February 12, 2007

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, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, (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, Graduate 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 – February 12, 2007

This is to confirm the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Monday, February 12, 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:**
   - Approval of the agenda (page 1 – 2)
   - Approval of January 22, 2007 notes (see Attached) (page 3 – 5)
   - **Information Items Only:**
     - Conflict of Interest Statement: Rules and Jurisdiction (Attached) (page 6)

2. **PROPOSED CHANGE IN SENATE BYLAW APPENDIX 5.3 – RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF POLICIES ON FACULTY CONDUCT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF DISCIPLINE AT UCR**
   - Dr. Kathleen Montgomery to lead discussions (see Attached) (page 7-19)

3. **POLICY ON THE POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES OF ATTENDANCE** – discussion and approval (page 20-21)

4. **REVISIONS TO UCR POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR NAMING CAMPUS PROPERTIES**
   - (Response to AC questions attached – need to go to Division for official approval) (page 22-24)

5. **CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
   - 5 min

6. **ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AWARDS AND THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE** (see Attached) (page 25-33)

7. **PROPOSED REGULATION 7: EXPECTED PROGRESS FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS SUCCESS TASK FORCE:** (Attached) (page 34-37)

8. **REQUEST FOR SENATE REVIEW AND COMMENTS ON THE REPORT OF THE STUDENT SUCCESS TASK FORCE:** (Attached) (page 38-46)
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES
JANUARY 22, 2007

PRESENT:

T. (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, (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)
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)
R. R. (Robert) Russell, Chair, Graduate Council (Department of Economics)
T. (Theda) Shapiro, Chair, Preparatory Education Committee, (Department of Comparative Literature & 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, Diversity and Equal Opportunity, (Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience)
R. T. A. (Rene) Lysloff, Chair CHASS Executive Committee, (Department of Music)
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)
I. A. (Ivan) Strenski, Chair, Physical Resources Planning, (Department of Religious Studies)

CONSENT CALENDAR:

Chair Cogswell indicated that the eFile presentation that had been scheduled had been cancelled and since we had time, he wanted to change the agenda to include a discussion about the Vice Chair of the Senate.
The Advisory Council adopted the consent calendar as revised by Chair Cogswell, and adopted the amendments to the January 8th AC notes.

**CHAIR’S ANNOUNCEMENTS:**
Chair Cogswell reported that over the weekend he attended the UCR women’s basketball game that had been set up as a CHASS Faculty/staff evening. The event was sponsored and paid for by the Athletics department, and it was one of the most well attended women’s basketball games. He indicated that he was interested in putting together a similar event but for Senate faculty and staff to attend the last homecoming game scheduled for Saturday March 3, and he wanted to know if the AC members thought it was a reasonable idea. The members agreed that it was a worthwhile event and it was agreed that the Chair would contact Stan Morrison to set this up and send out emails to everyone.

He indicated that negotiations over Committee on Research funding were almost complete and that the EVCP had agreed to provide an additional $270,000 for COR. In addition, she had also agreed to augment the Regents Scholarship awards.

Regarding the Health Affairs Committee, Chair Cogswell indicated that there were concerns raised about the terms of the members and he deferred to Ward Beyermann, chair of Committee on Committees to lead the discussion about these concerns. After a lengthy discussion, the AC members decided that it was better to have the Health Affairs members appointed to a one year term rather than what was originally proposed. They then discussed other issues related to membership and the number of people in the committee. It was noted that it was important that there should be representatives from every school/college of the campus. The AC members unanimously approved a motion to amend the wording to read “the committee will consist of up to 10 members”. The new document would therefore read as follows:

**Charge for the Health Affairs Special Committee**

Since the founding of the university, no single development will impact the campus more than the new medical school. Consequently it is imperative that the Academic Senate be closely involved with the planning and the implementation of this new school.

Towards this end, I am requesting the Committee on Committees to appoint a Special Health Affairs Committee with the following charge:

- to develop the curriculum for the medical school; and
- to work with the administration to resolve other matters relating to the new school; and
- to help the founding Dean with initial hires.

The committee will consist of up to 10 members. Each year, the new Health Affairs Special Committee will submit a formal report to the Division on its activities and a recommendation about its future. In response, the Advisory Committee will decide whether to terminate the Special Committee or to extend its existence.
PETITION CALLING FOR AN INTERDISCIPLINARY RIVERSIDE REVIEW OF THE UC-NUCLEAR WEAPONS LABS INVOLVEMENT

The AC members discussed the letter that was attached to the signatures received from the UCR students and which was part of the “UC Nuclear Free” campaign seeking to end UC management of the nation’s two nuclear weapon laboratories. The Secretary Parliamentarian indicated that the first thing to do was to determine whether this was indeed a Memorial and if so, what kind. He reminded the members that there are two types of memorials – a "Memorial to the Regents" which is a declaration or petition addressed to the President for transmission to the Regents, or a "Memorial to the President" which is a declaration or petition addressed to the President and not intended for transmission to the Regents. He indicated that this particular one looked like a Memorial to the Regents which would require coordination of faculty from the senates of multiple divisions. It was decided that Chair Cogswell contact UC Santa Barbara and find out how they responded to the issue.

DEFINITION OF JOINT APPOINTMENTS FOR USE IN ACADEMIC PERSONNEL REVIEWS:

The AC members discussed the issue of the definition of joint appointments for use in Academic Personnel reviews and voted to approve the recommendations of the Rules and Jurisdiction. The vote carried with 2 abstaining.

POSITION OF VICE CHAIR OF THE SENATE

The Chair indicated that an issue had arisen regarding the Vice Chair and whether there was a conflict of interest in having him serve as both a Vice Chair and an administrator.

