elected by the Division.
   The Secretary of the Division serves as non-voting secretary to the Council.

UCD - Executive Council
A. This committee shall consist of the following members ex officio: The Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Secretary of the Division, each of whom shall serve in the same capacity as an officer of the Council; the Representatives of the Division to the Assembly of the Senate; the first alternate Representative of the Division to the Assembly of the Senate; the Chairperson of the Committee on Committees; the Chairperson of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction; and the assistant professor who is first elected as an At-large Representative to the Davis Division Representative Assembly. The term on the Executive Council for the assistant professor shall be normally two years. In addition, the Council shall include one representative appointed by the Davis Academic Federation, one undergraduate student representative and one graduate student representative. The student representatives and the Academic Federation representative are authorized to attend and participate in all Council meetings except executive sessions.

B. The Chairperson, at his or her discretion, shall have the power to co-opt any or all chairpersons of the standing committees of the Division, and representatives of the Division to Universitywide standing committees of the Academic Senate. Those co-opted shall have full privileges of the floor and voting when called.
C. The primary responsibility of the Executive Council is to coordinate the actions and affairs of the Davis Division. It shall serve as liaison between committees of the Division and between the Division and its representatives on University Senate organizations. The Executive Council, although not a policy-making body, is to advise the Division and its officers and representatives on matters of policy, propose to the Representative Assembly legislation it deems necessary, serve as liaison between the Division and the Davis campus Administration, and be available to members of the Administration for consulting and advice when it is not expedient to convene a meeting of the Representative Assembly, especially in cases of emergency. Some responsibilities are:

1. To prepare for presentation to the Representative Assembly, early in the fall, a statement of the academic and other issues on which the Division should be working. A copy of this statement should accompany the call to the meeting. The Council may wish to co-opt chairpersons of standing committees, as authorized by Bylaw 73(B), when preparing this statement.

2. To facilitate and expedite consultations between the administration and appropriate committees of the Division, establish special committees to study and report to the Representative Assembly on concerns that are not within the jurisdiction of existing committees, be available for consultation with the Chief Campus Officer concerning the establishment of Administrative task forces, and communicate with appropriate Divisional committees relative to the establishment of task forces by the campus Administration.

3. To advise the Chief Campus Officer on the performance of principal administrative officers such as vice chancellors, deans, and associate deans.

4. To attempt to anticipate emerging problems and take measures to cope with them before they become urgent. If, in spite of its efforts, a situation should arise which in its opinion requires emergency action, it may in its own name issue statements or take such action as it deems essential and shall immediately report its actions to the membership of the Division by mail for shall call a special meeting of the Representative Assembly. If a majority of the Executive Council approves, the meeting may be called with only two days’ notice. If a statement is made in its own name, it shall be understood that the statement is subject to confirmation, rejection, or change by the Representative Assembly.

5. To approve or deny petitions of students requesting variance from Divisional regulations. This authority may be delegated each year to the appropriate committees of any college or school or to the Graduate Council. If the authority is delegated, each committee to which the authority is delegated must submit a report to the Executive Council at the end of the academic year summarizing the disposition of the petitions brought to it.

6. To act on behalf of the Davis Division in recommending to the President of the University candidates for degrees and honors in a school, college or graduate division subject to the jurisdiction of the Davis Division. At its discretion, the Executive Council may recommend candidates under suspension of Divisional and Senate Regulations, provided that each
such petition submitted by a candidate has been approved by the appropriate faculty or the Graduate Council. Such petitions may include those for the awarding of posthumous degrees. The committee, after forwarding its recommendations to the President, shall maintain in the Academic Senate Office a record of its actions, including separate lists of the names of candidates recommended under suspension of the Regulations.

7. To conduct a comprehensive review of the academic personnel process starting in Fall 2003 and every five years thereafter.

8. To collect, starting in Fall 2003 and every year thereafter, and to report to the Representative Assembly and publish to the Division, comparisons of academic salaries of the Davis Division with: 1) other divisions of the University of California; and 2) a comparison group of universities of higher status than UC Davis whose reputations the Division wishes to emulate. The second group should comprise both public and private universities, and its composition should be revised from time to time as appropriate.

UCI - Senate Cabinet

The Senate Cabinet advises and works with the Chair of the Divisional Senate in administering the rules and regulations prescribed by the Irvine Division, and in coordinating and managing Senate activities.

The members of the Cabinet shall be the Chair and Chair Elect-Secretary of the Senate ex officio and one representative from each of the Senate Councils. The Chair and Chair Elect-Secretary of the Senate shall be Chair and Vice Chair of the Cabinet, respectively.

A) Procedures for selection

It shall be the responsibility of each Council to select a representative to the Cabinet, in accordance with procedures established by the Council.

(B) Terms

Council representatives shall serve one-year terms. Councils shall select a voting Senate member as a representative during the Spring quarter, with terms commencing on the following September 1.

(C) Uncompleted Terms

If a Council representative is unable to complete a term of office on the Cabinet, the Council represented shall select within 30 days a representative to complete the term.

Duties
Advise and work with the Chair of the Divisional Senate in administering the rules and regulations prescribed by the Irvine Division, and in coordinating and managing Senate activities.

(B) Commentary
The Chair shall bring to the attention of the Cabinet in order to elicit comments (1) all items for which Senate comment is requested, and (2) agenda items for the Divisional Senate Assembly originating with the Committees of the Senate.

(C) Special Committee Charges and Membership
The Chair shall seek the advice of the Cabinet in establishing the charges and membership of Special Committees. The Cabinet may comment on the recommendations of all such groups.

(D) In Lieu Powers
Upon determination of exigent circumstances by a simple majority of the total Cabinet membership, the Cabinet is empowered to act in lieu of the Divisional Senate Assembly, or any of its Councils, except that no Senate legislation (Bylaw or Regulation) may be enacted or amended by any in lieu action of the Cabinet. The Cabinet must report any such in lieu action to the Senate agency for which it acted at the next regularly scheduled meeting of that agency, at which meeting the agency in question may endorse or reverse the in lieu action taken by the Cabinet.

A) Regular Meetings
The Cabinet shall have regularly scheduled fortnightly meetings during the academic year, and monthly meetings during the summer recess.

(B) Emergency Session
The Cabinet may be called into emergency session either by the Chair, or by any three (3) members of the Cabinet. When an emergency session is requested by three (3) Cabinet members, the Chair must convene the meeting within one (1) week of receiving the request.

UCLA - The Executive Board
The Executive Board coordinates and reviews actions and proposals from Senate committees and administration. Consults with and advises the Divisional Chair on all matters, including issues brought to attention from outside the Senate’s or administration’s formal structures. Acts on all matters, except legislation, in the name of the Los Angeles Division at times when the Legislative Assembly cannot readily be convened or when haste is required.

Membership
- Nine voting faculty members -- 6 at-large members elected for two-year terms from Senate faculty by the Legislative Assembly; 3 elected for three-year terms
by and from Senate faculty (elected as Senate Vice Chair, succeeding to Chair, then to Immediate Past Chair).

- Three ex-officio, non-voting faculty members -- appointed for one-year terms as Chairs of Council on Planning and Budget, Graduate Council, and Undergraduate Council.
- Two student representatives -- 1 undergraduate and 1 graduate appointed by their respective student government associations (votes reported separately).

**Interactions with Administration.** The Executive Board meets as needed with administrators. Including regular briefing from the Executive Vice Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Finance & Budget.

**The Executive Board** meets monthly on the 3rd Thursday of each month during the academic year, and on an as needed basis in summer months.

**UCR - Advisory Committee**
This committee consists of the Chair of the Division, who is also Chair of this committee, the Vice Chair, the Secretary-Parliamentarian, the senior representative to the Assembly, the Chairs of the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology, Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Committees, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Graduate Council, the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Physical Resources Planning, the Committee on Research, the Undergraduate Council, the Committee on Preparatory Education, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity and the Executive Committees of the colleges and schools at Riverside.

The Advisory Committee has only the powers enumerated in these bylaws. It advises the Chancellor of the Riverside campus, and it advises the Chair of the Division in his/her exercise of responsibility to coordinate the work of all standing and special committees of the Division, to submit the budget for the work of the Division, and to prepare the annual report of the work of the Division office. It further advises the Division's representatives to the Assembly and to Senate committees.

At the request of the Faculty of a school or college and with the advice of the appropriate Divisional committees, this committee may act upon courses, curricula, and legislation. However, it shall not act if the matter can be included in the agenda of a regular Divisional meeting to be held within thirty calendar days from the time of the request. Each such Advisory Committee action must be reported to the Division at the next regular meeting.

**UCSD Senate Council**

(A) This committee shall consist of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Division, who shall serve as chair and vice chair of this committee, and the chairs of the following committees: Academic Personnel, Admissions, Affirmative Action, Campus & Community Environment, Committee on Committees, Educational Policy & Courses, Faculty Welfare, Graduate Council, Planning & Budget, Privilege & Tenure, and Research; the two senior Divisional Representatives to the Assembly of the Academic Senate; two elected members to the Representative Assembly chosen by the Representative Assembly; and any members of the Academic Council from the UCSD
campus. When, in accordance with Bylaw 25(B)(9), a former Chair of the Division serves as a member of the Program Review Committee, that individual shall be a member of this committee.

(B) Duties:
(1) This committee shall oversee the business of the Academic Senate and shall consider issues of general interest to the faculty. It shall monitor and adjust the work of the Senate's committees, and shall advise the Chair of the Division about campus business.
(2) This committee shall determine the agenda for meetings of the Representative Assembly and the Division. Agenda items deemed non-controversial by unanimous consent may be placed on a Consent Calendar under Special Orders in the call. Approval of all business on the Consent Calendar requires a single unanimous vote. At the request of any Representative Assembly member, any such Calendar item must be deferred until consideration of new business.
(3) This committee shall prepare the agenda for meetings of the Division.
(4) The Senate Council may act for the Representative Assembly in case of emergency.
(5) This committee shall appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Committees prior to the beginning of Fall Quarter each year.
(6) This committee shall nominate two candidates for each vacancy of the Committee on Committees to be filled by election.
(7) This committee shall perform any duties assigned to it by the Policy and Procedures on Transfer, Consolidation, Disestablishment, and Discontinuance of Academic Programs and units.

UCSB - The Executive Council
A. Purpose. To ensure optimal conditions for the conduct of Senate work; identify and consider issues requiring Senate deliberation; and to act for the Division in certain circumstances.

B. Membership. The Divisional Chair and Vice Chair/Secretary, who are also Chair and Vice Chair of the Executive Council; the chairs of the Councils and the Committees on Senate Effectiveness, and Diversity and Equity, and the three Divisional Representatives to the Assembly. The quorum for the Executive Council is five (5) members.

C. Duties. The Council:

1. Regulates and oversees the work of standing committees of the Senate; requests committees of the Senate to investigate and report to the Executive Council or to the Faculty Legislature on any matter within the Senate's jurisdiction; refers items to the appropriate councils and committees, including petitions of students.
2. Approves the agenda for Faculty Legislature meetings.
3. Except as provided in Divisional Bylaw 105B 5, acts on appeals of decisions of councils and committees when those decisions are made on behalf of the Division.
4. Acts for the Division on any matter except legislation when the Faculty Legislature is unable to meet within 30 days of a council or committee action requiring approval by the Faculty Legislature. All such actions are subject to
ratification at the next Faculty Legislature meeting, and may be appealed to
the Faculty Legislature.
5. Approves operating procedures of the various committees and councils of the
Senate.
6. Receives and acts on reports from the Committee on Senate Effectiveness.
7. Annually, makes nominations for open positions of Divisional Representatives to
the Assembly.

UCSC - Executive Office
The Executive Office is under the general supervision of the Chair of the Santa Cruz
Division and the administrative direction of the Secretary of the Santa Cruz Division. It
is staffed with such administrative and clerical employees as are required to serve the
Division and its committees.

UCSF - Executive Office
Organization: The Executive Office of the San Francisco Division provides professional,
analytical, and administrative support; guidance; coordination; communication; and
assistance in matters concerning members of the Division and associated UCSF Faculty.
The office is under the supervision of the Secretary of the Division and is managed by
the Administrative Director.

A. Duties:
1. To maintain a depository of all records of the Division.
2. To provide professional support in the way of analytical, research, and
policy review and administrative services as required by the Officers
and committees of the Division.
3. To maintain complete files (electronic or paper) of minutes, reports,
and agendas of all Divisional committees, and of other Academic Senate
agencies.
4. To maintain on file the current membership of the Division, the current
Academic Senate committee service of each member of the Division,
and the current roster of all committees of the Academic Senate.
5. To coordinate, administer and manage all grant funds distributed
through the Division and its committees.
6. To coordinate and administer the preparation of In Memoriam
resolutions in consultation with the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
7. To provide assistance and guidance and to facilitate communication
among Division Officers, committees of the Division, and Academic
Senate Committees and Staff.
8. To coordinate and administer all Divisional electronic nomination, calls
for service, voting, and polling activities.
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 20, 2007

PROPOSED CHANGE IN COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
BYLAW 8.15.1

To be adopted:

Present:

8.15.1 This committee consists of at least five members, and (ex officio) the campus director of the Education Abroad Program, who may not serve as the Chair of the Divisional committee. The Vice Chancellor of International Programs, the director of the International Services Center, the director of University Extension's International Education Programs, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student will serve as non-voting representatives on the Divisional committee. The representative on the Universitywide committee is normally the Chair of this committee. (Am 26 May 88) (Am 27 May 99) (Am 11 Nov 04) (Am _________)

Proposed:

8.15.1 This committee consists of at least five members, and (ex officio) the campus director of the Education Abroad Program, who may not serve as the Chair of the Divisional committee. The Dean of University Extension, the director of the International Education Center, the director of University Extension's International Education Programs, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student will serve as non-voting representatives on the Divisional committee. The representative on the Universitywide committee is normally the Chair of this committee. (Am 26 May 88) (Am 27 May 99) (Am 11 Nov 04) (Am___________)

Justification:
There is no longer a position for the Vice Chancellor of International Programs. The replacement for this position will be the Dean of University Extension. International Services Center has changed its name to International Education Center.

Effective: Fall 2007
Approved by Committee on International Education – 10/9/2007
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: – October 10, 2007
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee: – __________
October 9, 2007

To: Thomas Cogswell, Chair, Riverside Division
From: Rick Redak, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare
CC: Sue Stracener

Re: Report from the Joint Task Force on Retired Faculty and Senior Staff

The Committee on Faculty Welfare met on September 28, 2007 and discussed the data, findings and recommendations found in the “Report from the Joint Task Force Relating to Retired Faculty and Senior Staff-July 2007”. The Faculty Welfare Committee was unanimous in endorsing the findings of the Task Force Report. Specifically we suggest the following actions:

1. As outlined in the report, facilities for retired faculty and staff be made available as soon as is reasonably possible. Such facilities should include temporary office space, a couple of computer stations with printer, scanner and fax availability, internet access, small- and medium-sized meeting rooms, socializing space, and facilities for the provision of light snacks (at a minimum).

