December 7, 2006

TO: R. A. (Richard) Luben, Vice Chair, (Department of Biomedical Sciences)  
R. L. (Rusty) Russell, Secretary Parliamentarian, (Department of Sociology)  
N. E. (Nancy) Beckage, Chair, Affirmative Action and Diversity, (Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience)  
W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Committees, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)  
J. B. (Jan) Blacher, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee, (Graduate School of Education)  
J. W. (Joe) Childers, Representative to the Assembly, (Department of English)  
H. L. (Helen) Henry, Chair, Faculty Welfare, (Department of Biochemistry)  
C. (Carol) Lovatt, Junior Representative to the Assembly, (Botany & Plant Sciences)  
R. T. A. (Rene) Lysloff, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Music)  
A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Planning and Budget (Department of Biochemistry)  
E. A. (Gene) Nothnagel, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy, (Department of Botany and Plant Sciences)  
L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee, (Department of Biology)  
T. D. (Tim) Paine, Chair, Undergraduate Council (Department of Entomology)  
T (Tom) Payne, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology (Computer Science)  
T. (Teodor) Przymusinski, Chair, COE Executive Committee  
W. (Waymond) Rodgers, Chair AGSM Executive Committee, (A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management)  
R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)  
T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)  
I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Religious Studies)  
K. (Kiril) Tomoff, Chair, Committee on Research, (Department of History)  
A. D. (Allen) Zych, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel, (Department of Physics and Astronomy)  

FR: T. Cogswell, Chair  
Riverside Division

RE: ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA – December 11, 2006

This is to confirm the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Monday, December 11, 2006, at 1:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.

Please let me know your attendance plans. A light lunch will be served – so please come hungry!!

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
     - Approval of November 27, 2006 notes (see Attached)
     - Proposed Change to Regulation 6.IV – Academic Integrity Committee (Attached)

2. **CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
   - **10 min**
     - Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Review
     - Conversion Factor and General Education Review (Draft Report from previous Ad Hoc Committee Attached)

3. **PROPOSED NAME CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY**
   - **5 min**
     - Responses from P&B, CEP, Graduate Council and CAP Advisory needs to review the recommendations and forward the same to the Division for action (Attached)

4. **PROPOSAL FOR AN 11TH PERSON ON CAP**
   - **15 min**
     - (Attached)

5. **PROPOSAL TO MOVE CAP**
   - **30 min**
     - Review and decide next course of action - see responses from P&B and CAP (Attached)

6. **ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AWARDS AND COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE:**
   - **25 min**
     - Tom Cogswell will lead discussion (Attached)

7. **PROMISE AND POWER OF TEN TOUR**
   - **30 min**
     - Tom Cogswell will lead discussion (Attached)
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES
November 27, 2006

PRESENT:

Thomas (Tom) Cogswell, Chair, (Department of History)
R. A. (Richard) Luben, Vice Chair (Department of Biomedical Sciences)
R. L. (Rusty) Russell, Secretary Parliamentarian (Department of Sociology)
W. P. (Ward) Beyermann, Chair, Committee on Committees (Physics and Astronomy)
J. B. (Jan) Blacher, Chair, GSOE Executive Committee (Graduate School of Education)
J. W. (Joe) Childers, Representative to the Assembly (Department of English)
H. (Helen) Henry, Chair, Faculty Welfare (Biochemistry)
R. T. A. (Rene) Lysloff, Chair, CHASS Executive Committee (Department of Music)
A. W. (Tony) Norman, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget, (Department of Biochemistry)
E. A. (Gene) Nothnagel, Chair, Committee on Educational Policy (Botany and Plant sciences)
L. P. (Len) Nunney, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee (Department of Biology)
T. D. (Tim) Paine, (Department of Entomology) Chair, Undergraduate Council
T. (Tom) Payne, Chair, Academic Computing & Information Technology (Computer Science)
T. (Teodor) Przymusinski, Chair, COE Executive Committee
W. Rodgers, Chair, AGSM Executive Committee (AGSM)
R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)
T. Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education (Comparative Lit and Foreign Languages)
K. (Kiril) Tomoff, Chair, Committee on Research (Department of History)
A.D. (Allen) Zych, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (Department of Physics and Astronomy)

ABSENT:

N. E. (Nancy) Beckage, Chair, Affirmative Action and Diversity (Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience)
I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning (Department of Religious Studies)

GUESTS:

EVC and Provost Ellen Wartella

EVC and Provost Ellen Wartella thanked the Advisory Committee for giving her a chance to address them. She indicated that she would be grateful if the Senate would complete the review of some of the reports that had been forwarded to the Senate, namely, the Student Success Report and the Code of Faculty Conduct. She mentioned that she would be chairing the Student Success Steering Committee (SSSC) which had been set up to respond to the recommendations contained in the report, and that Neil Schiller and Chair Cogswell were part of this committee. Regarding the Senate research funds, EVC and Provost Wartella noted that she was more than happy to supplement the existing funds and that she was working on this issue with Vice Chancellor Charles Louis, Vice Chancellor Gretchen Bolar and Vice Provost Betty Lord.
She also discussed the issue of the Dean of UNEX and in particular what to do with International issues. She was hoping for some advice from the Senate.

Regarding the Medical School, EVC and Provost Wartella mentioned that the Chancellor felt very strongly that we need to move quickly to get the full proposal ready. She had as a goal, a year from November 2006. They, therefore, need to put in place a team of advisors to (1) assist in the recruitment of the Medical School Dean, and (2) prepare the proposal. She indicated that they currently had approximately $5 million in hand for planning purposes and she plans to use these funds to hire a team of about 6 people to work on a revised budget plan. Regarding the search for the Founding Dean, she mentioned that her office was planning to hire an executive search firm to help with the search and currently, they were looking at 2 firms that were used by UC Irvine. She hopes to launch the search in January 2007.

She invited the Senate to help in setting up a Health Affairs Committee by February of 2007 which will help to approve the initial curriculum for 3rd and 4th year students and help the founding Dean with initial hires.

Consent Calendar:
The consent calendar including the informational items were approved unanimously.

Proposed Changes to GSOE Bylaw:
The Committee unanimously approved the language and contents of the GSOE bylaw.

Unfinished Business:
Chair Tom Cogswell brought up the issue of providing an open invitation to the Junior Assembly representative as a guest to Advisory with no voting privileges. The Committee moved unanimously to invite Dr. Carol Lovatt to attend Advisory Committee meetings as a non-voting member for the 2006-07 fiscal year.