There was discussion on the fact that the Bylaws as they stand now do not prohibit the Vice Chair from keeping his elected position. It was also noted that there could be instances when there was a conflict of interest. A committee member wondered whether the situation could not be corrected using the AC conflict of interest statement.

A lengthy discussion followed, and in the end, the AC asked the Chair to convey their substantial disquiet and unease over the situation.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Academic Senate
January 31, 2007

TO: T. COGSWELL, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: K. TOMOFF, CHAIR
   COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE: 2006-07 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Research re-adopted the following Conflict of Interest statement:

If a member of the Committee on research submits an application for funds from this committee, he/she will not participate in the evaluation discussion or decision concerning that particular application. Further, each application for Intramural Research funding will be reviewed and evaluated individually by two members of this committee, before final discussion by the entire committee, in order to ensure a fair and impartial review of each application. Finally, if any member of this committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict of interest to the attention of the chair. The chair will convene the committee, and those present will decide by majority vote if a conflict exists. If their decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicted matter and will not vote on that matter.
PROPOSED:

5.3.1 Applicability and Principles

At UCR the following implements the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline (set forth in its entirety in APM-016) and the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015) and applies to all members of the Academic Senate and to academic staff whose instructional duties are not subject to direct supervision. These procedures adhere to the five principles for Enforcement and Sanctions (Part III, Section A) articulated in the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015).

No disciplinary sanctions for professional misconduct shall be imposed by the administration except in accordance with the procedures set forth below. In circumstances where these procedures are silent, the policies and procedures contained in APM-015, APM-016, and UC Academic Senate Bylaw 336 shall govern.

The procedures set forth below describe several stages in the process: (a) an allegation of faculty misconduct, (b) efforts for informal resolution, (c) filing of a formal complaint, (d) inquiry by the Committee on Charges of the Academic Senate, (e) determination by the Chancellor\(^1\) to initiate disciplinary action by filing charges with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure of the Academic Senate, (f) disciplinary hearing by a Hearing Committee of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and (g) imposition of disciplinary sanctions by

\(^1\) For the purposes of this document, the “Chancellor” shall be taken to mean “the Chancellor or the appropriate Chancellor’s designee,” such as the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. This shall apply in all cases with the exception of imposing discipline, which shall not be delegated by the Chancellor.
the Chancellor.

If the matter involves an alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Integrity in Research, the allegation should be filed according to the UCR Policy and Procedures for Responding to the Allegations of Research Misconduct.

If the matter involves an alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Sexual Harassment, the allegation may be filed according to the UCR Policy and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment, instead of or in addition to filing an allegation under these Rules of Procedure.

This document indicates the timelines for the conduct of separate steps of the process, and it is important that such matters proceed expeditiously. However, it is recognized that these timelines may not always be adequate. Where individuals or committees require additional time to complete a step(s) in this process, all members involved shall be informed of the reasons for the delay and provided with a revised timeline for this step of the process, with a commitment that the step will be completed as promptly thereafter as possible.

All proceedings covered under this document are to be treated as confidential. No participant in such proceedings shall reveal or disclose the identity of the complainant, the accused Faculty member, witnesses, the nature of the allegation, the evidence, or the deliberations of any decision maker, other than to individuals who have a legitimate need for such information in order to conduct the proceeding or as may be required by law.
5.3.2 Channels

Allegations against a member of the Faculty originating from any source normally shall be addressed to the Chair of that Faculty member’s department, and shall be accepted for inquiry only on the basis of a written, documented, signed statement by the complainant. The channel for processing a matter involving such allegations is from the Department Chair to the Dean of the School or College to the Chancellor to the Charges Committee of the Academic Senate.

If for any reason this normal channel appears inappropriate to the individual making the allegations, (for example, if the complaint is directed against a Chair, Dean, etc.), he/she may address the allegations directly to the next higher level in the process as stated above, deposing a written, signed statement of the allegations.

5.3.2 Allegation Procedures and Channels

Allegations against a member of the Faculty in violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct may originate from members of the faculty, staff, students, the administration, and other members of the University community. Allegations shall be accepted for inquiry only on the basis of a written signed statement by the complainant. Allegations by a complainant shall be addressed to the Chair of the accused Faculty member’s department or to the Dean for units with no Chairs, unless this will present a potential conflict of interest, in which case the allegation will be directed to the administrator to whom this Chair or Dean reports.

The Faculty member accused of alleged misconduct shall be promptly informed of the allegation, in writing, by the recipient of the signed allegation. It shall also be the accused Faculty member’s right to examine all relevant documents assembled in connection with the allegation and to be heard at each step in the progress of the case.

The recipient of the allegation shall advise both the complainant and the accused Faculty member to obtain and become familiar with this document (Rules of Procedure for Implementation of Policies on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline at UCR), as well as the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM-015), the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline (APM-016), and the UC Academic Senate Bylaw 336 (Privilege and Tenure Divisional Committees – Disciplinary Cases).

If the complainant is a student, the complainant shall be given the option of retaining anonymity until the filing of a formal complaint with the Committee on Charges, with the understanding that such anonymity may preclude the opportunity for informal resolution prior to consideration by the Committee on Charges.

The channels for processing a matter involving allegations in violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct that do not pertain to allegations of research misconduct or sexual harassment shall be from the Department Chair (in those Schools and Colleges that have Chairs) to the Dean of the School or College to the Chancellor to the Committee on Charges of the Academic Senate.