2. As part of Item 1. Parking and handicap parking should be provided adjacent to such a retirement facility.

Upon further deliberation, our committee suggested that serious consideration be given to the concept of developing a joint faculty club and retirement facility. The functions of the two units are largely overlapping and one facility could be used to accomplish both objectives. Furthermore, our committee suggested that inquires be made as to the availability of the new Alumni Center for the placement of such a joint faculty club/retirement center facility. If the Alumni Center cannot take on such a responsibility successfully, we then suggest a separate facility with adequate parking be constructed adjacent to the Alumni Center (west of it). This would have benefit of providing close-in parking to the new structure (a very strong concern of the emeriti faculty) and allowing retirees to mingle with alumni to the benefit of both groups.
Riverside: Office of the Academic Senate
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

October 1, 2007

To: Thomas Cogswell
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Christopher Chase-Dunn
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Report from the Joint Task Force Relating to Retired Faculty and Senior Staff

CAP supports the idea of a Retired Faculty Center being created as part of a University Club. Both can perhaps be accomplished in combination with the new Alumni Center.
October 18, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: REPORT OF THE JOINT SENATE/ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO RETIRED FACULTY AND SENIOR STAFF

The committee on Planning and Budget reviewed the report of the Joint Senate/Administration relating to retired faculty and senior staff. They unanimously supported the idea of an Emeritus Award.

With regards to the need for a retirement center, the committee noted that it was important to realize that the needs of a retired faculty and those of a retired staff member are different. They however encourage the administration to continue deliberations on a facility for retired faculty. Retired faculty from CHASS and CNAS may not have the same needs. Also it was not clear that a high proportion of the total retired faculty had responded to the survey.
September 10, 2007

TO: RICHARD REDAK, CHAIR
    FACULTY WELFARE

    ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
    PLANNING AND BUDGET

FM: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: REPORT FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE RELATING TO RETIRED
    FACULTY AND SENIOR STAFF – JULY 2007

Attached is the joint task force report on retired faculty and senior staff for your review.

Please forward your response to me by October 1, 2007 so that it can be reviewed by the Advisory Committee.
The joint task force was appointed by the EVCP and the Academic Senate on May 9, 2006 and met seven times during the academic year. The purpose of the task force is to find ways to re-engage retired faculty and senior staff in the campus community. The two major efforts of the task force were: 1) An online survey about a retirement center, targeting active faculty 50 years and over and retired faculty and staff; and 2) Development of a policy and CALL for nominations for the Edward A. Dickson Emeriti Professorship award.

The retirement center survey was sent to 389 active faculty, 42 Emeriti, and 124 retired staff. For the retired, we were limited to those faculty and staff (totaling 219) who had provided their emails to the UCR Retirees and Emeriti/ae Association. The list of active faculty of 50 and over was compiled by Academic Personnel. The survey content was developed by the task force with input provided by the Committee on Faculty Welfare of the Senate. The web-based survey was created by the Academic Personnel Office. The response count was 93 active faculty, 29 emeriti, and 38 retired staff for a total of 160 responses (see attached). The majority of respondents approved of a center on campus with work space, computer and internet access, office equipment, a meeting room and socializing space. The most popular location was at the periphery of the campus with adjacent parking but there were also suggestions that we consider several locations, one in the Science Library where computer and internet access is available, another in the new Alumni and Visitors Center and another in the Arts Block downtown. The survey data, including some comments on physical features and locations for the center, are attached. There is no doubt that a retirement center is long over due at UCR (all but two UC campuses have one), and our survey has established the need and some ideas about location, but more consultation is necessary now to determine the final form such a center would take. As a task force we are willing to continue for another year, if asked to shepherd this effort. We propose a group visit to some of the southern UC centers before a final decision is made on how the UCR Center is configured.

The Dickson Emeriti Professorship award is an endowment for the whole UC that has languished on most of the campuses. Our task force developed a strategy for awarding this professorship and a CALL for nominations for 2008, in consultation with the Committee on Faculty Welfare of the Senate (see attached). The endowment contains sufficient funds for a $6000 award. The administrations on the other campuses have added to this to allow for at least a $10,000 and in one instance, a $25,000 award per year. We respectfully request that UCR administration provide the additional funds for a $10,000 award for this professorship.

Elizabeth Lord, VPAP and Chair
Richard Block, Professor of Mathematics Emeritus
Derickson Brinkerhoff, Professor of Art History, Emeritus
Carlos Cortes, Professor of History, Emeritus
King Henderson, Retired Director
Helen Henry, Professor of Biochemistry
Kyle Hoffman, Assistant Vice Chancellor
Sal Martino, Retired Executive Officer
Select one to indicate who you are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Faculty</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus/a</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired staff</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

160 answered question
6 skipped question

Presence of a Center on the UCR campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Least preferable</td>
<td>3.2% (5)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5% (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.4% (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.7% (34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Most preferable</td>
<td>57.3% (90)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

157 answered question
9 skipped question

Physical Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work space</td>
<td>8.3% (13)</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>10.3% (16)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet access</td>
<td>8.8% (14)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment (copier, etc)</td>
<td>5.7% (9)</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting room</td>
<td>5.1% (8)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socializing space</td>
<td>5.7% (9)</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

161 answered question
5 skipped question
### Additional Suggestions for the Physical Features

See File "Comments" for Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1 Least preferable</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Most preferable</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near Human Resources and Benefits</td>
<td>33.8% (44)</td>
<td>16.2% (21)</td>
<td>23.8% (31)</td>
<td>13.8% (18)</td>
<td>12.3% (16)</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Rivera Library</td>
<td>20.0% (25)</td>
<td>16.8% (21)</td>
<td>21.6% (27)</td>
<td>22.4% (28)</td>
<td>19.2% (24)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Science Library</td>
<td>19.2% (24)</td>
<td>13.6% (17)</td>
<td>20.8% (26)</td>
<td>22.4% (28)</td>
<td>24.0% (30)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Campus Center (with non-adjacent parking)</td>
<td>30.2% (38)</td>
<td>10.3% (13)</td>
<td>24.6% (31)</td>
<td>23.0% (29)</td>
<td>11.9% (15)</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Campus periphery (with adjacent parking)</td>
<td>11.3% (17)</td>
<td>9.3% (14)</td>
<td>14.7% (22)</td>
<td>18.0% (27)</td>
<td>46.7% (70)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See File "Comments" for Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Suggestions for Location

See File "Comments" for Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type your name to confirm your survey

See File "Comments" for Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Retirement Center Survey at UCR Campus

#1 Additional Suggestions for the Physical Features: 47 Responses

1. Whether I would need "work space" would depend on whether I was still able to have an office in my original home Department! There would need to be some coordination in terms of this. Mon, 6/18/07 9:19 AM
   (Active Faculty)

2. Wheelchair access Sat, 6/16/07 10:54 AM

3. Athletic facilities and equipment. Mon, 6/11/07 6:20 PM
   (Active Faculty)

4. I believe that providing the above in a center will completely isolate the retired faculty. The departments the faculty belonged to before retiring should provide those features. It would be much better to have a University club on campus who would welcome the retired faculty. Spending money for a center such as this when we don't even have a faculty club is another way to spend resources ineffectively. Sun, 6/10/07 10:36 PM
   (Active Faculty: N/A)

5. Use these monies to supplement health insurance premiums for retirees instead. Sun, 6/10/07 9:47 AM
   (Active Faculty)

6. I live 250 miles from the UCR campus and will only be on it as long as my research grants are active. If my research grants are active, then I will have whatever space and resources I need. Sat, 6/9/07 6:23 PM
   (Emeritus/a)

   (Emeritus/a)

8. Just need wireless internet -- not hard connection. I have an office at home, don't need all of that. Fri, 6/8/07 6:50 AM
   (Active Faculty)

9. Use of gym Fri, 6/8/07 4:00 AM
   (Active Faculty)

10. Coffee bar Thu, 6/7/07 6:13 PM
    (Emeritus/a)

11. Coffee bottled water Thu, 6/7/07 5:45 PM
    (Active Faculty)

12. Need for coffee and drinks Thu, 6/7/07 5:13 PM
    (Active Faculty)

13. Reading room/patio (with coffee/tea). Thu, 6/7/07 4:00 PM
    (Active Faculty)

14. Handicapped accessible Thu, 6/7/07 3:55 PM (Emeritus/a)
15. A space the Retirees can call their home--their space! I think we need a space large enough to hold luncheons, dinners, etc. Wed, 5/23/07 3:07 PM (Retired staff: (Academic Senate))

16. Air conditioned in summer. Sat, 5/19/07 2:21 PM (Retired staff)

17. Coffee nook and outdoor patio with garden. Tue, 5/8/07 4:56 PM (Active Faculty)

18. How about a coffee room? Tue, 5/8/07 12:19 PM (Emeritus/a)

19. Please see comment below. Mon, 5/7/07 7:33 AM (Active Faculty)

20. The only reason I and many of my colleagues (some have done 40 years teaching already!) are not retired is that we like to have our own office Sat, 5/5/07 1:43 PM (Active Faculty)

21. Ability to serve food - catering - parking Fri, 5/4/07 4:13 PM (Retired staff)

22. It would be nice if there were a kitchen for hosting lunches or cocktails in the social space. Fri, 5/4/07 3:19 PM (Active Faculty)

23. Socializing space could also function as a meeting room Fri, 5/4/07 3:14 PM (Emeritus/a)

24. Space for representative from Human Resources and/or Fidelity and/or other agents whose availability to answer questions and and help solve problems would be quite useful. It might be that representatives could be present perhaps twice a month for a couple of hours in the morning or afternoon, rotating on a regular basis. Fri, 5/4/07 2:35 PM (Emeritus/a)

25. It might be nice to integrate a retirement center with seminar & classroom facilities, designed for senior citizen educational programs. Fri, 5/4/07 11:20 AM

26. It would be useful to know the intended primary function of this facility. Is it intended to allow retired faculty to continue to do work-related things, such as writing, keeping up with their fields, etc., or is it intended as primarily for a social function, to give retirees a place to meet and talk? Fri, 5/4/07 8:25 AM (Active Faculty)

27. As departments likely will not be able to provide office space on an ongoing basis, some kind of flexible office space would be highly desirable for continuing to meet graduate students, for example. I presently use a flex office while on leave from UCR abroad and it's worked out very well: I have a locker/cabinet for storing personal items and a clean desk, computer, and access to a networked printer. Fri, 5/4/07 1:02 AM (Active Faculty:)
28. Quiet  Thu, 5/3/07 10:27 PM  (Active Faculty)

29. Handicap access.  Thu, 5/3/07 9:38 PM  
(Active Faculty )

30. There is no need for most of these services, as most faculty and staff have these at home. I think it would have been useful to have some idea of what types of services are provided by the existing service centers on other campuses. Moreover, if these service centers have been reviewed by faculty and staff that use the centers, it would be useful to know which services they have found useful, and which are unnecessary.  Thu, 5/3/07 9:28 PM  
(Active Faculty )

31. It would be especially nice to have a patio area where one could eat or meet outside when the weather was nice.  Thu, 5/3/07 8:54 PM  
( Active Faculty)

32. handicap accessible, and sensitive to the physical requirements of over 55 folks.  Thu, 5/3/07 7:18 PM  
(Active Faculty )

33. swimming pool hot tub other facilities supporting physical activity  Thu, 5/3/07 6:59 PM  
(Active Faculty )

34. Access to library facilities.  Thu, 5/3/07 5:28 PM  
( Active Faculty)

35. Comfortable and inviting, as opposed to efficient and sterile.  Thu, 5/3/07 5:22 PM  
(Active Faculty)

36. I don't know what you mean by work space  Thu, 5/3/07 3:26 PM  
(Emeritus/a)

37. There must be a place for the mid-day nap. Doesn't UCR have WiFi? Don't most faculty have laptops?  Thu, 5/3/07 1:58 PM

38. Thank you for attending to this. It is a past due need, one that has been at UCLA for more than a decade. Some departments make provision for emeriti faculty, but the accommodations are very uneven from department to department. Thu, 5/3/07 1:38 PM  
(Retired staff)

39. Place to get coffee/tea  Thu, 5/3/07 12:38 PM  
(Retired staff )

40. I work with the Osher Life Long Learning Program which provides daytime academic classes for retirees. Our Osher/LIFE Society office is at UNEX. Many of the campuses that have Osher programs work with campus retirement offices. Could we work together? Marion McCarty  Thu, 5/3/07 11:42 AM  
( Retired staff)

41. Since I live in Santa Barbara I will not be able to use the center. Therefore, please do not use my response in the survey. Thu, 5/3/07 10:06 AM  
( Emeritus/a )
42. Would be nice to be able to have a medium size meeting room for meetings where parking is not a huge problem. Wed, 5/2/07 9:29 PM (Emeritus/a)

43. This question is unanswerable as is. What would be the function of the Retirement Center? The function would dictate the physical features. Work space? Meeting room? Socializing? Wed, 5/2/07 8:57 PM (Retired staff)

44. Kitchen facilities Bathroom facilities Tables, chairs. Wed, 5/2/07 7:40 PM (Retired staff)

45. 1-Lounge with conversational seating. 2-A meeting room sufficiently large to serve luncheons, which could be rented out to off-campus groups and cater their food events in a competitive price climate. FYI, there are little or no private luncheon/dinner meeting rooms available (round tables for groups from 20-50) in the entire city of Riverside! Wed, 5/2/07 7:26 PM (Retired staff)

46. Access to library services (perhaps via internet) Wed, 5/2/07 5:55 PM (Emeritus/a)

47. Physical Fitness: Room, Classes, and Equipment. Wed, 5/2/07 4:48 PM (Retired staff)
# Proposed Retirement Center Survey at UCR Campus

## #2 Additional Suggestions for Location: 37 Responses

1. Botanical Garden  Mon, 6/11/07 8:48 AM  
   (Emeritus/a )

2. Use these monies to supplement health insurance premiums for retirees instead.  
   Sun, 6/10/07 9:47 AM  
   (Active Faculty)

3. (See parking comments above.)  Fri, 6/8/07 9:20 AM  
   (Emeritus/a)

4. near alumni center  Fri, 6/8/07 6:50 AM  
   (Active Faculty)

5. I amy have answered this previously - I don't remember, as I try to answer such surveys as soon as I receive them.  Thu, 6/7/07 10:54 PM  
   (Active Faculty)

6. might even think about placing it near the University Club if that is ever put to a high priority.  Thu, 6/7/07 5:13 PM  
   (Active Faculty)

7. free parking would be needed for most retirees...  Thu, 5/24/07 1:13 PM  
   (Active Faculty)

8. Just make it accessible to all of us--we ARE an important part of this campus and we are ready and willing to do whatever is needed to add to the importance and accessibility for all or us to our beloved campus. I believe we can (and do) offer a much needed aide and importance to the happenings of our campus in relationship to the community and to the Universit as a whole.  Wed, 5/23/07 3:07 PM  
   (Retired staff)

9. I suggest Downtown Riverside adjacent to Arts Block (Sweeney Gallery, California Museum of Photography, and Culver Center for the Arts). Parking on campus is not a pleasant experience.  Tue, 5/8/07 1:30 PM  
   (N/A)

10. This issue ought to be addressed by a standing committee of the Academic Senate. Does it lie within the purview of the Faculty Welfare Committee?  Mon, 5/7/07 7:33 AM  
    (Active Faculty)
11. Is there ever going to be a University club? Near that might be good. Fri, 5/4/07 6:13 PM
(Emeritus/a)