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Sessions:
Dr. Childers reported on the work that the Ad Hoc Committee on Summer Sessions had done. The ad hoc committee was a committee made up of administrators and Academic Senate members that was formed to address the issues confronting the transition of Summer Session to full summer funding and their charge was to "advise the administration and the Academic Senate on curricular and academic issues affected by the transition of Summer Session from a self-sufficient entity to its current "full funding" status. The committee had completed their work and put together a report for review by the Advisory committee before sending it onwards to the Administration. Some recommendations they came up with included:

1. A Summer Session steering committee should be established composed of Academic Senate members as well as appropriate Administrators.
2. The administration should establish a transparent set of goals and benefits for faculty and departmental participation in Summer Session – for years the reason that departments participated was because they got money. It was not clear now how much of that money will come back to departments.
3. Until the larger picture becomes clear, Summer Session should continue to do “business as usual”. The Summer Session director should continue negotiating directly with departments for courses.

Dr. Childers indicated that it was important that Summer Sessions be separate from Extension and should report to the EVCP. The committee discussed issues such as how the 11 month appointees will be compensated, etc. It was also recommended that a review of the structure of summer sessions should be undertaken. The Advisory Committee endorses the Ad Hoc Committee’s report and agrees that it is important to create a Summer Session positioned both to meet the current and ever-changing needs of UCR students and to accommodate potential directives from UCOP concerning the operations of Summer Session systemwide.

Revisions to UCR Policy and Procedures for Naming Campus Properties:
The Committee discussed the sections that had been revised and reviewed the comments received from the various committees. It was noted that any naming action needs to involve the faculty of the affected unit at the earliest possible stage. The committee felt that the policy should include a section that indicated that the faculty had reviewed and approved the proposed name change. The Committee on Planning and Budget also had some concerns about the proposed steps of the approval process. The Advisory Committee moved to adopt the changes as noted by Planning and Budget and to include a proviso that faculty needed to be consulted. The vote was unanimous.

Proposal for a New Department of Media and Cultural Studies:
The proposal for the new department of Media and Cultural Studies had been submitted to the following committees for review, Planning and Budget, CEP, Graduate Council, CAP, Faculty Welfare and Library. The members felt that there were many meritorious aspects about the proposed new department and found the proposal interesting however, there were many issues that had to be dealt with before they could approve it. The committee voted to move that they approve it provisionally, until they receive an addendum responding to the questions raised by all the above committees. The vote was passed unanimously.

Final Report of the International Advisory Committee:
The Advisory committee reviewed the response received from the Committee on International Education and agreed with the recommendations that were made therein. The AC members voted to approve the report and to have Chair Cogswell forward the recommendations to the EVCP.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Academic Senate
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

Proposed Change to Regulation 6. IV.
Academic Integrity Committees

To be adopted:

PRESENT:

6. IV. College Academic Integrity Committees
An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of the Colleges and for the Graduate Division/Professional Schools\(^1\) to:
* hear cases referred by Student Judicial Affairs that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs
* hear appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs

Four to six faculty, four to six full-time undergraduate students, and four to six graduate students will be appointed to each College Committee and shall serve two-year staggered terms to ensure continuity. In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each College. The Graduate/Professional School Committee will be comprised of faculty and graduate students and shall be drawn from appointees to the College Committees. The faculty will be chosen by the College Executive Committees in consultation with the Graduate Council. The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association. Students who have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or who have a case pending before the Student Conduct Committee or an Academic Integrity Committee are not eligible to serve as committee members.

PROPOSED:

No Change

In the Spring quarter, the Committee on Committees shall appoint 4 BCOE faculty, 4 AGSM faculty, 2 GSOE faculty, 6 CHASS faculty and 6 CNAS faculty to the panels to serve on one year terms effective July 1-June 30. Four to six full-time undergraduate students; and four to six graduate students will be appointed to each College Committee and shall serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30. In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each College. The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association. Students who have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or who have a case pending before the Student Conduct Committee or an Academic Integrity Committee are not eligible to serve as committee members.
A hearing panel of 3-5 members will be drawn from the pool of appointees for each case. A quorum of the committee consists of three persons, with at least one faculty member, one student for College Committees and one faculty member and one graduate student for the Graduate/Professional School Committee. In the absence of a quorum, the hearing will be rescheduled. Staff support to the Committee will be provided by the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee.

JUSTIFICATION:

Due to the increasing number of academic integrity cases and decreased ability and/or willingness of faculty to commit to serve on academic integrity cases, it is our recommendation to authorize the Committee on Committees to appoint a faculty member from each department (and for those departments who have a high number of cases, additional faculty may be requested.). We recommend one year terms versus two year terms in order to cut down on the demand for faculty time.

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: November 1, 2006
Approved by the Graduate Council: November 15, 2006
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: December 5, 2006
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee:
To: Manuela Martins-Green, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Ad Hoc Committee to Review General Education
   V.-L. Nyitray, Chair 2005-06, Vice Chair 2004-05 (Religious Studies)
   M. L. Molle, Vice Chair (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
   B. C. Hyman, Vice Chair 2005-06, Chair 2004-05 (Department of Biology)
   W. Ashmore (Department of Anthropology)
   L. S. Bell (Department of History), Educational Policy
   E. L. Chronister (Department of Chemistry)
   D. R. Cocker (Department of Chemical/Environmental Engineering)
   T. K. Hollis (Department of Chemistry), Undergraduate Council Committee
   W. M. Liao (A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management)
   T. W. Lyons (Department of Earth Sciences)
   G. W. Scott (Department of Chemistry), Associate Dean, Student Affairs, CNAS
   J. S. Wills (Graduate School of Education)
   N. E. Young (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
   Geoff Cohen, Academic Coordinator, CHASS
   Katherine Bailey, Student Affairs Officer, AGSM
   Li Guethlein, Student Academic Affairs Supervisor, COE
   Margaret N. Wild, University Extension

Date: June 23, 2006 DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION

The committee, its charge, and its work

In Spring 2005, Academic Senate Chair Martins-Green assembled an ad hoc committee, chaired
by B.C. Hyman and co-chaired by M.L. Molle and V.-L.Nyitray, and charged with conducting
an overall review of UCR’s current General Education (GE) policies. UCR’s GE policies were
established in 1981 and revised in 1987 to include a campus ethnicity requirement but have not
otherwise been substantially/successfully reviewed over the quarter century since their inception.
As UCR enters a new phase of growth and reassessment of its overall educational mission and
profile, the time was more than ripe for reevaluation of its undergraduate vision.