If the normal level of the channel appears inappropriate to the individual making the allegations, the complainant may address the allegations, in writing, directly to the next level in the channel.
5.3.3 The Rights of the Accused

The person accused of misconduct shall be informed promptly, in writing, by the recipient of the signed accusation, so that a resolution of the problem may be attempted immediately. It shall also be the accused's right to examine all documents assembled in connection with the allegation and to be heard at each step in the progress of the case. This given right shall not be discretionary on the part of a Chair or any administrative officer, or on the part of the Charges Committee of the Academic Senate.

5.3.4 Role of the Department Chair, Dean of the School or College, and Chancellor

The Department Chair, Dean of the School or College and Chancellor each must, when the matter comes before him, promptly attempt to settle it informally or pass it on to the most appropriate higher level. In the event such efforts to achieve settlement prove unsatisfactory to either of the parties, each such official respectively shall promptly forward the matter to the next step in the process along with the signed accusation, any notes developed on the case, and a written statement explaining his/her reason for forwarding the file.

5.3.3 Informal Resolution

The goal of informal resolution is to resolve the concerns at the earliest stage possible. The recipient of the signed allegation shall attempt to resolve the matter informally within twenty-one days of receiving the allegation. Informal resolution of the matter may result in withdrawal of the complaint by the complainant prior to the matter reaching the Committee on Charges or may result in a formal settlement, including conditions or the acceptance of disciplinary sanction(s) by the accused Faculty member (SBL 336.C). In cases where a settlement resolving disciplinary charges is entered into after a matter has been referred to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Chancellor shall meet with the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement.

If efforts to resolve the matter informally within twenty-one days prove unsatisfactory to the complainant and/or the accused Faculty member, the recipient of the signed allegation shall forward the signed allegation to the next step in the process as soon as an impasse has been reached, along with his or her written statement describing the efforts to resolve the matter informally and the reasons for forwarding the matter. When the file is forwarded, a copy of the recipient’s written statement shall be provided to the complainant and the accused Faculty member.

5.3.4 The Formal Complaint

If the matter has not been settled to the satisfaction of the complainant at some step in the process described above, and if the Chancellor is unable to resolve the matter informally, the Chancellor shall furnish the complainant with the Academic Complaint Form. To complete the Academic Complaint Form, the complainant must identify the relevant section(s) of the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline and include a full statement of the facts that allegedly constitute a violation of the University Faculty Code of Conduct. The Form must be signed by the complainant and submitted to the Chancellor. Materials elaborating the evidence may be appended to the Academic Complaint Form.

The Chancellor shall promptly transmit the signed formal complaint to the Committee on Charges of the Academic Senate. At the same time, the Chancellor shall transmit the signed formal complaint to the accused Faculty member, along with a statement that the matter has been transmitted to the Committee on Charges.
5.3.5 The Complaint

A. If the matter has not been settled to the satisfaction of the complainant at some step in the process described above, the Chancellor shall furnish a standard complaint form to each complainant. He/she shall also provide the complainant with a copy of the current “Rules of Procedure” of the Charges Committee. It shall be the complainant’s responsibility to draft his/her complaint in the form furnished to him/her and to submit it to the Chancellor, or his/her designated representative, for his/her inspection to insure that it conforms to a reasonable standard of conciseness and order. If any changes in the complaint are required to meet this standard, they shall be made in consultation with, and with the approval of, the complainant.

B. The complaint, signed by the complainant, shall be transmitted to the Charges Committee of the Academic Senate by the Chancellor, or his/her designated representative, without supporting evidence or substantive comment. At the same time, he/she shall serve a copy of the complaint on the accused, together with a copy of the current “Rules of Procedure” of the Charges Committee, and a covering letter explaining the nature of the complaint and the proceedings.

5.3.5 Inquiry by the Committee on Charges of the Academic Senate

The Committee on Charges shall promptly determine whether the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of the University Faculty Code of Conduct. If the Committee on Charges determines this issue affirmatively, it shall ask the Chancellor for any supporting evidence from earlier stages in the procedure and shall conduct an inquiry to determine whether there is probable cause to warrant a disciplinary hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure of the Academic Senate. For this purpose, the probable cause standard means that the facts as alleged in the complaint, if true, justify the imposition of discipline for a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and that there is credible evidence to support the claim.

The Committee on Charges shall treat all steps in its inquiry as confidential. In conducting its inquiry, the Committee on Charges may, at its discretion, conduct interviews in private with the complainant and other individuals relevant to the case. The Committee on Charges shall make every effort to complete its inquiry and make a determination of probable cause and reports its findings to the Chancellor within sixty days after receiving the formal complaint.

If the Committee on Charges finds no probable cause to warrant a disciplinary proceeding, the Committee shall promptly (within fifteen days) transmit its decision, in writing, to the Chancellor, along with a report of the substantive review made by the Committee. The Committee also shall recommend that all existing references to the matter be expunged from personnel files, and from the records of the Department Chair and the Dean of the School or College.

If the Committee on Charges finds probable cause to warrant a disciplinary hearing, the Committee shall promptly transmit its decision, in writing, to the Chancellor, along with a report of the inquiry made by the Committee and the complete file assembled by the Committee on Charges during its inquiry.
5.3.6 The Charges Committee of the Academic Senate

Upon receiving the complaint, the Charges Committee of the Academic Senate shall determine whether the allegations in the complaint, if true, would constitute a violation of University policy regulating individual Faculty conduct. If it determines this issue affirmatively, it shall ask the Chancellor for any supporting evidence from earlier stages in the procedure and shall conduct a factual investigation to determine whether there is probable cause to warrant a disciplinary hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. As part of its investigation, the Charges Committee may, at its discretion, hear witnesses in camera. The Charges Committee shall treat its investigation as confidential; members of the Charges Committee shall therefore be subject to the provisions of the Faculty Code should they transgress.

5.3.6 Determination by the Chancellor to Initiate Disciplinary Action

The Chancellor shall make a final determination of probable cause within thirty days of receiving the recommendation from the Committee on Charges.