12. Perhaps near the new alumni center/university club facility Fri, 5/4/07 4:45 PM
(Active Faculty)

13. Close to theatre or student union Fri, 5/4/07 4:13 PM
(Retired staff)

14. parking will be a concern for older and disabled emeriti, but then they might not come to activities as much anyway. I think it might make some sense to have it in the alumni/faculty center, if there is room to accommodate it. And it would be useful to know where other campuses decided to locate it. Fri, 5/4/07 3:19 PM
(Active Faculty)

15. Campus Center with provisions for nearest adjacent parking. Fri, 5/4/07 3:14 PM
(Emeritus/a)

16. I like the idea of having this center on the periphery of the campus, but near Campus Drive with adjacent parking (which for many means a gold lot), and within a short walk of the center of campus. Fri, 5/4/07 2:35 PM
(Emeritus/a)

17. University Club, rebuilt Fri, 5/4/07 11:21 AM
(Emeritus/a)

18. The central challenge will be providing access to those with physical difficulties while at the same time locating the center as an integral part of the campus. Fri, 5/4/07 11:20 AM

19. Close to the Alumni Center Fri, 5/4/07 10:22 AM
(Retired staff)

20. I think that the best place for such a center is in the very heart of things, preferably as part of the Commons. The emeriti should have a very close proximity to a cafe, etc. Fri, 5/4/07 10:15 AM
(Active Faculty)
21. Near the Alumi Center might be an appropriate choice as well, so that retirees might take advantage of the features there as well. Would it be possible to consider a small, downtown annex, near the CMP? Parking and public transportation are easily accessed there, as well. Fri, 5/4/07 9:58 AM (Active Faculty)

22. Emeritus faculty often continue their professional activities well into advanced age, which brings with it the increased possibility of physical disability. Adjacent parking and adequate provisions for (more than usual?) handicapped access would be desirable. Since any facility cannot be near both libraries, I would think that some kind of delivery service could be arranged between the retirement facility and the libraries. Fri, 5/4/07 1:02 AM (Active Faculty)

23. Near bus stop. Thu, 5/3/07 9:38 PM (Active Faculty)

24. What about the possibility of housing the center in the new Alumni Center. Thu, 5/3/07 9:28 PM (Active Faculty)

25. How about something near or just inside the botanical gardens? Thu, 5/3/07 8:54 PM (Active Faculty)

26. Some compromise between campus center and access to parking Thu, 5/3/07 7:24 PM (Active Faculty)

27. as central as possible. let's not have our emeritus faculty relegated to the margins -- they are a wonderful, vital resource that we need to make available to students and other faculty. Thu, 5/3/07 7:18 PM (Active Faculty)

28. Some people may wish not to have to drive. The main thing is to be able to get to libraries, stores, doctors, offices without having to drive. Also, walking in the immediate area should be pleasant and easy. There should be smooth pavements, ramps, and the like. Good bus service and so on. Thu, 5/3/07 6:59 PM (Active Faculty)

29. Near lot 30 where retirees have free parking. Thu, 5/3/07 5:05 PM (Emeritus/a)

30. Access to the botanical garden would be nice. Thu, 5/3/07 1:58 PM
31. All options indicated above are reasonable. Another would be to provide space within departments as a matter of policy. Thu, 5/3/07 1:38 PM
(Retired staff)

32. Parking is such a nuisance that the campus seems unwelcoming at all times. Best to situate this somewhere where parking is close, dependable and hassle free. If you are thinking of Highlander Hall, I am not so sure about the parking there. The campus bookstore location is a disaster because of access and parking (non-existent). Maybe build a new bookstore near campus where there is public parking and build this center as an add-on or adjacent structure. The bookstore would be attractive to retirees if nearby and accessible, and at the same time the bookstore probably would multiply its profits many-fold, if it has any profits. Add a coffee shop and you have a sure winner. Wed, 5/2/07 9:29 PM
(Emeritus/a)

33. Parking is always an issue on campus so I would prefer to have the Center located near adjacent parking. However, the location would be dictated by the function of the center..... Wed, 5/2/07 8:57 PM
(Retired staff)

34. Build out and incorporate Retiree needs and facilities into the existing Botanic Gardens building, taking into account the indoor/outdoor ambiance potential and adjacent parking. A Retirees Center would not have to be exclusively for the use of Retirees; rather like smart space sharing to maximize use patterns and functionality in addition to providing a proper place to serve the needs and desires of all our Staff and Faculty Retirees. Wed, 5/2/07 7:26 PM
(Retired staff)

35. Parking is key to it's use. Suggest a location near University Extension or Highlander Hall Wed, 5/2/07 5:55 PM
(Emeritus/a)

36. ALUMNI & VISITORS CENTER Wed, 5/2/07 5:00 PM
(Retired staff)

37. In the new Alumni & Visitors Center
(Emeritus/a)
Background of the award
Edward A. Dickson served as a regent of the University of California from 1913-1946, the longest tenure of any Regent. His vision is credited with helping to make the Los Angeles campus a reality. In 1955 Mr. Dickson presented the University with an endowment to provide for annual special professorships for retired faculty.

The 1955 gift document describing this award states:

For the support and maintenance of special annual professorships in the University of California to which shall be appointed by the President, with the approval of the Regents, persons of academic rank who have been retired after service in the University of California and who shall receive such awards in addition to their retirement or pension allowances. Awards shall be made upon such conditions of service, research or teaching as The Regents may require. Professorships so awarded shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeriti Professorships.

In 2003 the funds for the Dickson award were separated into ten endowments, one dedicated to each campus. The responsibility for making the awards was delegated to the Executive Vice Chancellor or chief academic officer at each of the ten campuses.

Award Funding and Use
Six thousand dollars ($6,000) is available for the annual award(s) at the Riverside campus beginning with the 2008-2009 academic year. The award will be made annually to one or more emeritus/a professors for teaching, research, or public service. The award funds may be used to provide financial support (on a ‘by agreement’ basis) of emeriti professors for any of these activities, or for research funding. In either case, when the award is made, the funds will be transferred from the Chancellor’s Resources to the faculty member’s department by the Budget Office. The faculty member’s department will make the necessary payroll or expenditure reimbursement transactions, in compliance with all University policies and regulations.

The CALL Process
A formal CALL will be issued annually in Winter Quarter to invite emeriti faculty to submit proposals specifying how they would use the Edward A. Dickson Emeriti Professorship Award. The proposal must be in accordance with the intent of the donor to support teaching, research or public service. It should address the amount of time the individual will devote to the project and specify how the funds will be budgeted. Proposals should be concise, but provide sufficient information to permit the selection committee to make an informed decision.

The award is open to all Emeriti Faculty, regardless of whether he/she is on recall for teaching and/or research, or not on recall at all. It is advised that applicants consult with the Benefits Office regarding possible tax and retirement implications, if they have other compensated appointments with the University. Award proposals of no more that 2 pages addressing how the candidate would use the award should be forwarded to the Committee on Faculty Welfare at the Office of the Academic Senate by October 1st.
Award Requirements

Each emeritus professor receiving support from the Dickson endowment shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professor for the duration of the year awarded. At the end of the award year, each awardee will provide a concise written report of the accomplishments that have resulted from the Professorship, in concurrence with the UCR Policy on Endowed Chairs. The reports should be submitted to the EVC/P and will be made available to the Selection Committee upon request.

Selection Committee and Process

The Selection Committee shall be a subcommittee of and appointed by the Committee on Faculty Welfare of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. This subcommittee shall include both active and retired faculty.

The Selection Committee will evaluate the proposals and the nominees’ previous contributions in the areas of teaching, research and service, and shall nominate one or two emeriti faculty for the award. The Selection Committee nomination package is forwarded to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel to enable CAP review, in concurrence with UCR’s Policy on Endowed Chairs. After CAP has reviewed and approved the nomination(s), they are sent to the EVC/P for appointment, which is effective the following academic year.

Award Requirements

Each emeritus professor receiving support from the Dickson endowment shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professor for the duration of the award. At the end of the award period, each awardee will provide a concise written report of the accomplishments that have resulted from the Professorship, in concurrence with the UCR Policy on Endowed Chairs. The reports should be submitted the EVC/P and will be made available to the Selection Committee upon request.

If the awardee elects to use the award funding to reimburse research or travel expenditures, all policies and requirements of the University and the Riverside Campus must be followed. Links to these guidelines are provided in the document Award Compensation Information located on the Academic Personnel website, under the heading “Programs and Awards”.
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The Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship
Call for Nominations – Winter Quarter 2007

Background of the Award
Edward A. Dickson served as a regent of the University of California from 1913-1946, the longest tenure of any Regent. His vision is credited with helping to make the Los Angeles campus a reality. In 1955 Mr. Dickson presented the University with an endowment to provide for annual special professorships for retired faculty.

The 1955 gift document describing this award states:

For the support and maintenance of special annual professorships in the University of California to which shall be appointed by the President, with the approval of the Regents, persons of academic rank who have been retired after service in the University of California and who shall receive such awards in addition to their retirement or pension allowances. Awards shall be made upon such conditions of service, research or teaching as The Regents may require. Professorships so awarded shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeriti Professorships.

In 2003 the funds for the Dickson award were separated into ten endowments, one dedicated to each campus. The responsibility for making the awards was delegated to the Executive Vice Chancellor or chief academic officer at each of the ten campuses.

The Award
The Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship Award at the Riverside campus will be awarded beginning with the 2008-2009 academic year and annually thereafter, to one or more emeritus professors for teaching, research, or public service activities that are in accordance with the intent of the donor. The awardee(s) shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professor for the duration of the award. The award also conveys up to $6,000 which may be used for salary, travel or research support, subject to all policies and requirements of the University and the Riverside Campus. Links to these guidelines are provided in the document Award Compensation Information located on the Academic Personnel website, under the heading “Programs and Awards”.
http://academicpersonnel.ucr.edu/awards/Important%20Award%20Information.pdf
At the end of the award period, each awardee will submit a concise written report of the accomplishments that have resulted from the Professorship.

The CALL
All UCR emeriti faculty are invited to submit proposals specifying how they would use the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professorship Award. The proposal must be in accordance with the intent of the donor to support teaching, research or public service. It should address the amount of time the individual will devote to the project and specify how the funds will be budgeted. Proposals should be concise, but provide sufficient information to permit the selection committee to make an informed decision.

The award is open to all Emeriti Faculty, regardless of whether he/she is on recall for teaching and/or research or not on recall at all. It is advised that applicants consult with the Benefits Office
regarding possible tax and retirement implications, if they have other compensated appointments with the University. **Proposals of no more that 2 pages addressing how the candidate would use the award should be submitted along with a current CV, to the Committee on Faculty Welfare at the Office of the Academic Senate by October 1, 2007.**

**Selection Committee and Process**
The Selection Committee shall be a subcommittee of and appointed by the Committee on Faculty Welfare of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. This subcommittee shall include active and retired faculty.

The Selection Committee will evaluate the proposals and the nominees’ previous contributions in the areas of teaching, research and service, and shall nominate one or two emeriti faculty for the award. The nomination package is subject to CAP review, in concurrence with UCR’s Policy on Endowed Chairs. After CAP has reviewed and approved the nomination(s), they are sent to the EVC/P for appointment, which is effective the following academic year.

**Award Requirements**
Each emeritus professor receiving support from the Dickson endowment shall be known as the Edward A. Dickson Emeritus/a Professor for the duration of the year awarded. At the end of the award year, each awardee will provide a concise written report of the accomplishments that have resulted from the Professorship, in concurrence with the UCR Policy on Endowed Chairs. The reports should be submitted to the EVC/P and will be made available to the Selection Committee upon request.
Report of the Graduate Council on
Graduate Student Funding Models
August 2007

0. Preamble.

At the February 20, 2007, meeting of the Academic Senate, Chair Cogswell announced a new charge to the Graduate Council to examine current and alternative models of graduate student funding as part of a general campus initiative to increase graduate student enrollment. An ad hoc graduate student funding subcommittee, formed at the Council's March meeting, collected information during the spring term. In addition to examining budgetary data and other documents, the subcommittee surveyed current and past graduate advisers—those on the front line of student recruitment—about their experiences with different funding models. We also requested any hard information they have about the competitiveness of our recruitment funding packages vis-à-vis peer institutions. (See Attachment A for the survey questions.) During the summer of 2007, the subcommittee followed up these surveys with interviews of several graduate advisers. The report that follows has the support (with one dissent) of the full Graduate Council.

1. Main Findings and Recommendations.

The main findings and conclusions of the subcommittee are as follows:

• While virtually every program would like to be able to offer more fellowship support, our funding packages (comprising fellowships, teaching assistantships, and graduate student researcher positions) seem to be reasonably comparable to those offered by most of our peer institutions for most students, although this finding is clearer for CNAS students than for CHASS students (in part because of the greater abundance of GSR funding in CNAS).

• Offers to top students, on the other hand, are not competitive with offers they receive from peer institutions (including other state universities), which often include (unlike ours) more than one year of fellowship funding.

• Moreover, the apparent failure of increases in stipends to keep up with the rising cost of living in Riverside (relative to other areas) is diminishing the attractiveness of our offers.

• In addition to more abundantly funded fellowship packages, graduate advisers desire additional flexibility. It seems that the main concern is the need to meet unanticipated contingencies in the funding of continuing students.
• The cohort funding model was adopted (in 2001-02) as a mechanism for controlling the budget (consistent with the campus objective of significantly expanding graduate enrollment). It allows substantial flexibility to programs in constructing offers to new students but is inherently inflexible with respect to allocation of funds across cohorts. Amendments to the cohort funding model, like the Chancellor's Dissertation Fellowships, build some cross-cohort flexibility and equity into the system.

• While no single funding model fits all programs equally well, we believe that the cohort funding model is a viable framework for student recruitment as well as budget control, though it can be improved upon by incorporating additional features that support student retention as well as recruitment. Such augmentations would, of course, require additional funding from the central administration, which currently provides a fixed dollar amount (about $17,000 for the 2007-08 cohort) of funding per student enrolled in each cohort.

• While somewhat outside the scope of our charge, we endorse the recommendations of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Education (June 13, 2007) regarding Teaching Assistantships as an effective way of retaining students.

• Respondents (who express an opinion) overwhelmingly prefer an administrative structure in which central fellowship funds are allocated by the Graduate Dean rather than the College and School Deans. This structure is also consistent with the principles of shared governance and with policy throughout the UC system.

• Above all, graduate advisers desire stability. Frequent changes in the funding structure—especially those made late in the recruitment year—hamper recruitment efforts of graduate programs.

Our findings lead us to the following set of general recommendations:

• The cohort funding model should be retained, albeit with enhanced attention to the varied needs across programs and colleges and to the support of student retention as well as recruitment. Small block grants in the annual budget for support of continuing students, allocated to and administered by programs, might be a constructive way to achieve the latter objective.

• The administration of central fellowship funding should remain in the Graduate Division (and not devolve to individual colleges).

• Major revisions of the overall funding structure should be made (if at all) only after extensive consultation and planning. Changes especially should not be implemented in the middle of a recruitment season: what is in place on October 1 should stay in place throughout the academic year.
• One simple change that would greatly facilitate student recruitment would be to finalize the allocation of the CFF budget to the Graduate Dean sooner in the recruitment year, so that early fellowship offers could be generated.