During summer 2005, the co-chairs undertook a review of UCR’s stated principles of GE (see
catalog, 44) and then moved on to examine GE practices at the other UC campuses and at
selected comparison institutions. In Fall Quarter 2005, the co-chairs met to discuss materials
reviewed. Winter Quarter was devoted to a continuing review of national research findings on
GE and curricular trends and outcomes, and to meetings with as many Senate committees,
college executive committees, department chairs, and individuals with particular experience in
curricular reform here at UCR (Hewlett Program, CHASS Connect) as was possible. During
Spring Quarter, the committee met as a whole bi-weekly, devised and posted an informal faculty
survey regarding General Education, and considered its recommendations.
This report briefly summarizes the findings of the ad hoc committee and presents its recommendations. A small and not entirely representative ad hoc committee such as this one cannot hope to provide a detailed blueprint for action; rather, it seeks to spotlight issues that a subsequent, more substantial committee must take up to move this important agenda forward.

Observations Arising from Literature, Reports, and Programs Reviewed [copies attached for the use of future committee(s)]

Commission on General Education in the 21st Century (April 22, 2005)
_A Survey of Related Initiatives in General Education_
http://cshe.berkeley.edu/gec/pdf/survey_of_related_initiatives

Duke University -- The University's Arts and Science Council's report, _Curriculum 2000_, recommended redesigning Duke's liberal arts curriculum to meet the challenges of the 21st century. This initiative emphasizes global citizenship, multiculturalism, the ability to see issues from multiple perspectives, ethics, lifelong learning, and citizenship. _Curriculum 2000_ recommends that students be required to take courses in four areas of knowledge (arts and literatures; civilizations; social sciences; natural sciences/mathematics); two modes of knowledge (quantitative, inductive, and deductive reasoning; and interpretive and aesthetic approaches); three focused inquiries (cross cultural; science, technology, and society; and ethical); and three competencies (research, writing, and foreign language).

➤ As part of its informal charge, the present ad hoc committee was particularly encouraged to examine Duke's reforms. Having done so, the committee notes that Duke's initiative grows out of and is focused on its liberal arts curriculum and thus mirrors UCR's situation incompletely; the challenge for UCR is to develop paths in its BS as well as BA degree programs to achieve desired general educational goals, e.g., foreign language requirements may continue to differ from college to college and may further differ between BA and BS degree tracks.

Stanford -- The University's Commission on Undergraduate Education issued a report in 1994 that recommended improvements in academic advising and curriculum, and recommended creating a new vice provost position for undergraduate education. The Commission focused its recommendations on (1) creating a new core science requirement for non-science majors that teaches students how to think scientifically, (2) requiring students to develop a thematic connection among their humanities and social science breadth requirements, and (3) strengthening the school's foreign language and writing requirements, and developing a course on oral communication.

➤ Following on suggestions advanced in the informal faculty survey, the ad hoc committee endorses the encouraging of new curricula for non-science and non-engineering majors; it also believes that thematic connections could add a measure of coherence to the menu of courses currently available (or to be developed), either in lieu of cluster courses or in addition to the development of such clusters. Faculty should be encouraged to coordinate certain courses to avoid overlapping time of offering and duplication of required materials. In terms
of science requirements for non-science majors, CNAS has previously issued a report with guidelines and suggestions for development of targeted courses [Price report 11/97] that the present ad hoc committee believes should be revisited.

University of Chicago – In 1998, the University developed a set of new general education guidelines in a report entitled Three Views of Continuity & Change at the University of Chicago. The University streamlined its general education requirements so that students could complete these requirements within two years and move on to more specialized studies in their majors. The new general education guidelines also allowed students to fulfill their foreign language requirement by demonstrating proficiency on an exam rather than through coursework. To encourage students to develop their foreign language skills and to gain more exposure to other cultures, the University decided to offer grants to students to study in foreign-language institutes in other countries.

- The ad hoc committee supports the use of meaningful and comprehensive examinations, especially for heritage languages, but notes the need to make meaningful examinations available for LCTL (less commonly taught languages); the UC Language Consortium might be of assistance in this matter (Professor Theda Shapiro has been UCR’s representative to the Consortium for several years). Consideration should be given to advancing use of EAP experience to fulfill language or, if defined internationally, cultural diversity requirements.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign – Since 1994, students have been expected to develop fluency and literacy in English, demonstrate literacy in at least one foreign language, gain exposure to different disciplines, and undertake intensive study in one discipline (or an interdisciplinary major). Freshmen are allowed to participate in Discovery Courses, i.e., small seminars taught by regular faculty. Some Discovery Courses meet general education requirements, while others are an opportunity for faculty to share their research with students. Freshmen in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences may participate in a Learning Communities program, in which a group of 18 students take two general education courses together in the fall semester and get together to discuss academics or other issues college freshmen face.

- The ad hoc committee sees these kinds of programs as providing needed contact and mentoring experiences for lower division students. Expansion of programs like CHASS Connect, along with the development of similar cross-college initiatives to integrate disciplines and expose students to the production and assessment of knowledge in general and/or practical topics such as problems of design, resource use and conservation, health and nutrition, distribution of goods and distributive justice in global context, curatorship and preservation of historical artifacts, etc., can only serve to enhance student experience and increase student satisfaction and retention rates.

[Other reports listed]

B. Review of other UC Campuses
   UCLA Cluster Courses
summary evaluation
UC Merced formulation
summary evaluation
UCI
summary evaluation

C. UCR

Hewlitt Cluster Course Project
CHASS-Connect
CNAS Nonmajors Curriculum Committee, Final Report (November 1997)]

General Conclusions and Recommendations

The report of the present committee should be understood to represent the start of a process that will take at least another 2-3 years to implement. During the term of the present *ad hoc* committee, numerous other Senate, administrative, and joint committees—in addition to standing Senate committees including Educational Policy, Undergraduate Council, etc.—were at work on issues and initiatives related to unit conversion, freshman experience, the Writing Center, student retention, and internationalization, to name but a few. Unintended consequences were both negative and positive: while the plethora of uncoordinated committees and the urgency, real or perceived, of their charges may have resulted in the confusion or conflation of these issues in the minds of some faculty, another result is that critical problems have been brought to wide attention across the campus. The time is ripe for crucial discussions on the meaning of GE and on the means of its implementation at UCR. The *ad hoc* committee believes that through its informal survey and through its outreach to various committees, it has contributed to the fostering of such discussions within departments, among the faculty of each college or school, and across the campus as a whole.