If the Chancellor concurs with the Committee on Charges on a no-probable-cause finding, this decision shall be immediately transmitted, in writing, to the Chair of the Committee on Charges. The Chancellor shall promptly (within fifteen days) notify both the complainant and the accused Faculty member, in writing, of the finding of no probable cause by the Committee on Charges, of the concurrence by the Chancellor, and of the substance of the inquiry made by the Committee on Charges. The only record of the case shall be a statement prepared by the Committee on Charges and placed in its permanent file in the Academic Senate. That statement shall include the following information: the date, name of the accused Faculty member, name of the complainant, a brief statement of the allegations, and the decision by the Chancellor to dismiss the case on recommendation of the Committee on Charges.

If the Chancellor determines that there is probable cause to warrant a disciplinary hearing, the Chancellor shall immediately notify the Chair of the Committee on Charges, in writing.

If the Chancellor does not concur with the recommendation of the Committee on Charges, the Chancellor shall inform the Chair of the Committee on Charges, in writing, of the reasons for the decision.

Upon a determination of probable cause, the Chancellor shall initiate notice of proposed disciplinary action, which requires that the Chancellor prepare written charges to be submitted to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure of the Academic Senate, with a full statement of the facts underlying the charges and the disciplinary sanction(s) the Chancellor proposes in this case. The types of discipline that may be imposed on a member of the faculty are as follows, in order of severity: written censure, reduction in salary, demotion, suspension, denial or curtailment of emeritus status, and dismissal from the employ of the University.

At the same time that the Chancellor submits the formal charges to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Chancellor shall also notify both the complainant and the accused Faculty member, in writing, of the decision to file a formal complaint with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
5.37 Proceedings after Charges Committee Investigation

In the event that the Charges Committee finds that there is no probable cause to warrant a disciplinary proceeding against either the accused, or the complainant (see #8), the Committee shall recommend to the Chancellor in writing that all existing references to the matter shall be expunged from personnel files, from the records of the Department Chair, from the Dean's office, and from that of the Chancellor. If the Chancellor concurs in the recommendation, the only record of the case shall be a statement prepared by the Charges Committee and placed in its permanent file in the Academic Senate. That statement shall include the following information: the date, name of the accused, name of the complainant, that the case was dismissed by the Chancellor on recommendation of the Charges Committee, the briefest possible statement of the allegations, and some brief evaluation of these allegations. The Chair of the Charges Committee shall notify both the Complainee and the Complainant only of the disposition and of the Chancellor's concurrence.

In the event that either the Charges Committee or the Chancellor (see Bylaw 335(F) of the Academic Senate) finds that there is probable cause to warrant a disciplinary proceeding, the Chancellor shall file the charges with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and notify in writing the Faculty member involved. Said Faculty member shall be entitled to a prompt hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and to all the procedural privileges and protections specified in the Standing Orders of The Regents and in the provisions of The Manual of the Academic Senate that implement those orders, namely as specified in Bylaw 335(F). In no case will any disciplinary sanction be imposed until the case has been reviewed by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall report its findings directly to the Chancellor and, in the event that it determines that the Faculty member has in fact violated University policy regulating individual Faculty conduct, shall recommend an appropriate sanction, in view of the gravity of the offense and of all of the facts and circumstances. Sanctions which may be imposed are described in the Regents' document, pp 2-3. They are: written censure, suspension, demotion, dismissal.

The Chancellor shall inform in writing the Vice Chancellor, the Dean, the Department Chair, and the Faculty member of his/her decision, of the sanction applied, and of the recommendation made to him/her by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. When the sanction to be imposed involves dismissal or demotion of a tenured Faculty member or lecturer with security of employment, the Chancellor's recommendation is subject to approval by the President.

5.3.7 Disciplinary Hearing by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall follow the procedures detailed in UC Academic Senate Bylaw 336 (Privilege and Tenure Divisional Committees – Disciplinary Hearings) with regard to prehearing procedures, early resolution, hearing and posthearing procedures, and relation to prior grievance cases.

At the conclusion of the disciplinary hearing, the Hearing Committee of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall promptly make its findings of fact, conclusions supported by a statement of reasons based on the evidence, and recommendation. These shall be forwarded promptly to the parties in the case, including the complainant and the accused Faculty member, the Chancellor, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The findings, conclusions, recommendations, and record of the proceedings shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law and UC policy. The Hearing Committee may, however, with the consent of the accused Faculty member, authorize release of the findings, conclusions, recommendations, and recommendations to other individuals or entities, to the extent allowed by law (SBL 336.D.10).

If the Committee on Privilege and Tenure determines that there is clear and convincing evidence that the accused Faculty member has violated the Faculty Code of Conduct, the Committee shall also recommend an appropriate sanction that shall not be more severe than the maximum sanction specified in the formal charge from the Chancellor.
5.3.8 The Responsibility of the Complainant

If, in the proceedings described above, it is determined by the Charges Committee that the charges made by the complainant are both groundless and malicious, that finding may serve as the basis for countercharges by the accused because harassment or ill-usage of another member of the University community is a violation of the Faculty Code. If the Committee on Privilege and Tenure then makes a finding on behalf of the accused, it shall report its findings to the Chancellor and recommend an appropriate sanction. Just as in Section 7 above.

5.3.8 Imposition of Disciplinary Sanction

The authority to impose disciplinary sanctions and the procedures for imposition of sanctions are detailed in the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, (APM-016, Section II – Types of Disciplinary Sanctions). The final decision to impose disciplinary sanction shall be made by the Chancellor and shall not be delegated.