• The rising cost of living in Riverside should receive greater attention in the scale of recruitment and retention funding.

The remainder of this report provides the background for the above findings and recommendations. Section 2 discusses the relative advantages of two different funding models: the cohort funding model and the block grant model. Section 3 addresses issues of administration of the budget, notably the issue of (past and possible) devolution of budgetary responsibility from the Graduate Dean to the college and school deans. Section 4 assesses the adequacy of the level and profile of fellowship support for recruitment and retention of graduate students.

2. Funding Models.

2.1. Background.

In 2001-02, the administration of central fellowship funds (CFF) for graduate students shifted from a block grant model (BGM) to a cohort funding model (CFM). Under the BGM, CFF were allocated annually to the Graduate Division (GD) as a block grant. Each graduate program received a portion of the whole to recruit new students and to fund continuing students, in proportions largely as the individual graduate program saw fit. From graduate program perspectives, the BGM seemed advantageous in its flexibility for allocating funds, by perceived need or merit of individual students or the program as a whole. The long-term cost, however, was that collective and cumulative graduate program commitments exceeded the actual block-grant budgets over several years' span, and the GD thereby found itself in an untenable situation of growing deficits.

To address the deficit, the CFM was instituted, beginning with funding for the 2002-03 cohort. Specific details of the CFM have changed, as discussed in detail in Attachment B. Its core attributes, however, remain constant: (1) CFF are allocated by the Central Administration on a per-student basis and (2) CFF are allocated for the support of students in a specific cohort. As under the BGM, CFF under the CFM are allocated to the GD, which in turn apportions graduate funding budgets to individual graduate programs. The key differences are that the overall CFF budget is calculated ultimately from recruitment targets, as reported by each graduate program to the GD, and reciprocally, that the actual allocation is then apportioned on a per-student basis for only the specific cohort under funding consideration. Although budget management has benefited from the CFM, issues for optimizing campus, GD, and graduate program goals remain, especially regarding overall support adequacy and its articulation with enlarging the graduate student body.
2.2. Salient Issues.

Based on their responses to our survey and our follow-up interviews, graduate programs appear to be generally satisfied with the CFM, though to be sure it has its drawbacks and detractors.

The principal complaint about the CFM is a perceived lack of flexibility relative to the BGM. It is true that the CFM is intrinsically inflexible in allocating funds across cohorts. The budget allocated to a program each year is restricted to support of the cohort entering the program that year and cannot be used to support continuing students. It is not true, however, as mistakenly stated by some, that the CFM restricts funding to the first year of a student’s graduate education. The GD has a policy of restricting funding to the first two years, but even that restriction can be excepted in consultation with the GD, even to the extent of offering dissertation-year fellowship funds to incoming students. Many respondents to our survey indicated a satisfaction with the CFM flexibility and stated that the Graduate Dean has been quite willing to work with programs to develop the best financial packages possible. There is nothing inherent in the CFM that precludes post-first or post-second year (out-year) fellowship funds.

In fact, the inflexibility often attributed to the CFM is the result of a severe budget constraint. As discussed in Section 4 and Attachment B, the GD receives a stipulated amount of funding per enrolled student in each cohort. For the 2007-08 cohort, that was $17,183, leaving a stipend of only $7076 after deducting fees. As discussed in Section 4, this is hardly enough to live on for one year. But the point here is that if out-year fellowship funds are awarded to one student, either that student or some other student receives no funding for the early years. Much of the consternation about inflexibility of the CFM reflects instead frustration at not being able to offer two full years of fellowship funding because of budget limitations.

On the other hand, the CFM allows for significant flexibility in the number of students an individual program can recruit, because it allows programs to make offers beyond their targets. For example, this last year the GD allowed all programs to make offers up to at least twice their target number of entering students; and by exception, some programs were approved to exceed even this limit. This is possible because the expected take rate is about fifty percent (see Section 4) and the monetary recruitment risk is diversified across the campus as a whole. This would not be possible under a BGM: the risk of exceeding the campus-wide budget could not be readily diversified, as programs have the option of using their block grants to support continuing students.

It seems that the principal problem with the CFM is that it does not provide funds that can be used as a "safety net" for continuing students who have lost funding due to unforeseen circumstances, such as the failure of a grant renewal. Block grant funding had the advantage here, as programs could set aside funds for this purpose. The introduction of dissertation-year fellowships has helped to alleviate this problem, but many programs believe that the extent of such funding is inadequate.
Finally, an area of additional concern about the allocation of central fellowship funds is that, in recent years, the GD has not received a budget allocation until very late in the recruiting cycle (often January). For effective recruiting, programs must be informed much earlier than this. Programs may wish to start making offers as early as November, and many try to have nearly all offers made by the end of January. It would help both the GD and the various graduate programs if the budget could be determined early in the fall, prior to the start of the recruitment season.

3. Administrative Structure of Graduate Student Funding.

3.1. Background.

In September 2000, then-EVC David Warren proposed several changes in the administration of graduate affairs at UCR. Among these changes was the devolution of authority for awarding financial support to graduate students from the GD to the schools and colleges. Subsequently, the 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 cohorts of graduate students were funded through their respective college/school offices. Following the appointment of Dallas Rabenstein as Graduate Dean in Fall 2004 (after serving one year as Interim Dean), this authority was returned to the GD effective with recruitment of the 2005/06 cohort. For the 2007-08 cohort in engineering graduate programs, the funding authority was vested in the Dean of Bourns College of Engineering (see Section 3.4 below). Authority remained with the Graduate Dean for students in all other programs.

3.2. Evaluation of Past Experience.

In research for this report, graduate advisers, (both current and former) were asked to comment on their experiences with these two different administrative arrangements. Of the 19 different graduate programs providing responses, 10 chose not to comment on this question, 8 stated a preference for GD administration of funding, and one reported a preference for the college dean. The reasons provided by those preferring funding through the GD included the efficiency created by an experienced staff without competing duties and the responsiveness of the Graduate Dean to program requests. The one response stating a preference for college administration reflected a successful experience with the current year’s experiment in BCOE.

3.3. Institutional Issues.

The reorganization of graduate affairs proposed in 2000 was not fully implemented, largely because of a response to the proposal from the Graduate Council in April 2001. Council Chair Michael Adams' cover letter succinctly summarized governance issues pertinent to the devolution of funding: "At each University of California campus, the Regents have established Graduate Divisions as major academic units . . . for administration of graduate affairs. Among the responsibilities of the Graduate Dean is representation of Academic Senate faculty acting through the Graduate
Council. The transfer of traditional responsibilities of the Graduate Dean and Graduate Division to College/School Deans raises serious concerns about the future involvement of Academic Senate faculty in graduate education." Specifically, the Graduate Council is charged by Academic Senate regulations "...to set policies and standards for admission to graduate status" and the Council is also charged "...to recommend the award of fellowships and graduate scholarships..." The Graduate Dean is an ex officio member of the Graduate Council, and the Graduate Council fulfills its charge to regulate graduate affairs through its ongoing interaction with the Graduate Dean, who serves as the Council's agent in administering its policies and standards.

Because admissions and fellowship support are inextricably related (i.e., in most graduate programs on campus, it would be impossible to successfully recruit graduate students without financial support), devolution of fellowship funding to the colleges compromises the ability of the Graduate Council to fulfill its charge, as it would require the Council to form working consultative relations with each of the college deans. Such a requirement impedes decision making in the critical period when admission and funding offers must be made.

3.4. The BCOE Experiment.

Devolution of fellowship and non-resident tuition (NRT) resources directly to the Bourns College of Engineering (BCOE) was re-instated for the 2007-08 cohort.

It is not fully clear why fellowship and NRT funds were devolved to BCOE. However, several factors affecting graduate student growth in engineering were cited by the Dean of BCOE in a presentation to Graduate Council in spring 2007, including the following perceptions of GD-administered awards:

(i) disconnectedness of central (i.e., CFF) and faculty (i.e., GSR) funding,
(ii) faculty and department exclusion from the financial planning and packaging loop,
(iii) lack of financial partnering for the 5-year normative time to degree completion,
(iv) delays in offers,
(v) lack of planning and investments by departments and the college, and
(vi) lack of faculty incentives to be proactive in recruitment.

In general, these issues should and can be solved by (a) direct consultations between the GD and graduate advisers, department/program chairs and their representatives and (b) a proper liaison between the Graduate Dean and the deans of colleges/schools, including high level academic planning with the Graduate Dean (as noted in the 2001 GC memo). Given that the inaugural year of the BCOE Dean coincided with the devolution of funds, there may not have been sufficient time for appropriate liaising to occur.

We wish to comment on several of the six issues cited. Beyond information provided by the BCOE Dean, additional information was gathered from GD and informal meetings with the graduate advisers in the five engineering departments.
We agree that central, department and faculty financial planning and partnering as noted in points (i) - (iii) are critical for a dynamic graduate program. A successful model to accomplish this goal in the sciences and engineering has been to offer incoming students four- or five-year financial support packages. These packages consist of central fellowship and TA funding in years 1 and 2 and faculty funding in the form of GSR support in years 2-5, with year 2 being a mixture of funds (e.g. GD: 2nd year of NRT for international students, and PI: GSR). On the basis of sample BCOE Graduate Applicant Financial Support Charts provided to our subcommittee, it appears that two BCOE departments provide four-year financial support packages as a mixture of central, TA, and faculty funding, and three departments provide packages for two years only, where one of these latter departments does not commit to summer support at the end of the first academic year. Graduate student financial support packages for the full tenure of a graduate student career that include faculty (GSR) support put faculty in the financial planning and packaging loop by way of their commitment of GSR resources. More extensive support packages may also serve to diminish Ph.D. student losses, noted by the Dean of BCOE as ~50% across engineering (~25% depart with no degree, ~25% depart after M.S.).

Based on consultations with BCOE graduate advisers in July 2007, no delays in offers were noted, either on the side of GD or the BCOE Dean's Office. The consensus appears to be that financial packages can be created in 1-2 days and acceptance of a student by GD occurs in approximately 1 week. One possible exception is GD acceptance of students with records that are deficient. The sentiment was voiced that, once a department acknowledges it is aware of an extenuating issue, an offer should be permitted without further discussion as the department is in the best position to understand and estimate any risks. From our viewpoint, this is a natural point of tension—it is undeniable that the program should be, and usually is, in the best position to evaluate a candidate; however, the Graduate Dean has the authority to admit students and is ultimately responsible for the overall quality of the admitted cohort. Marginal cases need to be appropriately supported by a program-supplied rationale. In turn, it is the Graduate Dean's responsibility to see that these cases can be handled without undue paperwork or delay.

In recognition of the above, the current Graduate Council recommends that the GD retain control of all central funding resources.

4. Adequacy of Graduate Student Funding.

4.1. Background.

Beginning with the 2005-06 cohort, the graduate fellowship budget has been divided into four broad categories: base fellowship funds, non-resident tuition (NRT), Chancellor's Distinguished Fellowship funds, Graduate Diversity Awards, and additional stipends for domestic non-resident students. The budgets for these categories in 2003-04 through 2007-08 are listed in Table 3 in Attachment B.
Under the CFM, the base fellowship budget is a function of the number of students recruited. As noted earlier, the Graduate Dean submits a budget request each year to the EVC/P based on a targeted number of students for the next year's cohort and a requested amount of base fellowship funding per student. The base fellowship budget approved by the EVC/P is simply the approved target number of entering students multiplied by the approved budget allocation per student. The Graduate Dean bases his budget request on a survey of graduate programs regarding their target for the next cohort of students. Clearly, if the number of students actually recruited by the programs is below the targeted number the actual budget falls short of the approved (maximal) budget. This shortfall appears to be perennial. Table 1 shows the approved base fellowship budget and the actual budget that transpired for the last three years. The actual budget falls short of the approved budget by nearly half a million dollars for the 2005-06 cohort, by more than that for the 2006-07 cohort, and by a little less than that for the 2007-08 cohort. Clearly, the overall budget is not a binding constraint on student recruitment. If the programs' targets were achieved, the entering classes would be close to ten percent larger.

In an attempt to close this gap, the Graduate Dean allowed programs to make offers to twice the targeted number of students for the 2007-08 cohort, relying on the likelihood that under-subscriptions in some programs would compensate for over-subscriptions in others. As can be seen from figures in Table 1, this approach has neither broken the budget nor closed the gap. This experience potentially invites assuming the risk of allowing greater over-offering of fellowships.

Table 1: Approved and Actual Cohort Fellowship Budgets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (academic year)</th>
<th>Maximal (base) budget ($ million) [targeted # students]</th>
<th>Actual (base) budget ($ million) [actual # students]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A possible constraint is the amount of approved funding per student. Table 2 shows the approved base fellowship allocation per student recruited, which has been growing steadily over the years.\(^1\) Student fees have been increasing at a comparable percentage rate and hence at a greater absolute rate, raising the implied stipend—the money that the basic fellowship student has to live on—by a substantial amount for the 2006-07 cohort but by only a modest amount for the 2007-08 cohort. Of course $7000 is not much to live on, and the cost of living in Riverside, especially rents, has been increasing fairly rapidly in recent years. Whether the stipend is a serious constraint on the recruitment of

\(^1\) The 2007-08 allocation in Table 2 does not match that in Appendix B because, subsequent to the preparation of the Appendix B document in May 2007, the budget was augmented to compensate for the increase in fees.
students also depends on stipends offered by competitive programs. We address that issue below.

Table 2: Budget Allocation, Fees, and Stipends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (academic year)</th>
<th>Allocation ($/student)</th>
<th>Fees (non-resident)² ($/year)</th>
<th>Stipend ($/student)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,033</td>
<td>5,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>9,201</td>
<td>6,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>17,183</td>
<td>10,107</td>
<td>7,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage Change 05-06 to 07-08 14.5% 11.9% 18.6%

For the last three years, non-resident tuition (NRT) has been unchanged at $14,694 per year. Domestic non-resident tuition awards cover a single year (since domestic students can become residents after one year), and international awards cover two years (since NRT is waived for three years following advancement to candidacy). As shown in Table 3, the allocation of awards was substantially increased, especially for international students, in the budget for the 2007-08 cohort (after a reduction in the 2006-07 budget). Well over half of the increase, however, went to a single college, BCOE, as the result of an agreement between the EVC/P and the BCOE Dean (see Table 4). This agreement also entailed devolution of the responsibility for allocation of a portion of central fellowship funds from the Graduate Dean to the BCOE Dean (discussed in Section 3.2 above).

Table 3: Non-Resident Tuition Awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (academic year)</th>
<th>Domestic NRT (number of awards)</th>
<th>International NRT (number of awards)</th>
<th>Total NRT (number of awards)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 indicates that the constraint on the number of domestic NRT awards is not binding, since the number of awards consistently falls short of the number of allocations. On the other hand, at least for the last two cohorts, the constraint on the number of international NRT awards is binding. (The number of awards exceeds the allocation for the 2007-08 cohort as the result of a decision by the EVC/P late in the recruitment year to open up the opportunities for additional international students.)