As UCR continues to grow and diversify, a GE model that mandates numerous campus-wide requirements is likely to prove unfeasible; the present committee believes that multiple paths to achieving a shared GE goal is not only possible but preferable, particularly in challenging fiscal times. As pedagogically appealing as cross-college cluster courses—learning communities that engage first year students in mentored small group experiences led by teams of senior faculty—may be, the administrative costs associated with such courses could be prohibitive. A cluster course arrangement need not be written off, however; it can be developed as one way in which certain students, whether by choice or design, are enabled to fulfill core and/or breadth requirements. Other students might continue to choose from a menu of courses, similar to the present arrangement but made more coherent by groupings of courses, a delimited list of vetted courses, or other thoughtful and systematic presentation of offerings that together would expose students to the definitive ideas, themes, tools, etc. of UCR’s new GE vision.

The present *ad hoc* committee is not the only committee to have attempted to initiate review and change in GE at UCR. The present committee feels strongly that this record of its work should not languish but should be used as a springboard for action in the coming academic year.
Specific Recommendations

A. This ad hoc committee recommends that deliberate action be taken to revise UCR’s GE policies. To this end, the present committee should be succeeded by a new committee composed of the following:

- Associate Deans for Student Affairs from CHASS, CNAS, and COE
- a representative from the Executive Committee of each college
- representatives from the Committee on Educational Policy and the Undergraduate Council
- a representative from the office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academic Programs
- a representative of the new Writing Center
- an experienced member of the academic advising staff of each college
- a representative of University Extension

Additionally, the ad hoc committee strongly urges that students be represented as well:

- a student peer mentor/adviser from each college
- a peer mentor from the University Honors Program
- if possible, alumni/ae representative(s)

The committee strongly urges that the aforementioned members be joined by selected faculty with demonstrated or stated interest in curricular affairs.

B. The new committee should be charged with continuing and moving the work of the present committee forward, viz., to facilitate substantive discussions of the components of a new GE vision, to create cross-campus and college working groups as appropriate and necessary, and to develop a reasonable timeline and preliminary budget for implementation.

C. As part of the work of the new committee, the present committee urges attention to the following items:

- development of a statement of GE goals to replace existing catalog statement and better reflect the vision of UCR as a 21st century public institution of higher learning charged with producing graduates capable of critical analysis, skilled in oral and written communication, cognizant of the larger world beyond their immediate horizons, appreciative of human creativity, alive to ethical reflection, and prepared to engage in thoughtful, grounded discussion of scientific, cultural, and environmental affairs as they impact all our lives as citizens of California, the nation, and the world.

- consideration of a distinction between core requirements, i.e., campus wide requirements, and college - or school-specific breadth requirements as two components of an overarching and clearly delineated GE plan. Such a distinction would allow GE to be defined both in terms of courses and/or units as needed. It would offer the further advantage of facilitating college- or school-specific breadth requirements that would allow transfer students to participate in the specific kinds of
inquiry and discussion deemed critical for all UCR students, e.g., through the mandating of an upper-division capstone requirement.

➢ coordination with new Writing Center to develop possible initiatives in writing across the curriculum to address specific needs of UCR student population, e.g., ESL-related difficulties or training in scientific or technical writing.

➢ reconsideration of present quantitative skills requirement to define level, purpose, and orientation of courses appropriate for non-science and non-engineering majors.

➢ reconsideration of the purpose of foreign language education within the context of each college and degree track in light of a campus demographic wherein many UCR students are already fully or at least partially bilingual. In CHASS, where sentiment in favor of significant language training appears to be strong, at least two years might be required of all students who are not already proficient in a second language to an intermediate level (ability to read newspaper in target language and conduct daily business). CNAS and COE might elect to require a single year for exposure or might choose to exempt their students from such a requirement (although they might encourage it or allow the use of such courses as part of a diversity requirement). Careful thought should be given to any proposal that requires either 4 or 5 quarters of instruction rather than 3 or 6 quarters, as the resultant enrollment drops mid-year can have a serious impact on staffing and thus on regular offerings of the next course in the progression, i.e., quarter 5 or 6. The lack of consistent and guaranteed funding for staffing in these areas has had ramifications for students’ progress to degree and cannot be ignored henceforth.

➢ reconsideration of the current campus ethnicity requirement. Instituted at a time when both the student population and faculty populations were considerably less diverse than at present, the requirement not only confirmed the work of the relatively young and underappreciated discipline of Ethnic Studies, but also ensured that UCR students graduated with a measure of understanding of cultural difference in the American context. Today, not only are UCR students far more diverse as a group than they were two decades ago (and are coming from secondary school environments that are also far more diverse than ever before), but faculty composition and the range of faculty research and teaching competencies have broadened as well. The ad hoc committee notes that more than half of the respondents to the informal faculty survey indicated a desire to see the current requirement altered; the present committee urges the new committee to formalize campus discussion about possible alternatives to the current requirement:

✧ retain the present requirement but augment it to identify appropriate courses taught elsewhere on campus that focus on issues of ethnicity, whether in the US or internationally; course content rather than faculty departmental affiliation or ETST course identifier would determine suitability;

✧ retain ethnicity as one issue under a larger “diversity” rubric that would include issues of sex, gender, racialized bodies, etc.;
✧ retain the ethnicity requirement and add an additional requirement that engages students in issues of international and global identity;
✧ abandon the ethnicity requirement in favor of a requirement related to international/global identity; or
✧ abandon any requirement for engagement with what are seen as politicized issues of ethnic, sexual, national, religious, or other identity.

The present ad hoc committee does not have a specific recommendation but notes the informal faculty survey preference for revamping the requirement rather than abandoning it entirely.

✧ consideration of cost, burdens, and necessary incentives relative to continued development of college cluster and sequential courses such as CHASS-Connect and to the development of cross-campus cluster courses on the model of those at UCLA and UCM.

✧ ensuring broad faculty involvement in the process and investment in the outcome of the process. To this end, the committee might request the following from each department, program, college, and school:
✧ a succinct statement of its proposed contribution to a new GE plan, laying out its understanding of what core and breadth courses should accomplish, e.g., exposure to a field of inquiry, exposure to methodological tools, discussion of theory, and/or demonstration of applied theory, etc. and how its own mission fits that understanding
✧ a list of which courses, if any, among its present offerings it believes would provide suitable “breadth” exposure for students from the other college(s) or school; if no suitable courses exist, then a suggestion of the kind of course(s) the unit could/would develop to meet this need would be welcome[see Price report re: CNAS]
✧ a “wish list” of what it would like to see other units offer, e.g., scientific or technical writing; Spanish for students on track to careers in the medical professions; or a course or sequence on design in daily life, health and nutrition, evaluating scientific evidence, the economics of global religion, the interplay of art and engineering, ethics in [insert field here], ....