If the Chancellor’s decision differs from the findings and recommendation of the Hearing Committee of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Chancellor shall meet with the Hearing Committee prior to reporting the decision to explain the reasons for his or her decision.

Within forty-five days after receiving the findings from the Hearing Committee of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Chancellor shall report his or her decision, in writing, to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, the Dean of the School or College, the Department Chair, the accused Faculty member, and the complainant.

5.3.9 Role of the Complainant

Complainants have a legitimate interest in being kept informed as the process proceeds and, within appropriate parameters, should be able to participate in various stages of the process. In the investigatory stage by the Committee on Charges, the complainant must be willing to meet with the Committee on Charges should that Committee consider such appearance necessary to the investigation. The complainant does not have a right to receive written statements submitted by the accused Faculty member or any other evidence uncovered in the course of the investigation by the Committee on Charges, nor does the complainant have a right to be present when testimony of witnesses is taken.

If it is determined by the Committee on Charges or the Hearing Committee of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure that the allegations brought by the complainant are both groundless and malicious, that finding may serve as a basis for counter charges by the accused Faculty member.
5.3.10 The Case of an Extreme Emergency

If in the judgment of the Chancellor, there is a clear probability that the continued assignment of the complained against Faculty member to regular duties would immediately and seriously endanger the University community or substantially impair the integrity of the academic program, he/she may place the Faculty member on full or partial interim suspension with pay, proceeding immediately to implement the full review procedure as set forth above. Such action does not represent imposition of a disciplinary sanction (cf. Regents' document, p.2).

5.3.10 Provision for Interim Suspension in Extreme Emergency

If in the judgment of the Chancellor there is a high probability that the continued assignment of a Faculty member to regular duties will be immediately and seriously harmful to the University community, the Chancellor may place the Faculty member on full or partial interim suspension with full pay. Such a suspension is a precautionary action and not a form of discipline. Before imposing such an interim suspension, the Chancellor shall, to the extent feasible under the circumstances in the individual case, consult with the chairs of the Committee on Charges and the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Chancellor shall promptly provide the Faculty member with a written statement of the reason for such suspension and shall promptly refer the matter to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall promptly provide an opportunity for a hearing to the Faculty member and report its findings and recommendations with respect to the propriety of the suspension to the Chancellor.

JUSTIFICATION:

The Committee, whose membership included current and former chairs of the Academic Senate committees on Charges and Privilege and Tenure, proposes the changes to clarify the channels through which allegations against a faculty member are to be lodged and to articulate more precisely the steps in the process, in order to reduce ambiguity of interpretation and inconsistency in application of the existing policy. The proposal also incorporates changes in the APM (015 and 016), changes in the University and UCR policies on Integrity in Research and Sexual Harassment, and changes in the system-wide Senate bylaws pertaining to disciplinary cases (SBL 336).

More specifically, these proposed changes do not differ from UC Rules or the APM. Since our bylaws were last amended, the APM 015 and 016 have been modified, as have the UC Senate Bylaws, and our bylaws needed to be brought into compliance. For example, UC Academic Senate Bylaw 336 has been substantially rewritten, with much more detail about how hearings are to be conducted. Thus, rather than rephrase these procedures, we added a reference to SBL 336 as the document guiding how hearing are to be conducted (our proposed 5.3.7).

Second, consistent with procedures on other campuses, the proposed changes refer complainants to the newly written policies on sexual harassment and research misconduct, which have their own investigation routes.

Third, the proposed changes make more explicit (than does UCR's current bylaw appendix 5) the steps and channels for addressing complaints, adding timelines for each step where feasible. Without divulging confidential about particular cases, these proposed changes are suggested by current and
former members of UCR's Charges and P&T committees, as a way to address inconsistencies and ambiguities that have arisen in previous cases.

Our first and foremost goal was how to assure that faculty rights were preserved to the greatest extent possible, while still being consistent with the administrative dictates of the APM. Although we carefully reviewed the parallel procedures on the other UC campuses, we worked to modify our existing procedures and to clarify the language in a way that our committee determined was most appropriate for UCR.

Reviewed by Committee on Charges: October 16, 2006
Reviewed by Privilege and Tenure: October 16, 2006
Reviewed by Rules & Jurisdiction: January 22, 2007
Endorsed by Advisory Committee:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Faculty Conduct</strong></th>
<th><strong>UC Administrative Policy</strong></th>
<th><strong>UC Senate bylaw</strong></th>
<th><strong>UCR Administrative Policy</strong></th>
<th><strong>UCR Senate bylaw</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APM-015: Faculty Code of Conduct (7/17/03)</td>
<td>SBL Appendix IV (APM-015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCR Senate bylaw Appendix 5.2 (APM-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM-016: University Policy on Faculty Conduct and Administration of Discipline (1/1/02)</td>
<td>SBL Appendix IV (APM-016)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCR Senate bylaw Appendix 5.1 (APM-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL 334-337: P&amp;T Divisional Committees: [esp.SBL 336] (5/23/01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UCR Senate bylaw Appendix 5.3: Procedures to Implement 5.1 and 5.2 (current being revised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scientific Conduct</strong></td>
<td><strong>University Policy on Integrity in Research (6/19/90)</strong></td>
<td><strong>UCR Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (proposed 4/30/06)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Campus Policy #650-73: UCR Policy and Procedures for Responding to Reports of Sexual Harassment (1/05)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
July 15, 2006

TO:       Manuela Martins-Green, Chair  
          Riverside Division

FROM:    Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM, Chair  
          Walter Farmer, Environmental Sciences  
          Harry Green, Earth Sciences  
          Subir Ghosh, Statistics  
          Helen Henry, Faculty Welfare  
          Michael Kearney, Charges  
          Richard Luben, Biomedical Sciences  
          Charles Louis, Vice Chancellor, Research  
          Mart Molle, Computer Science  
          Andrews Reath, Privilege and Tenure  
          Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences  
          Fred Takemiya, Office of UC General Counsel

RE:       Report of the Committee to Review UCR’s Faculty Disciplinary  
          Procedures

The Committee, whose membership includes current and former chairs of the  
Academic Senate committees on Charges and Privilege and Tenure, has completed  
its work on the review of UCR’s Faculty Disciplinary Procedures. Our work was  
informed by a close review of the relevant UC policies and recent changes in  
those policies, review of faculty disciplinary procedures at other UC campuses,  
examination of the 2000 Task Force proposal for changes, review of the UCR  
procedures for investigating charges of scientific misconduct and sexual  
harassment, and detailed discussion and analysis of the current procedures at  
UCR.