² Resident fees are slightly lower than non-resident fees.
Table 4: Distribution of International NRT Awards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (academic year)</th>
<th>BCOE Allocation</th>
<th>BCOE Awarded</th>
<th>Rest of Campus (BioMed, CHASS, CNAS, and GSOE) Allocation</th>
<th>Rest of Campus (BioMed, CHASS, CNAS, and GSOE) Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three additional items augment the budget. The Chancellor's Distinguished Fellowships, which augment the base fellowship award by $10,000, are designed to attract more outstanding students who will likely receive major awards from competing programs. The Graduate Diversity Awards, which offer a $4000 augmentation, are aimed at promoting diversity. The additional stipends for domestic non-resident students, offering a $2000 augmentation, are designed to help ameliorate the relative paucity of such students at UCR. The budgets for these three items are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Augmentation Budgets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort (academic year)</th>
<th>Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships</th>
<th>Graduate Diversity Awards</th>
<th>Additional Stipends for Domestic Non-Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two distinct goals of graduate student funding must be addressed: (1) recruitment of sufficient numbers of high quality students and (2) retention of those students through completion of their degree. The present campus funding model, with CFF, fees, and tuition waivers dispersed through the GD, is designed primarily for efficient recruiting. Student retention, however, falls primarily to college, department, and faculty funding of TA and GSR positions. Without massive augmentation of the campus support budget, CFF can only be expected to have minor effects on retention.

4.2. Recruitment.

Data acquired from the GD regarding graduate student acceptance and SIR rates during recruitment for the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 cohorts (Attachment C) provide a quantitative basis for evaluating recruitment efficiency on department-by-department, college, and overall bases. Survey responses from graduate advisers add detailed information, including some systematic comparisons as well as anecdotal evidence.
GD data indicate that the campus as a whole enrolls roughly one student for every two offers made. The success rate is slightly under 50% for CNAS and slightly over 50% for BCOE and CHASS. The School of Education, with its special programs, enrolls four of five students, whereas the nascent Biomedical Sciences Program enrolls about one in three students to whom offers are made.

While many assessments of the adequacy of fellowship funding are common across the campus, there are also important differences. In the remainder of this section, we summarize the responses from different colleges and schools.

4.2.1. CNAS.

Our survey responses from natural science departments (CNAS) express near unanimity that fellowship support is lower than desirable but sufficient to compete for strong students. Although many stress that there is fierce competition for the top candidates and that UCR often loses such individuals to institutions that provide higher stipends or longer terms of fellowship support, most responders feel that we most often entice enough high-quality students to fill our available positions.

Most CNAS departments provide promises of full five-year Ph.D. support, despite uncertainty of the TA and GSR support that must be found for years 2–5. Departments vary widely in their balances between domestic and international students and between Ph.D. and M.S. students, creating additional uncertainties in predicting funding needs in these later years. Both graduate advisers, who must construct and balance funding plans over many years, and faculty members increasingly reluctant to commit to funding students during years where grant success is unknowable will often err on the conservative side, thus slowing growth of graduate enrollment. Under the present system, no reliable "safety net" seems to exist for funding students whose predicated support fails to materialize or for incentives to retain advanced students at risk of leaving UCR.

The presence of interdepartmental graduate programs, in addition to some complex departmental structures, appears to create unbalanced and occasionally unfair hurdles in recruiting high-quality students. Programs lacking direct access to departmental resources and situations where competing interests of related programs collide should not become stumbling blocks to efficient recruitment.

Some departments recruit heavily into M.S.-to-Ph.D. programs where the best M.S. students can be transferred to a Ph.D. track. The present funding system appears to inhibit use of this sometimes-effective recruitment mode.

4.2.2. CHASS.

Survey responses from CHASS departments are more variable and significantly more negative in their impressions of funding adequacy. There is a general sense of dissatisfaction with present funding levels and practices. Strong, competing universities
generally seem willing to provide two full years of fellowship to top students, as well as more certain funding in later years. It is interesting to note, however, that many of the most critical comments arise from departments that successfully recruit at well above campus average.

Numerous examples were provided by survey responders supporting CHASS's general consensus that multiple years of fellowship would be needed to compete for the very best candidates. Many suggest full fellowship support for first and last years, perhaps years 2-3, and there are some requests for "full-ride" support. In many departments, multi-year packages are reported to be difficult to construct because of insufficient college support for TAships and low-level availability of externally funded support in the form of GSRs. Adequately funding international student packages seems particularly difficult for departments where normative times of advancement to candidacy fall within the third or fourth years. As only two-year NRT waivers are available, the department or the students themselves must somehow support fees and additional NRT costs (which can total roughly $15,000 per year).

Departments that offer MFA degrees perceive themselves to be disadvantaged under the present funding system, feeling that they are treated as M.A. or M.S. programs and provided with only half the Fellowship and fee support provided to Ph.D. candidates.

4.2.3. Other Programs.

Biomedical Sciences has serious concerns about the level of stipends in fellowship packages and about administrative support for interdisciplinary programs.

The School of Education has unique needs. It enrolls a large number of part-time, returning students seeking advanced degrees while still retaining their K-12 teaching positions, and an increasing but smaller number of applicants seeking full-time M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. They desire flexibility in recruiting support that they can tailor to each of these distinct populations. Support for continuing students is of particular concern, since TA support is negligible.

The Bourns College of Engineering is also a special case, and specifics of their 2007-08 cohort experiment in devolving the handling of funding from GD down to the College is discussed in Section 3.4 above. In a survey response, one of the BCOE graduate advisers seemed satisfied by the stipend level available for fellowships and noted that recruitment using such funding levels and their own internal handling of recruitment files works well. Unlike many of the CNAS and CHASS departments, three of the BCOE departments typically offer Ph.D. funding packages covering only the first two years. The other two departments construct 4-year packages. In one response to our survey, it was stated that their "faculty have been reluctant" to submit 5-year offers because of "the strong commitment that they imply" on the part of individual faculty members. The potential ramifications of such a recruitment strategy for retention are obvious.

3 The Anderson Graduate School of Management, which does not receive CFF for its students, had a 39% success rate in recruitment for the 2006-07 and 2007-08 cohorts.
4.3. Retention.

Most of the ongoing campus discussions about increasing graduate student enrollment (including our own survey and deliberations) have focused on student recruitment as opposed to student retention. This is unfortunate, since our primary objective should be to increase the output of our graduate programs—that is, degrees awarded, and retention is crucial to that objective. An aphorism is apt: “The most efficient way to recruit a student is to retain one.”

Retention is a primary concern of the respondents to our survey. Formulating generic retention policies for the campus, however, is difficult. Financial support beyond the first one or two years depends primarily upon the availability of TA and GSR, and this availability varies dramatically across the campus. The recent introduction of dissertation-year fellowships is seen as a step in the right direction but short of what is needed.

Of course, many aspects, in addition to financial support, have an impact on graduate students’ experience at UCR and affect retention. Many ideas to support student retention can be found in the Report of the Task Force on Graduate Student Support, Recruitment, and Retention (October 19, 2004). In fact, before appointing yet another task force, perhaps this 2004 report should be evaluated for ideas about both recruitment and retention.

5. Conclusion.

Our main findings and recommendations have been summarized in Section 1. We conclude with two thoughts that we consider fundamental.

(1) There is no magic bullet that will suddenly generate increased graduate student enrollment. We should do what we can to facilitate recruitment and retention within the constraints posed by budget limitations and quality control. But in the long run, the only genuine answer to the problem of growing our graduate student body is increasing the number of faculty members and elevating the ranking of our graduate programs. This will take years, but that is no reason not to work hard at it now.

(2) That said, there is a danger of too much emphasis being placed on the number of graduate students enrolled. Greater attention should be paid to the quality of our graduate student body and to the placement and professional success of our students.
ATTACHMENT A

April 5, 2007

TO: Current and Past Graduate Advisers

FR: R. Robert Russell, Chair, Graduate Council

RE: Graduate Student Funding

The Graduate Council has been asked by the EVC/P and the Academic Senate to evaluate alternative processes and models for graduate student funding. The long-term objective, of course, is to increase graduate student enrollment. In the short term, we would like to make recommendations about next year’s recruitment process by this summer. We believe that there is a vast reservoir of knowledge accumulated by Graduate Advisers over the years of hands-on recruitment efforts and are therefore seeking your input. Please provide us, by April 16, with any information or insights that you think might be useful in our deliberations. (Where relevant, please make a distinction between M.A. and Ph.D. programs.) We are especially interested in receiving input about the following issues:

• Information about competitive offers from other institutions, especially other UC campuses (including such features as number of years of support, sizes of awards, and components of awards [especially stipends]).

• Comparison of your experiences under different funding allocation structures (e.g., by Dean/College or by Graduate Dean/Graduate Division.

• Comparison of your experiences with (a) the cohort funding system and (b) year-to-year funding of programs.

• Any ideas you may have, in addition to more money, for improving funding packages.
Central Fellowship Funding for Graduate Students

May 29, 2007

Summary

Central Fellowship Funds (CFF) are provided by the Central Administration in what has come to be known as the Cohort Funding Model (CFM). The CFM has two important features:

- CFF are allocated by the Central Administration on a per student basis.
- CFF are allocated for the support of graduate students in a specific cohort.

The CFF budget allocated to the Graduate Division (GD) for recruitment of a cohort of graduate students consists of seven fund categories. Of these, two are allocated by the GD to Graduate Programs; the other five are held in the GD.

Fellowship offers (stipend plus fees) in financial support packages are made by Graduate Programs from funds in the Fellowship Budget category. The Fellowship Budget is allocated to the GD by the Central Administration on a per-student-recruited basis. The GD in turn allocates the Fellowship Budget to Graduate Programs on a per-student-recruited basis. Graduate Programs have flexibility in how they use their Fellowship Budget allocation, e.g. a Graduate Program has the flexibility to make its most generous fellowship offers to its best applicants. The only requirements are that their offers be within the Guidelines set by the GD (Appendix 2) and they manage their funds so that at the end of the recruiting season their fellowships are, on average, close to their per student allocation, i.e. they are expected to stay within budget. The GD holds back a fraction of the Fellowship Budget for Dissertation Fellowships to be awarded to students in the cohort in later years.

Funds in the “Non-Resident Tuition for International Students” budget category are allocated to Graduate Programs.

Funds in other budget categories, including non-resident tuition (NRT) for domestic non-residents, are held in the Graduate Division. However, Graduate Programs are allowed to admit an unlimited number of qualified domestic non-resident students, with one year of NRT remission.

Background

Before describing the CFM, some background is presented to indicate why the CFM was instituted by the Central Administration, and how it has evolved.
Pre-2002/03. Prior to 2002/03, CFF were allocated to the GD each year as a block grant. The GD in turn allocated a portion of the CFF to Departments/Programs as block grants and retained a portion in the GD. The block grants could be used by Departments/Programs for fellowships to recruit new students and for continuing students, i.e. they were not restricted to funding students in a specific cohort of graduate students. Commitments made each year for several years running exceeded the size of the block grants, with the result that the GD was in deficit. At the same time graduate enrollments were not growing.

As a result of the deficits, Chancellor Orbach instituted a new system for providing CFF for graduate students, starting with the 2002/03 cohort of graduate students. The new system was based on the Cohort Funding Model. In the CFM:

- The total CFF budget is based on $XX/student recruited, rather than a block grant.
- CFF can be used only for recruitment and support of students in a specific cohort. For example, CFF for the 2002/03 cohort could be used only for students in that cohort.
- CFF can be used for fellowships, fees and non-resident tuition (NRT) in recruitment packages, and can be carried forward for fellowships in out years for students in the cohort.

2002/03-2003/04. In addition to instituting the CFM for funding graduate students, the Central Administration allocated CFF to the Colleges rather than the GD. The Colleges were to be responsible for:

- Allocation of CFF to Departments/Programs.
- Accounting for CFF.
- Any deficits incurred.

CFF were allocated directly to the Colleges for recruitment of the 02/03 and 03/04 cohorts of new graduate students.

2004/05. At the request of the incoming Graduate Dean (Fall 2003), the Central Administration agreed to return CFF for future cohorts to the GD, starting with CFF for the 2004/05 cohort of new graduate students. However, because the GD did not have staff or an accounting structure in place for managing CFF funding for recruiting the 04/05 cohort of new graduate students, the GD allocated the CFF for recruiting the 04/05 cohort to the Colleges/Schools, which in turn were responsible for allocating the funds to their Departments/Programs, i.e. the GD simply served as a pass-through and the Colleges had control of CFF for their Departments/Programs as they did for the 2002/03 and 2003/04 cohorts. The only difference was that the GD held back a fraction of the CFF for funding Dissertation Year Fellowships for students in the 2004/05 cohort.
2005/06. Starting with recruitment of the 05/06 cohort of new graduate students, the GD took over management of CFF. The base budget for stipend and fee fellowships was allocated to the GD on the basis of XX $/student recruited and the funds were restricted to students in that cohort. In addition, separate funds were allocated for non-resident tuition for domestic non-resident and international students and for special awards to make our financial support packages more competitive. The GD in turn allocated CFF to Departments/Programs on a YY $/student recruited basis. This is discussed in more detail below for the 2006/07 cohort. The GD would be responsible for any deficit incurred.

2006/07. CFF for recruitment of the 2006/07 cohort of new graduate students were allocated to the GD on the basis of XX $/student recruited and the funds were restricted to students in the 2006/07 cohort. In addition, separate funds were allocated for non-resident tuition for domestic non-resident and international students and for special awards to make our financial support packages more competitive. The GD in turn allocated CFF to Departments/Programs on the basis of YY $/student recruited, with the exception of Departments in the College of Engineering. COE requested more control over the funds for their Departments, so the GD treated the COE as a Department, i.e. the GD allocated CFF to the College (on the basis of YY $/student recruited), and the Dean/Associate Dean of COE in turn allocated the funds to the Departments. However, the GD was held responsible for any deficit incurred.

2007/08. CFF for recruitment of the 2007/08 cohort of new students in the Division of Biomedical Sciences, CNAS, CHASS and the Graduate School of Education were allocated to the GD. At the request of the Dean of COE, CFF for recruitment of the 2007/08 cohort of new students in COE were allocated by the Central Administration directly to COE, and COE is to be responsible for managing the funds and for any deficit incurred.

The Cohort Funding Model

The CFM will be described for the 2006/07 cohort, the last cohort for which we have complete data.

The CFF Budget for Recruiting the 2006/07 Cohort of New Graduate Students.

Early in the Fall of 2005, the Graduate Advisors of each graduate program were asked by the GD for the number of new graduate students they planned to recruit in their 2006/07 cohort of new graduate students, including their target numbers of new Master’s and Ph.D. students and international students. The target numbers, and the numbers of students actually recruited, by graduate programs in CHASS and CNAS are listed in Table 1. Using the target numbers, the GD prepared a budget request. The budget request was submitted in November 2005. Note: the delay in submitting the budget was due to delays in obtaining targets from some graduate programs. In fact, targets were never received for several graduate programs.
The GD did not receive its budget for the 2006/07 cohort until January 24, 2006. Because this was well into the recruiting season, Departments/Programs were told earlier they should be making offers to students, and they were told that they could assume their per student allocation would be at least as much as it was for the 2005/06 cohort. In addition, recruiting workshops were held for CHASS and CNAS on November 16, 2005 and for BCOE on November 17, 2005. The Workshops were held to discuss cohort funding of graduate students. Department Chairs, graduate advisors and graduate program assistants were asked to attend the Workshops. Unfortunately, less than one-third of those asked to attend actually attended the workshops – which is undoubtedly one reason some do not understand the cohort funding of graduate students.