✧ identification of an administrative position with sufficient staff support to coordinate discussion and implementation of GE reforms in conjunction with appropriate Senate committees; to establish mechanisms for continuing oversight, e.g., vetting new courses’ suitability for GE and coordinating thematic connections; to coordinate mandatory periodic review of the GE curriculum.
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Results of informal faculty survey on General Education
November 3, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
      COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: PROPOSED NAME CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed the proposal for the proposed name change for the Department of Plant Pathology. The committee noted that the name change requires no resources and in the absence of any adverse budget consequences, and because it appears to meet the needs of the faculty members of the department, we unanimously approve the name change to the proposed new name of Plant Pathology and Microbiology.
November 29, 2006

TO:    THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR  
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM:    EUGENE NOTHNAGEL, CHAIR  
       COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE:    CEP RECOMMENDATION ON THE PROPOSED NAME CHANGE FOR  
       THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY

The Committee on Educational Policy met on November 29 and discussed the proposal  
for a name change for the Department of Plant Pathology. We unanimously (10 yes and 2  
unavailable) endorse the change to the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology  
and wish the department success in recruitment efforts.
November 22, 2006

Thomas Cogswell, Chair
Riverside Division
Academic Senate

At its meeting of Wednesday, November 15, 2006, the Graduate Council considered the proposed name change for the Department of Plant Pathology to the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology. The Council has no objection to this change.

R. Robert Russell, Chair
Graduate Council

RRR/vb
To: Thomas Cogswell  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Allen Zych  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Proposed Name Change for the Department of Plant Pathology

CAP supports this name change to the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology.
October 26, 2006

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR, PLANNING AND BUDGET
EUGENE NOTHNAEL, CHAIR, EDUCATIONAL POLICY
R. ROBERT RUSSELL, CHAIR, GRADUATE COUNCIL
ALLEN ZYCH, CHAIR, ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

FM: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSED NAME CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY

Attached, please find a memo from the EVCP the proposed name change for the Department of Plant Pathology.

Please let me have your comments back by November 30, 2006.

Attach: Campus procedures for Name Change for an Academic Department
CAMPUS PROCEDURE FOR NAME CHANGE FOR AN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT

The October 30, 1972 statement from Vice President C. O. McCorkle, Jr. notes that Chancellors are authorized to establish procedures for the initiation of name changes of academic departments. The procedures followed on the Riverside campus are:

1. The department writes a proposal addressed to the dean of the college/school.

2. The dean sends the proposal to the college/school executive committee for review and recommendation.

3. The dean himself/herself makes a recommendation addresses to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

4. The three above items shall be forwarded to the Executive Vice Chancellor.

5. The Executive Vice Chancellor will refer the request to the Academic Senate Division Chair who will refer the request to the committees he/she believes appropriate (generally Academic Personnel, Educational Policy, Planning and Budget, and Graduate Council). The Senate Advisory Committee will review the recommendations and forward the item to the Division for action.

6. When the Executive Vice Chancellor receives a positive Academic Senate response from the Division, he/she will forward the recommendation for the name change to the Office of the President.

Academic Personnel Office September 19, 1984
Memorandum

25 October 2006

TO:    Thomas Cogswell
       Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FR:    Ellen Wartella
       Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

RE:    Proposed Name Change for the Department of Plant Pathology

I am writing to request that, per the enclosed campus procedures for a department name change, the appropriate Senate committees review this proposal to change the name of the Department of Plant Pathology and forward the item to the Division for action.

As you can see from the enclosed memoranda, the Dean of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and the Executive Committee support the change to append microbiology to the department name. I believe this change will better reflect CNAS’ strengths and benefit faculty and student recruitment for the department.

Once there is a positive vote in the Division and the minutes are published, I will forward the name change and supporting documentation to the Office of the President per section III.A of the University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (also known as the Compendium).

cnc:    Memorandum of support from Dean Angle
        Memorandum of support from CNAS Executive Committee Chair Redak
        Name change request from Chair Allen
        Campus procedures for department name changes
October 18, 2006

To:    Ellen Wartella  
        Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

From:  Steve Angle  
        Dean, CNAS

Re:    Proposed Name Change for the Department of Plant Pathology

I received the enclosed proposed name change request from the Department of Plant Pathology. Campus procedures call for the dean to pass the recommendation to the College Executive Committee for a recommendation and then to forward this along with a separate recommendation to you.

The proposed name change to the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology will benefit the faculty and student recruiting efforts and will better reflect CNAS' current strengths in these areas.

I have reviewed all supporting documentation and the votes of both the faculty in the Plant Pathology Department and the CNAS Executive Committee. Accordingly, I recommend in favor of the proposed name change.

ATT.
Memo

To: Steve Angle, Dean, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

From: Rick Redak, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

CC: Susan Stracener, Dean’s Office, CNAS; Mike Allen, Chair, Dept. of Plant Pathology; Linda Walling, Associate Dean, CNAS, Len Nunney, CNAS Exec. Committee Chair Elect

Date: 8/28/2006

Re: CNAS Executive Committee Recommendation on Proposed Name Change for the Department of Plant Pathology.

At the 9 August 2006 meeting of the CNAS Executive Committee, the proposal for a name change for the Department of Plant Pathology was discussed and reviewed. After considerable discussion, the Executive Committee unanimously approved (13 yes, 1 abstaining) the request to rename the Department of Plant Pathology to the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology. The Executive Committee feels that the proposed name change will only benefit College efforts and highlight the present and future College strengths within the fields of both Plant Pathology and Microbiology. The Executive Committee is of the unanimous opinion that the proposed name change will benefit our faculty and student recruiting efforts and will better reflect our current strengths in these areas. We urge you to move forward on the recommendation as expeditiously as possible.
July 19, 2006

To: Rick Redak, Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

From: Steve Angle, Dean, CNAS  

Re: Request for Name Change in Dept. of Plant Pathology

Attached please find a request from the Dept. of Plant Pathology to change their name to the Dept. of Plant Pathology and Microbiology.

Also enclosed is the campus procedure for name change for an academic department. I request that the Executive Committee review the proposed name change and make a recommendation, as the procedure requires.

If you need additional information, or would like to discuss this issue, please feel free to contact me. Thanks to you and the Committee in advance for taking the time to review this request. I look forward to receiving the recommendation.