We summarize the outcome of our work below:

1. The UCR Senate Bylaw Appendices 5.1 and 5.2 have been updated to  
   incorporate recent changes in the APM-016 (University Policy on Faculty  
   Conduct and the Administration of Discipline) and APM-015 (The Faculty  
   Code of Conduct), respectively. Since these appendices to UCR’s  
   Bylaws are taken verbatim from the APM and are not unique UCR policies,  
   they do not require review and vote of the UCR Senate.

2. To assure that these appendices are updated whenever changes are made  
   to the APM, we advise that the UCR Senate Bylaw Appendices 5.1 and 5.2  
   appear as a direct web link to the appropriate sections of the APM. We  
   note that the UC Systemwide Academic Senate follows this procedure.
3. Appendix 5.3 represents UCR’s unique procedures for implementing the UC policies that appear as Appendices 5.1 and 5.2. The attached document contains the Committee’s proposed changes in the current 5.3. This Committee submits these proposed changes for review by the appropriate Senate committees and vote by the full Senate.
POLICY ON THE POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES OF ATTENDANCE

Purpose

The University of California, Riverside seeks to extend sympathy and compassion to the families of students who pass away near the completion of their degrees and to recognize the academic achievement of students who would have fulfilled the requirements of the degree. These actions must also be balanced with attention to academic and institutional integrity.

Criteria

Normally, the posthumous degree is conferred on students currently enrolled or on leave at the time of death. To be eligible for a posthumous BA/BS degree, the deceased student must have earned at least 135 units (i.e., senior-level standing) and have a 2.0 GPA. For students who pass away before achieving the requisite number of units or who do not possess the requisite 2.0 GPA, the University of California, Riverside will offer a Certificate of Attendance.

To be eligible for a posthumous MA/MS degree, the deceased student must have been in the final quarter of coursework or enrolled in courses, which upon successful completion would have culminated in the awarding of the degree. For a MS thesis, the deceased student must have completed a draft of the thesis and had it approved by the thesis committee.

To be eligible for a posthumous Ph.D. degree, the deceased student must have completed a draft of the dissertation and had it approved by the dissertation committee.

Procedure

The process for identifying and considering candidates for the award of posthumous undergraduate degrees shall be:

1. A formal request may be initiated by any of the following: a family member, a faculty member, a dean, or a fellow student. If the request is not made by a family member, the family should be contacted and found to be receptive to the possible award.

2. The Office of Student Affairs in the appropriate college will be responsible for reviewing the student’s academic record, confirming with the Registrar whether the specified criteria are met, and forwarding the request to the Executive Committee of the College who, on behalf of the Chair of the Division, will then instruct the Registrar to issue the designated degree or certificate.

3. Ordinarily, degrees awarded posthumously will be noted on the commencement program. The student’s diploma or certificate will be released or mailed to the person legally authorized to manage the deceased student’s affairs. The posthumous nature of the award will be indicated on the diploma and in the student’s official transcript. Any fees associated with the administration of the posthumous degree or certificate of attendance shall be waived.
The procedure for identifying and considering candidates for the award of posthumous graduate degrees shall be:

1. A formal request may be initiated by any of the following: a family member, a faculty member, a dean, or a fellow student. If the request is not made by a family member, the family member should be contacted and found to be receptive to the possible award.

2. The Graduate Division and the Department will be responsible for reviewing the student’s academic record, confirming with the Registrar whether the specified criteria are met, and forwarding the request to the Graduate Council who, on behalf of the Chair of the Division, will then instruct the Registrar to issue the designated degree or certificate.

3. Ordinarily, degrees awarded posthumously will be noted on the commencement program. The student’s diploma or certificate will be released or mailed to the person legally authorized to manage the deceased student’s affairs. The posthumous nature of the award will be indicated on the diploma and in the student’s official transcript. Any fees associated with the administration of the posthumous degree or certificate of attendance shall be waived.

Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: **July 3, 2006**
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: **October 19, 2006**
Approved by the Graduate Council: **November 22, 2006**
Approved by the CHASS Executive Committee: **November 20, 2006**
Approved by the CNAS Executive Committee: **November 17, 2006**
Approved by the GSOE Executive Committee: **November 16, 2006**
Approved by the AGSM Executive Committee: **October 20, 2006**
Approved by the BCOE Executive Committee: **February 6, 2007**
Endorsed by the Advisory Committee:
January 17, 2007

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FM: Judy Lehr, Director, Donor Research & Relations, Office of Development

Cc: Ellen Wartella, Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost
    Bill Boldt, Vice Chancellor University Advancement
    Gretchen Bolar, Vice Chancellor Academic Budget & Planning
    Susan Harlow, Associate Vice Chancellor, Development

RE: Response to the Academic Senate suggestions on the UCR POLICY, GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR NAMING CAMPUS PROPERTIES, ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES

Dear Tom:

Thank you for forwarding the recommendations of Academic Senate Advisory Committee to VC Bill Boldt.