The CFF budget approved by the Central Administration for the 2006/07 cohort is presented in Table 2. There are seven separate funding categories in the budget.

- **Fellowship Budget.** The fellowship budget was based on $16,000/student recruited, and could be used for fellowship awards (stipends and fees). Note: fees for 2006/07 were $8,934 for residents graduate students and $9,201 for non-residents. Because the fellowship budget was based on the number of students recruited, the GD had no idea what its total fellowship budget would be. The target was 502 students, which would have generated a total fellowship budget of $8,032,000. The actual number of new students recruited was less (459), so actual fellowship budget for the 2006/07 cohort was less ($7,344,000).

- **NRT for Domestic Non-Resident Students.** One year of NRT remission was approved for a maximum of 106 domestic non-residents, for a total of $1,557,564. The actual number of domestic non-residents recruited was 86, for a total of $1,283,110.

- **NRT for Domestic Non-Resident IGERT Students.** A maximum of five one-year NRT remissions was approved as part of the matching fund commitment for the IGERT grant. A total of 2 domestic non-residents were awarded IGERT fellowships.

- **NRT for International Students.** Two years of NRT remission was approved for a maximum of 92 international students, for a total of $1,351,848. The actual number awarded was 92, so the maximum possible was received.

- **Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships.** $400,000 was approved for Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships (CDF). The goal of the CDF is to allow us to make more competitive offers for the best and brightest domestic applicants. These funds were used as add-ons to year one support in the financial support package proposed by the graduate program. The final decision was made by the Graduate Dean, with a maximum award of $10,000.
• **Graduate Diversity Awards.** Funds for up to 40 Graduate Diversity Awards (GDA) at $4,000/award were approved. The goal of the GDA was to help us increase the diversity of our graduate student population. The GDA was added to year one of the financial support proposed by a graduate program. Because these are state funds, the criteria for diversity are defined by Proposition 209. The final decision on a GDA was made by the Graduate Dean.

• **Additional Stipend for Domestic Non-Resident Students.** Funds for an additional stipend award of $2,000/student, up to a maximum of 106 awards, was approved to help us recruit a larger number of domestic non-resident students.

• **Maximum funds Approved (Based on Targets).** A total Central Fellowship Budget of up to $13,138,730 was approved for the recruitment of 502 students, which corresponds to a total of $26,173/student.

• **Final Amount Approved (Based on Actual Number of Students Recruited).** A total of 459 students was recruited. The total of all budget categories, based on the per student funding of each budget category and the number of students in that category, was $12,038,027, which corresponds to a total of $26,227/student.

As noted above, the CFF budget for the 2006/07 was approved by the Central Administration on January 24, 2006. Budget allocations were sent by the GD to Departments/Programs on February 3, 2006. A sample budget letter is included as Appendix 1. “Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2006-07” were also sent with the budget letters; the Guidelines are included as Appendix 2. The Allocation Letter to Departments/Programs together with the Guidelines describe in detail how Departments/Programs were to construct fellowship awards under the cohort funding model. However, it becomes apparent during the recruiting season that some graduate advisors have not read either the letter or the Guidelines, which is another reason some do not understand the cohort funding model.

For budgeting purposes, fellowship funds are allocated to programs on a per student basis, as detailed in Appendices 1 and 2. The Department/Program letter states a Fellowship funding amount/student up to a maximum determined by their target. However, because there will always be some programs that do not meet their target, programs are encouraged to exceed their target. For example, the 2006/07 target for the Physics Department was 27, but they recruited a total of 35 new students.

The Financial Support Package.

As stated above, the Fellowship Budget received by the GD was $16,000 per student recruited. Fees for 2006/07 were $8,934 for resident students and $9,201 for non-resident students. Thus, the GD did not receive a sufficiently large Fellowship Budget that all students being recruited could be offered a competitive fellowship stipend plus fees in year one. To make competitive offers, Departments/Programs have to combine their fellowship allocation with other resources, including TA and GSR funds. For
example, if the Fellowship allocation to a program was $15,000/student recruited, out of which they paid three quarters of fees for a resident student ($8,934), only $6,066 would be left for a stipend. However, if the program put the student on a TA for one quarter, the TA appointment would pay a salary of $5,203 plus fees of $3,068 for the quarter. Two quarters of fees could then be paid from the fellowship allocation ($6,136), leaving $8,864 for stipend for the two quarters. The TA salary + fellowship stipend now totals $14,067. Some programs are willing to add in TA and/or GSR support to year one to make their offers competitive, others refuse to do so. Programs also are encouraged to manage their funds so that their most attractive offers are made to their best students.

The Department/Program prepares a financial support package for an applicant being recommended for admission, and as long as the fellowship component is within the Guidelines (Appendix 2) and they are not too far over budget, it is approved by the GD. The Department/Program is allowed to have flexibility in how it uses its fellowship allocation. In addition, if the applicant is an outstanding domestic student, a CDF will be added to the year one stipend, the amount determined by the academic record of the applicant, up to a maximum of $10,000. If the applicant qualifies for a Graduate Diversity Award, a GDA award of $4,000 will be added to the year one stipend. And if the applicant is a qualified domestic non-resident, an additional $2,000 will be added to the year one stipend. In some cases, if the program is significantly over budget (on a per student basis), they will be encouraged to reduce the stipend from their fellowship allocation.

CFF Budgets for the 2003/04 through 2007/08 Cohorts of New Graduate Students

The maximum CFF budgets approved by the Central Administration for the 2003/04 through the 2007/08 cohorts based on the projected targets are summarized in Table 3. Note that for the 2003/04 through 2006/07 cohorts, less than the maximum amount was received because the targets were not met.

Some comments about the data in Table 3.

- The data for the 2003/04 through 2005/06 cohorts are for BioMed, CHASS, CNAS and COE. GSOE was funded according to a different model.
- The per-student allocations for the 2003/04 and 2004/05 cohorts included all funding for each cohort (fellowship stipends, fees and domestic non-resident and international student NRT).
- The per-student allocations for 2003/04 and 2004/05 are averages. The actual allocations for each college/school varied. For the 2003/04 cohort, the allocations were: BioMed $29,638/student, CHASS $15,898/student, CNAS $14,288/student and COE $14,288/student. For the 2004/05 cohort, the allocations were: BioMed $32,026/student, CHASS $16,975/student, CNAS $15,937/student and COE $17,432/student.
- The total CFF approved has increased significantly from the 2003/04 cohort to the 2007/08 cohort (from $6,875,162 to $16,109,728), as has the total/student (from $15,211 to $28,716). However, it is difficult to determine how much the
fellowship budget for stipends (the amount that ends up in the student’s pocket) has increased over this period because NRT was embedded in the Fellowship Budget for 2003/04 and 2004/05.

- Over the period, 2005/06 through 2007/08, the Fellowship Budget has increased from $15,000/student to $16,438/student. However, over this period, fees have increased $1,048, so the net increase has only been $390/student. That is, there has been essentially no increase in the amount available for stipend – the funds that end up in the student’s pocket.
Table 1. Targets and Numbers of Students Actually Recruited by CHASS and CNAS in the 2006/07 Cohort of New Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td># Recruited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing/</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance &amp; Dance History</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | 2006/07 | 2006/07 | Difference |
| Target           | # Recruited |         |            |
| Applied Statistics/Statistics | 12   | 18      | 6          |
| Biochemistry & Molecular Biol. | 42   | 19      | -23        |
| Cell, Molecular & Dev. Biol. | 14   | 8       | -6         |
| Chemistry        | 30      | 23      | -7         |
| Entomology       | 11      | 8       | -3         |
| Environmental Sciences | 5    | 2       | -3         |
| Environmental Toxicology | 10  | 5       | -5         |
| Evolution, Ecology & Environ. Biol | 10  | 9       | -1         |
| Genetics, Genomics & Bioinform. | 8    | 11      | 3          |
| Geological Sciences | 10    | 8       | -2         |
| Mathematics      | 25      | 17      | -8         |
| Neuroscience     | 6       | 4       | -2         |
| Physics          | 27      | 35      | 8          |
| Plant Biology    | 12      | 11      | -1         |
| Plant Pathology  | 6       | 2       | -4         |
| Soil & Water Science | 8    | 3       | -5         |
|                  | 236     | 183     | -53        |
Table 2. Central Fellowship Funds for the 2006/07 Cohort of New Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Funds Approved (Based on Targets)b</th>
<th>Final Amount Approved (Based on Actual Number of Students Recruited)c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Budgetd</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000/Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number of Students]</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$8,032,000</td>
<td>$7,344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRT for Domestic Non-Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,694/NRT Remission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,557,564</td>
<td>$1,283,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRT for Domestic Non-Residents (IGERT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,694/NRT Remission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$73,470</td>
<td>$29,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRT for International Students (First Year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,694/NRT Remission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NRT for International Students (Second Year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$14,694/NRT Remission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$371,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Diversity Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000/Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$140,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Stipend for Domestic Non-Resident Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000/Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td>$165,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for the 2006/07 Cohort</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13,138,730</td>
<td>$12,038,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals/Student</strong></td>
<td>$26,173</td>
<td>$26,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) For graduate students in CHASS, CNAS, BCOE, BioMed and GSOE.
b) Maximum possible amount; amount received depends on number of students recruited.
c) Amount received based on number of students recruited.
d) For fellowship stipend and fees.
Table 3. Maximum Cohort Funding Approved for the 2003/04 through 2007/08 Cohorts (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003/04(b)</th>
<th>2004/05©</th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>2007/08(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fellowship Budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$/Student</td>
<td>$15,211</td>
<td>$16,857</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number of Students]</td>
<td>(453)</td>
<td>(484)</td>
<td>(490)</td>
<td>(502)</td>
<td>(561)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,875,162</td>
<td>$8,192,526</td>
<td>$7,350,000</td>
<td>$8,032,000</td>
<td>$9,221,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Non-Resident NRT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT/Student</td>
<td>$12,246</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(106)</td>
<td>(120)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,557,564</td>
<td>$1,557,564</td>
<td>$1,763,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Non-Resident NRT (IGERT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT/Student</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td>[5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$73,470</td>
<td>$73,470</td>
<td>$73,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International NRT (First Year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT/Student</td>
<td>$12,246</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[114]</td>
<td>[92]</td>
<td>[92]</td>
<td>[145]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,675,116</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
<td>$2,130,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International NRT (Second Year)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT/Student</td>
<td>$12,246</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
<td>$14,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Number]</td>
<td>[93]</td>
<td>[114]</td>
<td>[92]</td>
<td>[145]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,366,542</td>
<td>$1,675,116</td>
<td>$1,351,848</td>
<td>$2,130,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Diversity Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000/Award</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td>[40]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Stipend for Domestic Non-Resident Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000/Award</td>
<td>[106]</td>
<td>[106]</td>
<td>[115]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td>$212,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for the Cohort</strong></td>
<td>$6,875,162</td>
<td>$9,559,068</td>
<td>$13,023,266</td>
<td>$13,138,730</td>
<td>$16,109,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total/Student</strong></td>
<td>$15,211</td>
<td>$19,668</td>
<td>$26,578</td>
<td>$26,173</td>
<td>$28,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Fellowship budget for 2003/04 and 2004/05 included all funding for each cohort (fees, stipends and NRT).
b) $15,211 was the average (BioMed: $29,638; CHASS: $15,898; CNAS: $14,288; COE: $14,288/student)
c) $16,857 was the average (BioMed: $32,026; CHASS: $16,975; CNAS: $15,937; COE: $17,432/student)
d) The data for 2007/08 is the total allocated for BioMed, CHASS, CNAS, GSOE and BCOE.
Appendix 1.  

TO:

CC: Graduate Assistant
    Financial Administrator

FROM: Dallas L. Rabenstein
      Dean, Graduate Division

RE: Central Fellowship Allocation for New Graduate Students Arriving in AY 2007/08

I am pleased to endorse the following target of new graduate students to be recruited for your AY 2007/08 class:

I am approving the following allocation of central fellowship support to aid in your achieving this target.

- Central Fellowship Funds of up to $___/student, up to a maximum of $___ for your target of ___ new students. These funds are to be used for stipends and fees, including the Graduate Student Health Insurance Program, for your AY 2007/08 cohort of new graduate students. Fees for 2007/08 are projected to be $9,204 ($3,068/Qtr) for resident graduate students and $9,471 ($3,157/Qtr) for non-resident graduate students.

This allocation of up to $___ is contingent upon reaching your program’s target of ___ new graduate students. If you recruit fewer students, your allocation will be reduced proportionately.

These funds will be available to your graduate program for offers made to qualified applicants through May 1, 2007. Late applications after that date will be considered subject to the availability of funding. The opportunity to offer centrally funded fellowship packages for Winter 2008/Spring 2008 will be contingent upon the availability of funding remaining after the Fall 2007 graduate student packaging process has been completed.

You will be permitted to make offers to qualified applicants in an amount up to twice your outstanding allotment, including offers to a number of international graduate students equal to twice your allocated number of ___ NRTs for international students. It is expected that you will monitor your commitments in order to stay within your allocation on a per student basis and to make the best use
of your Central Fellowship Funds. The Graduate Division will also track offers made and outstanding balances.

- Non-resident tuition of $14,694/graduate student will be approved for all qualified domestic non-resident graduate students (gpa ≥ 3.25 and GRE scores ≥ 1100). Strong justification will be required for NRT to be approved for domestic non-resident applicants who do not meet these criteria. NRT for domestic non-resident graduate students will be funded from Central Fellowship Funds held in the Graduate Division; it will not be deducted from your Central Fellowship Fund allocation.

- As part of our initiative to recruit more domestic non-resident graduate students, year one of the multiple year support packages for qualified domestic non-resident graduate students (gpa ≥ 3.25 and GRE scores ≥ 1100) will be augmented with a $2,000 recruitment incentive from funds held separately in the Graduate Division. Do not add the $2,000 to the Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart. Applicants selected to receive a Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowship (see below) will not automatically receive the $2,000 augmentation.

- Full NRT of $14,694/graduate student will be provided for AY 2007/08 for up to 1 qualified international graduate student. NRTs for international students in excess of this number must be paid from your Central Fellowship Fund allocation or other sources of funding.

This allocation of ___ NRTs for international graduate students will be available to your graduate program for offers made to qualified applicants through May 1, 2007. Late applications from international students after that date will be considered subject to the availability of international NRT funds.

- Up to ___ quarters of second year (AY 2008/09) NRT will be provided for international graduate students. These can be packaged in multiple year financial support packages in units of one, two or three quarters per international graduate student. They cannot be carried forward beyond the second year.

This allocation of ___ quarters of second year NRT for international graduate students will be available to your graduate program for offers made to qualified applicants through May 1, 2007. Late applications from international students after that date will be considered subject to the availability of second year NRT funds.

- You will have the opportunity to compete for Eugene Cota Robles Awards. Eligibility criteria for an ECRA are described in the Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2007/08. Recipients of ECRAs will be selected by the Graduate Division. If you have an applicant who might be eligible for an ECRA, complete a normal Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart, and nominate the student for an ECRA in your cover memo.
You will have the opportunity to compete for **Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships** (an augmentation of up to $10,000 to the year one fellowship award for the very best applicants). Recipients of the Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships (CDF) will be selected by the Dean of the Graduate Division and will be limited to domestic Ph.D. applicants or domestic Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree. The year 1 augmentation for Master’s degree students will be up to $5,000. If you have an applicant who might be eligible for a CDF, you should complete a normal **Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart**, and nominate the student for a CDF in your cover memo. Do not add the $10,000 or $5,000 augmentation to the Financial Support Chart.