ATT.

cc: Don Cooksey, Assoc. Dean, CNAS
DATE: January 30, 2006

TO: Steven R. Angle, Dean
    College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

FROM: Michael Allen, Chair
      Department of Plant Pathology

RE: Name Change for Department

In 1997, we submitted a proposal for a name change from the Department of Plant Pathology to the Department of Plant Pathology and Microbiology. The primary intent of this name change was to provide broader visibility for our expanded mission in teaching and research, and to provide a stronger departmental advocacy for the development of the microbiological sciences than presently exists at UCR. The proposal faced unexpected opposition from one department, which anticipated an external impression that all microbiology at UCR would be plant-associated microbiology. This was not our intent, and indeed, our faculty now includes microbiologists who are not plant microbiologists. We understand that this opposition has now been reversed, and we are thus resubmitting our proposed name change. Our faculty composition has changed considerably since 1997, but we have continued to discuss and support this name change in numerous faculty meetings. During the week of May 21-25, 2001, we voted for the attached proposal by secret ballot. For Academic Senate members, the vote was 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained, and 1 unavailable. For Cooperative Extension Specialists, the vote was 1 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstained, and 1 unavailable.

In October 2005, we discussed and unanimously agreed to try yet again to change the name. During the week of 23 January 2006, we voted again using a secret ballot. The vote was unanimous in support of the name change, with 4 individuals not voting. Executive Dean Cooksey did not vote as he will be involved in future decisions and three faculty members were traveling.

The justification for this name change is greater today than it was in 2001 or in 1997. Since that time, we have added significantly to our department faculty in the microbiological sciences, and we have assumed a major role in teaching microbiology classes at UCR. Microbiology research is an area of traditional strength at UCR and one where we have an opportunity to achieve great distinction. UCR has microbiologists in eight departments in three different colleges or divisions, with the largest number housed in Plant Pathology. However, no departmental name reflects a commitment to this discipline. The Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Microbiology has been placed on hold, and we strongly believe that creating a graduate program in Plant Pathology and Microbiology will strengthen both programs. We believe that it will develop as two tracks within a single program, with opportunities for cooperating faculty, in the manner undertaken by a number of faculty in Life Sciences in different graduate programs- both as collaborating and cooperating faculty, and in interdepartmental programs. We are committed to creating a program that is inclusive of our colleagues in Microbiology from all appropriate Departments. By this means, we wish to advance the field of microbiology at UCR, and we believe that our departmental name change will facilitate this effort.

The following new name is submitted for approval:

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT PATHOLOGY AND MICROBIOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE
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Justification for Change of Name from Department of Plant Pathology

Microbiology at UCR. Our campus has significant strengths in applied microbiological sciences, including i) plant, insect, and clinical pathology, ii) microbial ecology, and iii) microbiological aspects of the environmental sciences and engineering, such as bioremediation, water quality, and toxicology. We anticipate continued growth in these areas and in the fundamental microbiological sciences to support these applications. In addition, we anticipate increased demand for undergraduate and graduate education in microbiology.

There are 28 microbiologists at UCR affiliated with the Interdepartmental Graduate Program in Microbiology. These include faculty from the following eight departments, divisions, or colleges: Biology (2), Biomedical Sciences (1), Cell Biology and Neuroscience (1), Engineering (3), Entomology (2), Environmental Sciences (5), Nematology (1), and Plant Pathology (13). We are currently undertaking searches for a Prokaryote biologist, and for a cooperative extension position, both of whom will be microbiologists as well as plant pathologists. Therefore, adding “Microbiology” to our department name would formalize our commitment to the growth of this discipline and enhance its visibility at UCR.

Microbiology and our departmental mission. Our primary mission as a Department of Plant Pathology continues to be research, teaching, and extension in the biology of plant pathogens and their control. The department is one of the largest in the country and maintains a strong balance between research in basic pathogen biology and research and extension activities directed toward disease management. However, UCR lacks a strong infrastructure in more fundamental microbiology that would support our applied efforts and those of other microbiologists on campus. With no other department visibly promoting growth in fundamental microbiology, we have expanded our mission to include microbiology research and teaching in support of plant pathology and other microbiological programs at UCR. With this expanded mission, we have increased our teaching role in microbiology and have proposed new faculty positions in areas such as the molecular biology of host-microbe interaction, evolutionary microbiology, metabolic microbiology and invasive and emergent pathogens.

Microbiology teaching. Faculty in the Department of Plant Pathology currently teach eleven undergraduate microbiology courses, including nine listed as core requirements or electives for the Microbiology Track of the Biological Sciences undergraduate major (PLPA 120, 121, 134, 134L, MCBL 121, 121L, 122, 123, 124, 133, and 134). In addition, the faculty offer graduate courses in Microbiology, Mycology, and Virology, disciplines integral to Microbiology as a discipline as well as plant and animal pathology.

The Microbiology track within the Plant Pathology and Microbiology Graduate Program will serve as a mechanism to link faculty and students in the various academic units that contain microbiologists. Microbiologists with positions in other Departments will be encouraged to participate fully as cooperating faculty in the graduate program, just as in many other departmental programs. Such positions may find homes in our department, in other academic units, or jointly with other units. The presence of a department with “Microbiology” in its name may help to attract both faculty and students interested in this field.

Why "Plant Pathology and Microbiology"? Plant Pathology remains our primary mission, consistent with the resources allocated to the department to fulfill the mission of the Agricultural Experiment Station. Therefore, it is essential to retain Plant Pathology in our departmental name, as well as placing it first. The general “Microbiology” was chosen, rather than more specific areas of microbiology, since we do not wish to limit ourselves to hiring plant microbiologist or other applied microbiologists. Our goal is to facilitate the broader research and teaching efforts in microbiology on campus. We recently hired a fungal population biologist and a vector/molecular interaction virologist. We are currently recruiting for a basic prokaryote biologist, and are simultaneously recruiting for a sub-tropical CE specialist, who would likely have particular strengths in mycology, prokaryotic biology, or virology. We feel that it is more realistic to add the name “Microbiology” to a department with existing strengths and a commitment to this discipline, rather than create a new department of Microbiology.
Riverside: Office of the Academic Senate
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

December 6, 2006

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
    Riverside Division Academic Senate

FROM: Allen Zych, Chair
      Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: The [Temporary] Eleventh Person

The Committee on Academic Personnel strongly endorses the temporary addition of a faculty member from the College Of Engineering (COE) for the 2006-2007 academic year. Since its inception COE has steadily grown in size to now more than 75 faculty members. CAP membership needs to include a permanent member from COE. This will ensure proper college representation.
18 November 2006

FM: T. E. COGSWELL
CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

TO: ADVISORY COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

RE: THE [TEMPORARY] ELEVENTH PERSON

Just as the Aggies of Texas A & M have the twelfth man, so too this year I propose that we add a temporary eleventh person to CAP. Allow me to explain.