Concern #1

Having sent the Advisory Committee’s suggested alternate wording to the PROCEDURE section to EVC &P Wartella, Wartella, VC University Advancement Boldt, VC Academic Budget & Planning Bolar, and Associate VC Development Harlow regarding the concern:

P&B had concerns about the proposed steps of the approval process and Unanimously support the changes that are indicated below.

The proposal will be distributed electronically simultaneously to the UCR Naming Committee members and to the Academic Senate. The Senate review shall be carried out promptly and its advice provided to the Naming Committee (by the Senate Chair or her/his representative) who shall then review the proposal and respond to the Office of the EVC&P. The EVC&P shall within two weeks provide a final decision to the Naming Committee

Other individuals will be consulted as appropriate when the naming pertains to their specific area, e.g., Presidents of the Associated Students of UCR and Graduate Student Association of UCR when naming student buildings and facilities; Vice Chancellor, Research when naming research centers, programs or facilities.

We felt it made more sense to bring the Senate into the review process earlier and will send the background/proposal to the Chair of the Academic Senate before it goes to the Naming Committee. Therefore the policy now reads:

IV. PROCEDURE

D. Review procedure

1. The EVC&P’s office submits the naming request to the Chancellor for review.
2. Academic Senate

For such proposals deemed by the Chancellor to have merit based on the above policy, the EVC&P or designee shall distribute electronically to the Academic Senate Chair the
proposal. The Senate review shall be carried out promptly and its advice provided to the Naming Committee by the Senate Chair or her/his representative.

3. For such proposals deemed by the Chancellor to have merit based on the above policy, the EVC&P or designee shall seek the advice of the UCR Committee on Naming Campus Properties, Programs and Facilities (UCR Naming Committee). The Committee’s charge is to provide due diligence as to the appropriateness of the name that is to be recognized. In addition, Committee members may comment regarding their specific area of responsibility. The proposal may be distributed electronically and the UCR Naming Committee members shall review the proposal and respond to the Office of the EVC&P with comments within five business days. The UCR Naming Committee consists of the following:

- Vice Chancellor, Administration (for comments regarding building, design, construction, maintenance issues),
- Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Budget (for comments regarding operating and capital resources),
- Vice Chancellor, University Advancement (to confirm compliance with UCR and UCOP policy),
- Associate Vice Chancellor, Development (for comments regarding donor negotiations),
- Chair, Academic Senate or designee to represent the faculty (for comments regarding academic issues)
- Legal Counsel (as required).

Other individuals will be consulted as appropriate when the naming pertains to their specific area, e.g., Presidents of the Associated Students of UCR and Graduate Student Association of UCR when naming student buildings and facilities; Vice Chancellor, Research when naming research centers, programs or facilities.

3. **Academic Senate**

The proposal will be distributed electronically simultaneously to the Academic Senate. The Senate review shall be carried out promptly and its advice provided to the Naming Committee (by the Senate Chair or her/his representative) who shall then review the proposal and respond to the Office of the EVC&P.

We deleted the last sentence of the paragraph that starts with “The proposal,” (The EVC&P shall within two weeks provide a final decision to the Naming Committee) because if a proposal goes to the UC Office of the President, it is often months before OP takes action.

**The rest of your suggested changes have been incorporated (see the red).**

I have attached the current draft with the changes included.
Concern #2:
CAP felt very strongly that any naming action needs to involve the faculty of the affected unit at the earliest possible stage. The policy should include a section that indicates that the faculty have reviewed and approved the name change.

With all of the mark-ups in the document that your colleagues reviewed, the policies dealing with this issue were buried. As a result of a suggestion from CAP on November 3, 2004 (page 6 of the Policy), we amended the Initial Request to Name form (Attachment #1 Section IIIV - College/Unit/ Faculty Consultation) which now states:

IV. College/Unit/Faculty Consultation
This naming has been reviewed by and received approval from the faculty of the (specific department/ school/unit) _________________________ affected by the named building, etc."

The Request to Name form is the origin of all naming processes and moves to the next step only after the chair/unit head/ dean, Associate Vice Chancellor for Development and the Vice Chancellor University Advancement sign off on the form. This process and the form are referred to throughout the policy.

This documentation starts the entire naming process/review.

Additional mention of this consultation is made in:
IV. PROCEDURE
B. Preparation of Proposal
1. The Associate Vice Chancellor Development (AVCD) and/or designee coordinates the review of naming proposals in consultation with the head of the submitting unit, the VCUA, EVC&P or designee and Chancellor during the negotiation process for a gift. Review includes endorsements by the occupants or potential occupants of a building or facility or by the members of a program documented on the Initial Request for Approval to Name/Establish an Endowed Property, Program or Facility form.

2. Development, in coordination and consultation with Dean or Unit Head, prepares proposal which shall include the Initial Request for Approval to Name/Establish an Endowed Property, Program or Facility form. Development obtains all appropriate signatures and works with Donor to prepare a draft gift agreement. If the gift is in the form of a pledge, the agreement shall include payment schedule.

3. Development prepares the formal naming request with supporting documentation which has been reviewed to be sure all necessary parties have been consulted and that the proposal includes all necessary information. The request is then sent to the EVC&P or designee. The gift agreement may be signed at this time with naming contingent upon campus review and UC Presidential (UCOP) approval.

Again, Tom, thank you for your careful and thoughtful review. I hope this will serve UCR well.