You will have the opportunity to nominate applicants for **Graduate Diversity Awards** (a $4,000 augmentation to year one of the multiple year support package for students who will increase the diversity of our graduate student population). Eligibility criteria are described in the **Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2007/08**. If you have an applicant who might be eligible for a GDA, you should complete a normal **Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart**, and nominate the student for a GDA in your cover memo. Do not add the $4,000 augmentation to the Financial Support Chart.

Additional information about the use of Central Fellowship Fund allotments is given in the accompanying document **Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2007/08**. Please read this document carefully.

Applications should be forwarded directly to the Graduate Division, attention Vicki Long, Director of Admissions. The application file must contain the cover transmittal, the completed and signed evaluation, all official transcripts, original letters of recommendation, statement of purpose and test scores. In addition, all foreign files require pages 3a and 3b of the application, and domestic files must contain pages 4a and 4b for diversity award consideration. A completed and signed **Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart** must be included along with a specific memo of justification for the proposed funding (each file must have a separate memo). Final approval of the admission of applicants and the proposed multiple year financial support packages will be given by the Dean of the Graduate Division. The use of Central Fellowship Funds in the financial support package will be reviewed for consistency with the **Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2007/08**. To avoid delays in the processing of applications, it is critical that proposed fellowship packages be constructed in a manner that complies with the **Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2007/08**. Financial support charts that do not comply will be returned to the program for revisions, which may result in delaying offers to qualified applicants.

It is your responsibility to consult with your departmental/program financial administrator regarding commitments of Departmental or PI funds. The Graduate Division will not be responsible for funding commitments made by programs from
Departmental or PI funds, including TA and College GSR funds, if those fund sources become unavailable.

If you have questions about any part of this memo, please do not hesitate to contact me or Assistant Dean Quinn.

I wish you success in recruiting an outstanding cohort of new graduate students for AY 2007/08.
Appendix 2. Graduate Student Fellowship Guidelines, FY 2006-07

General Principles for Central Fellowship Fund Allotments.

- Central fellowship funds are to be used for the recruitment of the AY 2006-07 cohort of new graduate students, specifically Ph.D. students for graduate programs where the Ph.D. is the terminal degree and Master’s degree students for graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree.

- Central fellowship funds are to be used for stipend and fee awards. The awards may be distributed over the first two years of a student’s program (AY 2006-07, summer 2007 and/or AY 2007-08). Funding for non-resident tuition (NRT) for qualified domestic non-resident and international students will be provided from other funds held in the Graduate Division.

- The central fellowship funds allotted to your graduate program are the total centrally funded support for graduate student stipends and fees for the AY 2006-07 cohort of new graduate students.

- The types of fellowships that can be funded with central fellowship funds are described in the “Centrally Funded Fellowships” table (p. 7). Stipend amounts for each type of fellowship are for Ph.D. applicants, and are specified as ranges to provide flexibility in the use of your central fellowship funds to construct competitive multiple year support packages. Stipend amounts for Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree are one-half the stipend amounts given in the Table.

- Graduate programs are expected to make optimum use of their central fellowship funds to maximize their new student yield and to meet their new student target. Other funds available to the Department/program, including TAs, GSRs, PI funds, gift funds, summer session funds, etc, may be used to increase stipend amounts in fellowship years and must be used for all support offered in other years.

- To be competitive, Ph.D. graduate student support packages for new graduate students should include a multiple year commitment, which may consist of a combination of a centrally funded fellowship, department/program support (such as TAs and GSRs) and PI support.

- Master’s degree support packages for new graduate students in programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree should include a multiple year commitment, typically a 2-year commitment, which may consist of a combination of a centrally funded fellowship, department/program support (such as TAs and GSRs) and PI support. Centrally funded fellowships are limited to one-half the amounts given in the Table.
• Central Fellowship funds are allocated on the basis of X $/student recruited, and not as a block grant. Thus, the actual amount of Central Fellowship funding your program will receive will depend on your per student allocation and the number of new students you recruit for the 2006-07 academic year. You have flexibility in how the funds are used to construct stipend/fee awards, within the parameters outlined in these Guidelines, but in the end the amount awarded on average should be no more than the average $/student allocated to your program. (Note: Central Fellowship Funding also is provided to the Graduate Division on the basis of Y $/ new student recruited, and not as a block grant.)

• Strong justification will be required for the use of central fellowship funds in support packages for Master’s degree students in graduate programs where the Ph.D. is the terminal degree. If the use of central fellowship funds is approved, the amount approved will be limited to up to one-half the ranges given in the Table.

• Graduate programs are encouraged to use all the financial resources available to them when constructing financial support packages, including Central Fellowship, TA, and Departmental and PI GSR support. However, TA and Departmental and PI GSR support is considered employment and the total support in any given year must be in accord with the following from the Graduate Student Employment Handbook:

"Fellowships are awarded to students to free them from the need for employment. Awards with a stipend of greater than $10,000 can only be supplemented with prior approval of the Graduate Dean. It is not unusual for the Dean to approve employment of up to 10 hours a week (25 percent time) during the tenure of an award. Employment may be approved up to 50 percent time for limited periods, but only if employment averages 25 percent or less over the course of the academic year. The Graduate Adviser in the student's department must make this request to the Dean in writing. Fellowships that do not allow supplementation are the GAANN, Eugene Cota-Robles Award, Dissertation Year Fellowship, Humanities Research Assistantship, and Research Assistantship/Mentorship Program."

If a financial support package is proposed that combines a fellowship stipend plus employment as a TA or GSR, and we approve it, that will constitute the prior approval of the Graduate Dean.

• The central fellowship funds allocated to your graduate program will be available for offers made to qualified applicants through May 1, 2006. Central fellowship packages for late applications/nominations after May 1, 2006 will be considered subject to the availability of funding. The opportunity to offer centrally funded fellowship packages for Winter 2007 and Spring 2007 admits will be contingent upon the availability of funding remaining after the Fall 2006 graduate student packaging has been completed.
Centrally Funded Fellowships.

- **Dean’s Distinguished Fellowships (Domestic)**
  - Dean’s Distinguished Fellowship nominations for all qualified (gpa ≥ 3.5 and GRE ≥ 1200) domestic Ph.D. applicants and Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree will be considered, provided they are submitted for approval prior to May 1, 2006.
  - The maximum stipend amount is $16,000 for Ph.D. students and $8,000 for Master’s degree students.
  - The stipend amount may be allocated over the first two years of a student’s program, but may not exceed a total of $16,000 for Ph.D. students and $8,000 for Master’s degree students. For example, it would be permissible to allocate a stipend amount of $16,000 as $6,500 in year 1, $3,000 in the subsequent summer, and $6,500 in year 2. Only the summer between the student’s first and second years will be considered.
  - One year of fees, maximum, may also be allocated to Ph.D. applicants over the first two years of the student’s program, but may not exceed the FY 2006-07 published fee amount in total, i.e. the Graduate Division will not provide additional central funding to cover any FY 2007-08 fee increase.
  - Year one NRT will be approved as needed for qualified domestic non-resident students from funds held separately in the Graduate Division.

- **Graduate Division Fellowships (Domestic)**
  - Graduate Division Fellowships are for applicants who do not meet the criteria for a Dean’s Distinguished Fellowship, but who otherwise demonstrate the potential for success in a Ph.D. program or a Master’s degree program where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree and have a gpa ≥ 3.25 and GRE scores ≥ 1100. All nominations for Graduate Division Fellowships for qualified domestic Ph.D. students and Master’s degree students in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree will be considered, provided they are submitted for approval prior to May 1, 2006.
  - The maximum stipend amount is $11,000 for Ph.D. students and $5,500 for Master’s degree students in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree.
  - The stipend amount may be allocated over the first two years of a student’s program, but may not exceed a total of $11,000. For example, it would be permissible to allocate a stipend $5,500 in year 1 and $5,500
in year 2. A portion of the stipend may also be used for summer support for the summer between the student’s first and second years.

- One year of fees, maximum, may also be allocated over the first two years of a student’s program, but may not exceed the FY 2006/07 published fee amount in total, i.e. the Graduate Division will not provide additional central funding to cover any FY 2007/08 fee increase.

- Year one NRT will be approved as needed for qualified domestic non-resident students from funds held separately in the Graduate Division.

• **Dean’s Distinguished International Fellowship**

  - Dean’s Distinguished International Fellowship nominations for all qualified (gpa ≥ 3.5 and GRE ≥ 1200) international Ph.D. applicants, and Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree, will be considered, provided they are submitted for approval prior to May 1, 2006.

  - Programs are authorized to make a total number of offers to international students, i.e. the total number of Dean’s Distinguished International Fellowship and Graduate Division International Fellowship offers, equal to twice the number of Year 1 NRTs allocated to the program.

  - The maximum stipend amount is $15,000 for Ph.D. students and $7,500 for Master’s degree students.

  - The stipend amount may be allocated over the first two years of a student’s program, including the summer between years 1 and 2, but may not exceed a total of $15,000 for Ph.D. students and $7,500 for Master’s degree students. Only the summer between the student’s first and second years will be considered.

  - One year of fees, maximum, may also be allocated to Ph.D. applicants over the first two years of the student’s program, but may not exceed the FY 2006/7 published fee amount in total, i.e. the Graduate Division will not provide additional central funding to cover any FY 2007/08 fee increase.

  - NRT for years 1 and 2 will be approved as needed for qualified international students from funds held separately in the Graduate Division.

• **Graduate Division International Fellowships**

  - Graduate Division International Fellowships are for applicants who do not meet the criteria for a Dean’s Distinguished International Fellowship, but who otherwise demonstrate the potential for success in a Ph.D.
program or a Master’s degree program where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree and have a GPA $\geq 3.25$ and GRE scores $\geq 1100$. All nominations for Graduate Division Fellowships for qualified (GPA $\geq 3.25$ and GRE $\geq 1100$) international Ph.D. students, and Master’s degree students in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree, will be considered, provided they are submitted for approval prior to May 1, 2006.

- The maximum stipend amount is $11,000 for Ph.D. students and $5,500 for Master’s degree students in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree.

- The stipend amount may be allocated over the first two years of a student’s program, including the summer between years 1 and 2, but may not exceed a total of $11,000. For example, it would be permissible to allocate a stipend amount of $5,500 in year 1 and $5,500 in year 2. Only the summer between the student’s first and second years will be considered.

- One year of fees, maximum, may also be allocated over the first two years of a student’s program, but may not exceed the FY 2006/07 published fee amount in total, i.e. the Graduate Division will not provide additional central funding to cover any FY 2007/08 fee increase.

- NRT for years 1 and 2 will be approved as needed for qualified international students from funds held separately in the Graduate Division.

**Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships**

- To make our offers to the very best domestic Ph.D. applicants more competitive, additional funds have been allocated to the Graduate Division for Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships. A Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowship will consist of the Dean’s Distinguished Fellowship award proposed by the graduate program plus an augmentation of up to $_____ to the year 1 fellowship. The combined total of all sources of stipend support will be limited to a maximum of $30,000 for AY 2006/07 and summer 2007 for Ph.D. students. The additional $_____ for a Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowship will not be deducted from your Central Fellowship Fund allocation.

- Recipients of the Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowships will be selected by the Dean of the Graduate Division and will be limited to the very best domestic Ph.D. applicants and domestic Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree. The augmentation for Master’s degree applicants will be $_____.

- If you have an applicant who might be eligible for a Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowship, you should complete a normal *Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart*, and nominate the student for a CDF in a cover memo. Do not add the $_____ augmentation to the Financial Support Chart.
Graduate Diversity Awards

To increase the diversity of our graduate student population, additional funds have been allocated to the Graduate Division for Graduate Diversity Awards. Domestic students nominated for either a Dean’s Distinguished Fellowship or a Graduate Division Fellowship are eligible for a Graduate Diversity Award. The Graduate Diversity Award will consist of a $4,000 augmentation to year 1 of the proposed multiple year support package.

Eligibility criteria are described on p. 8 of this document. If you have an applicant who might be eligible for a GDA, you should complete a normal Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart, and nominate the student for a GDA in a cover memo. Do not add the $4,000 augmentation to the Financial Support Chart. Recipients of Graduate Diversity Awards will be selected by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

Recruitment Incentive for Domestic Non-Resident Students

To increase our recruitment of domestic non-resident students, the Graduate Division has been allocated additional funding so the year 1 central fellowship support in the first year for all domestic non-resident students who are recipients of a Dean’s Distinguished Fellowship or a Graduate Division Fellowship can be increased by $2,000. Do not add the $2,000 to the Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart. Applicants selected to receive a Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowship will not automatically receive the $2,000 augmentation.

Eugene Cota Robles Awards

A limited number of Eugene Cota Robles Awards will be awarded by the Graduate Division. Eligibility criteria for an ECRA are described on p. 8 of this document. Recipients of ECRAs will be selected by the Graduate Division. If you have an applicant who might be eligible for an ECRA, complete a normal Graduate Applicant Financial Support Chart, and nominate the student for an ECRA in your cover memo.
### Centrally Funded Fellowships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Stipend Range $^{a,b,c}</th>
<th>Fees $^b$</th>
<th>NRT Year 1</th>
<th>NRT Year 2</th>
<th>gpa</th>
<th>GRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor’s Distinguished Fellowship (Domestic only)</td>
<td>An augmentation up to $___ to the AY 2006-07 fellowship award for the very best Ph.D. applicants.$^d$ Recipients will be selected by the Dean of the Graduate Division.</td>
<td></td>
<td>As Needed$^e$</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$\geq 3.5$</td>
<td>$\geq 1200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Distinguished Fellowship (Domestic)</td>
<td>$11,000$ to $16,000$</td>
<td>$\leq 1$ AY, as needed</td>
<td>As Needed$^e$</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$\geq 3.25$</td>
<td>$\geq 1100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division Fellowship (Domestic)</td>
<td>Up to $11,000$</td>
<td>$\leq 1$ AY, as needed</td>
<td>As Needed$^e$</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$\geq 3.5$</td>
<td>$\geq 1200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean’s Distinguished International Fellowship</td>
<td>$11,000$ to $15,000$</td>
<td>$\leq 1$ AY, as needed</td>
<td>Yes$^f$</td>
<td>As Needed$^g$</td>
<td>$\geq 3.5$</td>
<td>$\geq 1200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Division International Fellowship</td>
<td>Up to $11,000$</td>
<td>$\leq 1$ AY, as needed</td>
<td>Yes$^f$</td>
<td>As Needed$^g$</td>
<td>$\geq 3.25$</td>
<td>$\geq 1100$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- **a)** Centrally funded fellowships are intended for Ph.D. applicants, and Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the master’s degree is the terminal degree. The stipend ranges in the Table are for Ph.D. applicants; stipend ranges for applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree should be at one-half these stipend levels. Strong justification will be required for the use of central fellowship funds to support Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Ph.D. is the terminal degree.
- **b)** Your Central Fellowship Fund allotment can be used for stipend and fee awards.
- **c)** Total stipend amount that may be offered during AY 2006-07, summer 2007, and/or 2007-08.
- **d)** The very best Master’s degree applicants in graduate programs where the Master’s degree is the terminal degree will be eligible for an augmentation of up to $____.
- **e)** One year of NRT will be approved for all qualified domestic non-resident applicants (gpa $\geq 3.25$ and GRE scores $\geq 1100$).
- **f)** NRT will be approved for year one for qualified international non-resident students, up to the number of year-one NRTs allocated to your graduate program.
- **g)** NRT will be approved for year two for qualified international non-resident students, up to the total number of quarters allocated to your graduate program.
**Diversity Awards**

Diversity fellowship awards are designed to facilitate the academic career development of students who show potential to become excellent faculty or researchers in institutions of higher education as well as to foster diversity in graduate education at the University of California, Riverside. To maintain academic excellence, the University places a high value on achieving a diverse graduate student body because diversity is critical to promoting the lively intellectual exchange and the variety of ideas and perspectives that are essential to advanced research and because graduate students form the pool of academic leaders of the future.