By an unwritten informal arrangement, AGSM, GSOE and COE have in the recent past alternately held one seat on CAP, and this understanding has worked quite well when the relevant numbers were smallish. But the recent dramatic expansion of COE has undercut this logic; while AGSM and GSOE each number about 20 faculty, COE now has almost 80 faculty.

To be sure, when an engineer is not on CAP, some of the physical scientists on the committee have done, and continue to do, a fine job assessing the files from COE. Nevertheless the stark fact remains that while COE generates roughly 15% of the files before CAP, it only has irregular representation on the committee. By any rational yardstick, this is – to say the least -- a little unsettling, and colleagues from COE are understandably distressed.

After mature reflection on the situation, I propose that we add, and only for this year, an eleventh person to CAP -- an engineer. Current Senate Bylaws set CAP membership at 10 members, but to ease us through the current awkward situation, I think we can make a one-time exception raising the number to eleven.

If approved, this would only be a temporary expedient. In subsequent years, we can return to the “ten person” rule. Meanwhile the informal understanding on the composition of CAP would be amended with COE having one representative while AGSM and GSOE alternatively share another.

Rest assured I am exceedingly loathe to propose such an exception – and I only do so, convinced that a college representing some 15% of the entire faculty deserves its own representative among the ten members of CAP.
November 17, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: PROPOSAL TO “MOVE” CAP FROM THE ADMINISTRATION TO THE ACADEMIC SENATE

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed the proposal to ‘move’ CAP from the Administration to the Academic Senate. The committee members felt that there are three fundamental reasons that justify the move.

1. The strength and quality UC’s Academic Senate contributions to our institution is derived, in large part, from our vigorous participatory shared governance with the administration. It is, thus, appropriate that UCR’s operation and staffing of CAP should be the responsibility of the Academic Senate, rather than the central administration.

2. Our UCR CAP committee is housed in Administrative space and serviced by Administration staff; this gives the incorrect perception that UCR’s academic personnel process is run solely by Administration, and

3. All other UC’s have their Senate offices responsible for managing their CAP as well as their Ad Hoc committees.

The Committee felt that in order to effectively carry out the functions of CAP, there would need to be an increase of Senate staff to handle the substantial CAP related workload. P&B recommends an increase of 2.0 FTE will be necessary to professionally service the myriad of activities managing and preparing the faculty files for CAP as well operating the Ad hoc committees. The Committee also proposed that the move of CAP from Administration to the Senate be carried out in the summer of 2007 to allow for a smooth transition. Also there should be one-time start-up funds of $5500 and a permanent allocation of S&E funds of $8000. Finally, three offices will be required for storage of files, Ad hoc meetings, and staff office space. Finally, and importantly, a sufficiently user-friendly meeting room must be available for the 100’s of hours of CAP meetings that are required.

The P&B Committee members unanimously voted to support the move of CAP from Administration offices to the UCR Senate offices.
TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

FROM: Allen Zych, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

RE: Proposal to Move CAP to the Senate

CAP has devoted considerable discussion to this proposal. It seems that there are two primary arguments for this move:

1. The Academic Personnel Committee activities reside in the Academic Senate Offices on all the other UC campuses.
2. The “UCR academic personnel review process is perceived by many faculty as being organized and administered principally by the administration”.

Some of the present CAP members have mixed views concerning the proposed move and questions whether these are sufficient reasons for “fixing something that isn’t broken”. While it is certainly true that staff in the Academic Personnel Office supports CAP, this has little to do with the deliberations that CAP undertakes. Staff loyalty doesn’t seem to be an issue either. One major concern is that from our view it is difficult to estimate the real staffing needs to support CAP activities. There is also a high risk that any changes will inevitably slow down the review process. The view has also been offered that the move to the Senate won’t really change the perception of some faculty and that there may be better ways to alter any misperception.

Should the Advisory Committee and Academic Senate implement such a plan, we make the following recommendations:

1. The “move” should take place in Summer 2007.
2. At least two staff FTE will be needed.
3. The administration of the “Ad Hoc” process should be included in the move.
October 24, 2006

TO: Allen D. Zych, Chair
    Academic Personnel

    Anthony Norman, Chair
    Planning and Budget

FR: T. Cogswell, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: PROPOSAL TO MOVE CAP TO THE SENATE

The Advisory Committee at its meeting on October 23, 2006 discussed the proposal to move CAP back into the Senate and after discussing the pros and cons, it decided that the proposal should be reviewed by CAP and Planning and Budget for input on what is realistic in terms of budgetary needs and on the best time for the move.

Please forward your committee’s recommendations by December 1, 2006.

Attached
October 19, 2006

TO: ADVISORY COUNCIL

FM: TOM COGSWELL

RE: PROPOSAL TO MOVE CAP

Elizabeth Lord, the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, has proposed that CAP, which is currently managed by the administration, be transferred to the Senate’s control. Since various Senate committees have argued for this move over the years, I propose that we accept the offer with thanks.

While this move has many advantages, most notably bringing us into line with all of the others campuses, it also brings corresponding challenges. After all, if the files do not move forward smoothly, we will now be partly responsible for delays in merit and promotion cases. Therefore, it behooves us to think through all implications of this new responsibility.

Under the new arrangements, CAP will now be in charge of:

1. Scheduling all ad hoc committees and preparing the reports
2. Tracking and receiving all files from the Dean’s offices
3. Preparing files for review by Cap
4. Handling all CAP-related correspondence
5. Forwarding of files to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel for administrative review

In order to do so effectively, the Senate will require:

- One fulltime staff member, ideally a Principal Analyst (*Cindy Palmer is being reclassified to a Principal Analyst*) + related benefits at 25%
- One half-time Administrative Assistant III
- Three additional offices, one for this staff member and another for record storage.
- [Both of these must be secured with a touchpad alarm system.] Furthermore while CAP itself can use one of our two conference rooms, we do not currently have room to accommodate the Ad Hoc committees. Hence the third office will be converted into smaller meeting room for this purpose.
- One time start up funds of $5,250 and permanent S & E funds - $7,500
Finally if the administration agrees to this requirement, we then must confront the related problem of timing. Should the transfer take place in the next few weeks in time to receive the flood of files at the end of the year or in the summer of 2007?

In short, we have much to discuss - principle and details as well as timing.
18 November 2006

FM: T. E. COGSWELL  
CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

TO: ADVISORY COMMITTEE

RE: ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AWARDS AND THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH

John Milton famously fretted over "that one Talent which is death to hide,/Lodg'd with me useless." Four centuries later, the Riverside faculty might well echo that concern, for while their ranks contain spectacular scholars whose work is transforming their respective fields, the Academic Senate only makes a single award each a year to honor scholar achievement.

We did not have to worry excessively over the possibility of not recognizing "that one Talent" when the faculty size was that of liberal arts college. Sadly we can no longer be as sanguine about the effectiveness of this sole annual award when our ranks are over 600 strong and rapidly growing. Plainly with a faculty this large, we are failing to recognize and to honor scholarly distinction among ourselves.

Therefore, lest we all become co-conspirators in hiding our collective talents, I propose a dramatic expansion in the number of awards given by the Committee on Faculty Research.

1. Instead of one Faculty Research Lecturer each year, there should be two, one from CHASS, GSOE and AGSM, and another from CNAS and COE. Each of these will receive a cash prize of $7500.

2. In addition, there should be two Mid-Career Research Prizes awarded each year, one from each side of the campus. These are designed to honor research excellence and innovation among Associate Professors and newly promoted Professors. The prize comes with a course release and the ability to arrange a term with no teaching responsibilities, provided the winner agrees to remain on campus and to perform all committee work and advising.

3. Finally, there would also be two Early Career Research Prizes awarded each year, again one from each side of the campus. Likewise these are designed to honor research excellence and innovation among Assistant Professors and newly promoted Associate Professors. The Prize comes with a course release and the ability to arrange a term with no teaching responsibilities, provided the winner agrees to remain on campus and to perform all committee work and advising.

Given the number and nature of new awards, the composition of the Committee on Faculty Research should be expanded as well. Consequently, I propose that the committee membership be expanded to ten. The Committee on Committees will select five from the ranks of the
preceding Faculty Research Lecturers; and they will select the other five from among full Professors with an eye towards reflecting the diversity of the faculty.

With six research awards a year, we will go a longer way to ensuring that we duly recognize and applaud our colleagues’ talents.
UC’s 2007 “Promise and Power of Ten” Campuses Tour - A Proposal (Nov. 2006)

Background

In 2004, President Dynes established the Long-Range Guidance Team (LRGT), comprised of UC Regents, chancellors, faculty and staff, to explore a fundamental question: What will the University of California need to look like to serve the needs of the people of California 20 years from now?

To help think through that question, the group met with experts in demographics and economics; with leaders from business and education; and with public officials. It explored different scenarios for California’s long-term future, and in their light considered how the University of California of 2025 would have to adjust.

The Long-Range Guidance Team was not asked to produce a detailed academic or business plan for the University. Rather, it was charged with giving the President input on the overarching vision and strategies needed for UC to sustain its place as a world-class research institution and to make its maximum contribution to California in the year 2025.

The vision that emerges is a system that works as one university, propelled by the promise and power of its ten campuses. It is based on a future of the university that is cross-disciplinary, nimble, innovative and responsive to the needs of society. It envisions addressing problems from the vantage point of need, rather than from the available disciplines. And it is grounded in a renewed social contract with the people of California that is both a reaffirmation and redefinition of its founding land-grant mission.

This vision begins to illuminate new strategies that can help guide the University in the current millennium. Many of them are based on innovative models already emerging through multi-disciplinary, cross-campus efforts being launched by UC’s talented faculty and researchers, students, staff and campus leadership.

The resulting document is a framework for further discussion, not a strategic plan. It explores the challenges facing California, the enduring land-grant legacy of the University of California and how it informs the mission of UC today, the external and internal forces that place UC at its current crossroads, and how it can remain a powerful force for people, place and prosperity in the 21st Century.

The next step is to share this framework for further discussion both inside and outside the University, on the campuses and in California’s communities, to further understand California’s challenges, to identify appropriate new initiatives that bring together UC’s unique “power of ten,” and to create a new shared vision for the role of the University in the California of 2025. The first step will be to present the framework to The Regents at the November meeting.

Objective and Proposed Framework

The proposed 2007 “Promise and Power of Ten” tour is intended to facilitate this further discussion through visits to each of UC’s ten campuses over the next year. We do not wish to impose a one-size-fits-all approach on these visits. We believe the campuses themselves should develop tactics most appropriate to them in meeting their strategic objectives.

However, we would hope these visits could include at least three components:

- **Internal dialogues** intended both to gather additional input from UC faculty, staff, students and administrators on how UC can better meet the needs of California and society and to identify new initiatives
and opportunities worthy of further discussion and investment.

- **Public events**, designed both to allow public input on the “promise and power of ten” framework and how UC can better meet California’s needs, as well as to highlight UC initiatives to the news media, legislators and other target audiences, and to provide forums for public discussion.

We hope the highlighted initiatives could reflect the vision outlined in the framework:

1) It is meeting a relevant California need;
2) It demonstrates leveraging the “power of one” campus or department through cross-disciplinary and/or multi-campus involvement;
3) It showcases innovation in approach, such as speeding delivery to market;
4) It demonstrates partnerships with industry, government and/or the education community.

In addition, the initiatives should lend themselves both to an engaging and highly visual public demonstration, in the hope of attracting media coverage; and to third-party credentialing, either by business leader partners or patient/customer beneficiaries of the research.

- **Support-building opportunities** that can be created by inviting potential advocates among alumni, local business and community leaders, and others to campus for events organized around the “promise and power of ten” framework.

The tours can also serve an additional purpose of helping to educate University stakeholders — from Regents to staff — about how and why UC is able to continue to play such a critical role as part of its land-grant mission, and why aspects of its governance and organizational structure must be preserved, while also allowing for an open discussion about what should be changed.

**Next Steps**

If the Chancellors agree that the tours approach could prove an effective way of achieving the desired objectives, we ask that the campuses each develop a proposal, with desired approximate dates, for submission no later than December 1, 2006.

The Office of the President, in consultation with the campuses, will analyze the submissions, balance for subject matter, geography, and timing, and return with a proposed master schedule at the December COC.

**Final Note**

These events will not occur in a vacuum: they will be part of a disciplined month-to-month systemwide messaging strategy that will change only in issue focus, based on the exemplary initiative highlighted by each campus.

For instance, should one campus decide to highlight its work on global warming, every effort will be made to “frame” that issue for an entire month through coordinated messaging with the other campuses — all showing how they, too, are leveraging the “power of ten” to solve this particular problem. These messages will be targeted in particular to the legislature. Multimedia reports of these visits will become standing items at each Regents meeting.

Internally, the LRGT staff will be continually gathering input from each campus visit to further refine the LRGT framework, with the goal of presenting as an end product in early 2008 a refined shared vision for the University of California 2025.