Although preference may no longer be given to applicants based on the basis of race, color, ethnicity, gender or national origin, the University of California remains committed to goals of achieving a diverse graduate student body; qualified students are individuals from cultural, linguistic, geographic, and socioeconomic backgrounds who would not otherwise be adequately represented in the graduate student and faculty populations. Nominations for minorities and women, who also meet these criteria, are encouraged.

**Eugene Cota-Robles Awards (ECRA)**

This award is intended to support students from diverse backgrounds who are entering Ph.D. programs and interested in university teaching and research as their ultimate career goal. The ECRA provides a $15000 stipend plus all assessed fees during their first year. Recipients receive a second year ECRA during their third, fourth, or fifth year of doctoral study. During the years not funded by the ECRA, students are supported by salaried positions as teaching assistants, graduate student researchers or on traineeships.

ECRA recipients must be academically meritorious and from a cultural, linguistic, geographic and/or socioeconomic background where under-representation is present in graduate education. The intent is to provide access to higher education for students who might otherwise find it difficult or impossible to successfully pursue graduate study. It is essential to have the Supplementary Fellowship Information, pages 4a and 4b of the Admission Application, completed as part of the student’s profile.

**Eligibility:**
- Demonstrated academic potential and promise for doctoral study.
- Must be a citizen or permanent resident of the U.S.
- Recipient must enhance diversity of the department/program.
- Nominee must be recommended for admission to the Ph.D.
- Nominee must have a designated faculty mentor.
- Interest in academic career in teaching and research at the university level.
- Completed the Supplementary Fellowship Information pages 4a and 4b of Admissions Application.
Recipients of an ECRA will be selected by the Dean of the Graduate Division. The fellowship components of these awards will be funded by the Graduate Division and will not come out of the program/department’s 2006/07 cohort allotment.

**Graduate Diversity Awards**

To determine eligibility for the diversity awards the Supplementary Fellowship Information, pages 4a and 4b of the Admission Application must be submitted with the file. If this is unavailable, but there are other documents in the applicant’s file which address the questions asked in the supplementary form, highlight this information in your fellowship cover letter to support the selection of your nominee for a Graduate Diversity Award.

Graduate Programs are encouraged to nominate qualified applicants for Graduate Diversity Awards when admission files are submitted to the Graduate Division. Recipients will be selected by the Dean of the Graduate Division. Graduate Diversity Awards ($4000 stipend augmentations) will be funded by the Graduate Division and will not impact the program/department’s 2006/07 cohort allotment.
ATTACHMENT C

STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA

2007-08 COHORT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Applications</th>
<th>Admitted Applicants</th>
<th>SIR=YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2006</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2007</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management - Palm Desert</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGSM Total</strong></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing and WPA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Campus Prop in Classics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHASS Total</strong></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Statistics</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry &amp; Molec. Biol</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Molec. &amp; Dev Biology</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental tox</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology Sciences</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Water Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statistics</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CNAS Total</strong></td>
<td>1157</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical &amp; Environ Engr</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COE Total</strong></td>
<td>641</td>
<td>899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUC Total</strong></td>
<td>3263</td>
<td>3902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, ASC Cred</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP, non-degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL - degree</strong></td>
<td>3261</td>
<td>3911</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION:
Constituted in December, 2006, the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Education, received the following charge:

“Flourishing graduate programs are essential to the overall health of the campus, and to ensure that our programs are following the best practices on other UC campuses, this committee is charged with undertaking a comparison of UCR policies and practices in the following three areas of graduate education and support relative to other UC campuses, and to recommend changes where warranted:

1. The availability of dissertation year and other “out year” non-teaching support for graduate students.
2. The workload of teaching assistants, specifically in terms of section sizes and total number of students per quarter.
3. Participation by ladder faculty in graduate education and the policy of incentives, if any, for a large graduate-teaching workload.”

During much of the Fall and Winter quarters (2006-07), the committee collected data on these three items from other UC campuses as a basis of comparison on these action items. As might be expected, procedures on establishing out year funding, for determining optimum teaching loads (within the strictures of the MOU with the UAW, which represents student employees), and for encouraging/enforcing graduate teaching not only vary campus by campus, but indeed, department by department, throughout the system.

Regardless, it is clear to the committee that each of these issues has a significant impact on graduate recruiting as well as the quality of graduate education at UCR, and we have attempted to address each within the limited power vested in this committee.
I. DISSERTATION AND OTHER “OUT YEAR” NON-TEACHING SUPPORT

Commentary and Analysis:

Although it is the consensus of the committee that dissertation year support is seriously underfunded at UCR, creating difficulties both in recruiting the best graduate students and in helping enrolled graduate students toward timely completion of their degrees, the committee found this a particularly difficult topic to address for two reasons. First, it is not a universal need on this campus. Many of the laboratory sciences at UCR rely less on teaching to fund graduate students who are completing their research. The best of these students are often funded as Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs) through their advisors’ grants. It should be noted, however, that GSR support is not necessarily available for graduate students in all science programs and is dependent on the vagaries of grant funding. Further, the life sciences as well as mathematics depend heavily on TAships both for instruction and support—often for as much as six years. Indeed, the life sciences in particular are looking towards a time when even more TAships will be needed due to a lack of enough external funding that will cover graduate students. Currently this is a major problem in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

In the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, graduate funding is principally reliant on TAships, especially for long-term support for advanced graduate students. Although some students do get GSR support, this relatively rare in CHASS. Other colleges/schools face similar issues in funding their graduate students: where grant support is available GSRships are often used; in other instances TAships are the most common form of funding through the dissertation year. Given the various cultures of financial support within disciplines and colleges at UCR, attempting to formulate a single campus-wide policy on “out year” funding seems inappropriate. Nevertheless, the status quo appears to be unsatisfactory in both lab-based and non-lab-based disciplines, particularly because the current cohort system forbids any guaranteed funding after a student’s second year at UCR.

The second difficulty the committee had in speaking to this issue is specifically linked to the current funding model in place at UCR. Although Graduate Dean Rabenstein has begun to build some dissertation year monies into the “cohort funding” model now used, that too has its shortcomings. In all disciplines, students finish at different rates. Even within a single discipline, some may finish in five years, for example, while others may finish in seven and still be well within an approved time to degree. The reasons for such differences are numerous, but in many instances may be ascribed to differences in the types of research being done: archival materials may be difficult to obtain; the research problem may be more complex, requiring more time to master the commentaries, or the research problem may be so new and cutting edge that no commentaries exist and much of the scholarly apparatus must be constructed along the way. It does not necessarily follow that those who complete their degrees more quickly are doing better work or are more worthy of being funded in their dissertation years. Yet, under the cohort model—which sets a limit on the amount of funds for any cohort in any department—someone doing exceptionally important work, but who takes longer, may find him or herself without funding in the final year of research because those who are working more quickly have already used up the cohort’s allocation for dissertation year funds. The problem is
compounded because a different amount of such funding will exist for each cohort – quite independently of any particular student’s performance, since out year funding under the current cohort system depends primarily on the Dean’s skill in guessing correctly about such variables as accept rates, package sizes, and student persistence rates. This introduces an element of unfairness on top of the fundamental underfunding of advanced students.

Other campuses use a more flexible combination of sources for providing dissertation year funding. On those UC campuses that responded to our survey, some dissertation year money is available from central sources (Graduate Division): recipients are established through a campus-wide competition. At some campuses, funding is also available from the Schools and Colleges, as well as from the Graduate Division. In some departments, additional block grant money is available to fund partial or entire years (depending on the relative wealth of the departments) for some or all of their dissertation students. Other departments include dissertation year funding in the recruitment package—stipulating that one fellowship year (usually of two granted) is to be taken after the student has advanced to candidacy and is in the processing of writing the dissertation. The flexibility of potential funding scenarios is enviable, and it allows campuses (and departments) to recruit more aggressively and to marshal funds strategically, thus potentially providing dissertation-year support (even if only partial) to more students.

Recommendations:
In light of the need to consider ways to provide more dissertation year funding to UCR graduate students, the committee makes the following recommendations:

1. Significantly increase the allocation of monies specifically designated for dissertation-year support. The Chancellor’s Dissertation fellowships that were recently announced represent an important step in this direction; however, it is only a beginning. To increase recruitment success, packages must be devised that guarantee non-teaching support at a point after the student has advanced to doctoral candidacy.
2. Allow students to compete for dissertation year funds regardless of their cohort status, and increase the money available for such funding.
3. Constitute a joint senate/administrative committee, to include the Graduate Dean, V-C Bolar, the Deans (or appropriate Associate Deans) of each school or college, and graduate advisors from representative departments, to review and rethink the viability of cohort funding as the appropriate funding model for graduate support at UC Riverside.

T.A. WORKLOAD

Commentary and Analysis:
The issue of T.A. workload (in terms of section size and numbers of sections) is particularly vexed in part because of the successful efforts of the UAW to unionize TAs, tutors, and readers in the UCs several years ago. One upshot of unionization has been to create a bifurcated view of graduate student support that comes in the form of
compensation for instructional labor. On the one hand, many departments (and campuses) have adopted the union view that academic student employees are just that, employees, they should be treated as such, and issues of support are secondary. Others maintain the pre-unionization perspective that TAships, readerships, etc. are primarily forms of student support, and, consequently, the University’s concern should be on funding (through employment) in ways that are not so onerous as to interfere with the students’ research or retard their times to degree.

Recommendations:
It is the opinion of this committee that UCR should take the second view and use graduate student employment both to fund and to recruit as many quality students as possible. Such an approach not only would enhance UCR’s recruiting, but also, by reducing section sizes, raise the quality of pedagogy in sections taught by graduate students. Efforts by the Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences are already underway to reduce sections to more manageable sizes for teaching assistants. As the campus continues to increase its undergraduate population, however, even more must be done to ensure that graduate students do not individually assume too large a share of the instructional burden. To this end, we make the following recommendations:

1. Increase the number of TAships available to college and school deans. These FTE should be restricted for use only as TAships or other forms of graduate support and should not be fungible.
2. Investigate the possibility of reinstating a number of 33% appointments for TAs, thus creating 3 (rather than 2) TAships per FTE. The committee recognizes the financial constraints of such a recommendation, but believes that the benefits of the availability of more 33% appointments would justify the costs.
3. Request that all college/school deans require departments to evaluate and report optimum section sizes for TA-led sections, with the intent of using these numbers as target sizes for those sections.

III. LADDER FACULTY AND GRADUATE EDUCATION
Commentary and Analysis:

Given the relatively small number of faculty for a campus of its size, for UCR to reach AAU numbers for its graduate programs, ladder faculty—on average—must direct four graduate students each. Of course, in some colleges, such as AGSM or GSOE this number is much higher than four. Other programs are well below the 4 to 1 ratio. While it would be mistaken to assume that every faculty member should always have at least four graduate students under his or her tutelage, it is important to have as many ladder faculty as possible contribute to graduate education.

Our survey showed that some departments offered incentives for heavy graduate mentoring, usually in the form of counting that work as a course, thus releasing the faculty member from some undergraduate teaching responsibility during the year. Other departments simply responded that there were no incentives for “doing one’s job”: still
others stated that while they had no system of incentives or rewards for heavy graduate
teaching or dissertation direction, they felt a pressing need to devise a way to recognize
those who took on a large burden in their graduate programs.

At UCR it is sometimes the case that faculty members do not offer graduate courses in
the department or direct students because of a lack of a critical mass in their specialties.
History, for example has some quality faculty with expertise in areas that are not offered
as specializations for the history Ph.D. precisely because there is only one faculty
member in those fields. In other instances, students may not be seeking to work with
faculty members—for a variety of reasons. Nevertheless, many of the faculty in these
circumstances in History—and in similar ones across campus—contribute substantively
to graduate education through teaching courses, organizing field exams, mentoring
students for advancement to candidacy, etc., even though they are not directing
dissertations. The conditions that preclude these faculty from actually directing doctoral
research are outside the power of individual faculty members to rectify, and should be
taken into account in any review of graduate teaching and mentoring responsibilities
within a unit. However, there are other instances at UCR when faculty refuse to take on
graduate students—and sometimes even refuse to teach graduate courses. Clearly, if
UCR is to continue to grow its reputation as a research university, such situations must be
addressed.

Recommendations:

In an effort to encourage participation in graduate mentoring and teaching by as
large a number of ladder faculty as possible, the committee recommends the following:

1. Allow departments to count unit granting, but unscheduled, teaching such as 290s
   and 299s and the direction of dissertations as part of the official teaching
   workload. Also allow departments to devise systems whereby incentives—in the
   form of course releases—are offered for a specified number of dissertations
directed (to completion) and a specified amount of 290, 299, etc. teaching.

2. Make explicit to all levels of faculty merit review (Departments, Deans, CAP,
   EVC/Chancellor) that the issue of graduate teaching must be addressed; that
   failure to participate in some material way with a department or program’s
   mission of graduate education should be considered a weakness in a file and an
   indication of the faculty member’s failure to meet one of his or her obligations to
   the University. In cases where there is no participation, a department’s letter
   should speak specifically to that absence.

Other General Recommendations:

1. This committee recognizes that a “one size fits all policy” for graduate funding is
   an unworkable model, and recommends that the senate/administrative committee
   formed for rethinking graduate funding at UCR collect more data with an eye to
   understanding thoroughly how graduate students are funded beyond those monies
that are funneled through Graduate Division. Specifically, detailed attention should be given to dollar amounts needed and models used by the various disciplines.

2. The committee also recommends developing a method for counting those students who are ABD but beyond the 9th quarter since advancement to candidacy. While we are not encouraging slowness to degree, it is clear that in many instances, students who are taking longer are not enrolling (to avoid fees or for other reasons) but are continuing to work toward their degree. While it is UC policy not to advise such students, practice is very different. In departments like Philosophy, History, English, Anthropology, as well as Sociology and Economics, students withdraw with the intent of returning in their final quarter to defend and file. Typically, faculty continue to work with such students, as most faculty believe they have an ethical responsibility to do so, whatever the students’ registration status. We propose extending a reduced fee schedule for such students—perhaps for as long as three or four quarters—and counting students who register under this status among our graduate student population.

3. The senate/administrative committee should work toward formulating more faculty incentives for the mentoring/advising/directing/teaching of graduate students.