Judy Lehr
Director, Donor Research & Relations
Office of Development
January 1, 2007

TO:    STANLEY N. STEWART, CHAIR
       FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER

       HELEN HENRY, CHAIR
       FACULTY WELFARE

       ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
       PLANNING AND BUDGET

FM:    T. E. COGSWELL
       CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:    ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AWARDS AND THE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY
       RESEARCH

Attached for your review is a proposal to expand the Faculty Research Lecturers to include two
Faculty Research Lecturers and two Mid-Career Research Awards awarded each year, one from
each side of the campus. The awards will be in the amount of $7,500 for Faculty Research
Lecturers and $4,000 each for Mid-Career Research Awards.

At the meeting, the AC members also decided that you should receive the information on how
the awards committees are handled at other UC campuses. The information is herein attached.

This will require a change in bylaws for the Faculty Research Committee and approval by the
entire Division. To be able to implement this for next year, please let me have your comments
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 Lecturers, one from each side of the campus. These are designed to honor research excellence and innovation among Associate and Assistant Professors. The Lecturers will receive a cash prize of $4,000.

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 raised from its current five members 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 four research awards a year, we will go a longer way to ensuring that we duly recognize and applaud our colleagues’ talents.
BERKELEY

FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURE

A. Membership

This Committee consists of the most recent Faculty Research Lecturers, to a maximum number of ten. In each academic year, it elects its chair for the following year.

B. Duties
This Committee is to nominate for approval by the Divisional Council two members of the Division who have made distinguished records in research, each to deliver a lecture upon a topic of his or her choice. (CC. 10.89)

DAVIS

1. This committee shall consist of the most recent previous faculty research lecturers, up to a maximum number of five, who are still connected with the Davis Division. In each academic year the committee shall elect its chairperson for the following year.
2. This committee shall hold office from April 1 through the following March 31.
3. This committee shall nominate for election by the Representative Assembly a member of the faculty or staff at Davis who has made a distinguished record in research, to deliver a lecture upon a topic of his or her choice. The nomination shall be made at the first meeting of the Representative Assembly in the fall quarter and the lecture shall be delivered during Charter Week of the following spring. (Am. 10/19/71, effective 12/21/71)

IRVINE

Responsibilities of the Committee on Scholarly Honors and Awards (SH&A)

The committee solicits nominations and selects recipients for the following Distinguished Faculty Awards that recognize Senate members for their outstanding research, teaching and service:

- Distinguished Faculty Award for Research
- Distinguished Mid-Career Faculty Award for Research
- Distinguished Assistant Professor Award for Research
- Distinguished Faculty Award for Teaching
- Distinguished Assistant Professor Award for Teaching
- Daniel G. Aldrich, Jr. Distinguished University Service Award
- Distinguished Mid-Career Faculty Award for Service
The committee solicits nominations for the faculty recipient of the UCI Medal and forwards one or more recommendations to the Chancellor for his special appointment.

The committee also advises the Irvine Division on matters related to scholarly honors and awards.

**Membership**

The Committee on Scholarly Honors and Awards consists of four faculty members appointed for three year terms by the Committee on Committees. There will be no more than one member from any Faculty. The Vice Chancellor for Research/Dean of Graduate Studies and the Dean of Undergraduate Education will serve as *ex officio* members. Consideration will be given to previous recipients of the Academic Senate’s Distinguished Faculty Awards and the UCI Medal for at least three positions on the Committee.

**UCLA**

The responsibility of the *Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship* is the naming of two faculty distinguished for research achievement to deliver public lectures during the succeeding academic year on topics of the lecturer’s choice. The nominees are proposed by Department Chairs and other officials.

**Membership**

No fewer than seven or more than ten previous Faculty Research Lecturers, *appointed* by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly for up to 3 years.

**UCSD**

This committee shall consist of five ordinary members of the Division. [Am 4/22/86] The committee shall solicit recommendations and nominate two members of the faculty or staff at San Diego whose research has made a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge, who shall each present a public lecture on a topic of his or her choice. There shall be two such awards annually: one in the Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences and one in the Sciences. The nominations shall be made to the Representative Assembly or the Division no later than its final meeting in the spring term, and the lectures shall be presented during the following academic year.

**SANTA BARBARA**

Council on Faculty Issues and Awards

**A. Purpose.** To study and make recommendations on any matter of interest and welfare of the campus community, and to reward excellence in research and teaching.

**B. Membership.** Members are selected to ensure appropriate representation of the campus’ diversity of faculty and emeriti/ae, with representation based on the
apportionment of the Faculty Legislature as much as possible. The Council consists of at least ten (10) Academic Senate members, two (2) of whom are emeriti/ae. The Council Chair and Vice Chair are appointed by the Committee on Committees from among the members. In addition, there is one non-Senate academic, one undergraduate and one graduate student representative, appointed by the Committee on Committees, Associated Students, and the Graduate Student Association, respectively. One member is appointed each to the University Committee on Faculty Welfare and University Committee on Academic Freedom by the Committee on Committees. The Chair is a member of the Executive Council.

C. Organization. The Council on Faculty Issues and Awards consists of three standing subcommittees and any number of ad hoc committees. The Council Chair, in consultation with the membership, shall appoint any number of individuals or ad hoc committees in response to Administrative or joint Administrative/Senate Committee needs, and within the Council’s purview, e.g., the Parking and Transportation Committee. In so doing, the Chair may consult with the Committee on Committees. Individuals may be appointed from the general Senate membership as necessary. Members so appointed report to the Council. Membership of the standing committees is selected by the chair. The Chairs of the standing committees are appointed from the Council members by the Council Chair in consultation with the Council Vice Chair. The Council and its standing committees may invite consultants and guests to meetings as deemed appropriate. The standing committees are as follows:

1. Executive Committee, consisting of the Council Chair, Vice Chair, the subcommittee chairs, and systemwide committee representatives, if different;
2. Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom, composed of a Chair and four (4) Council members;
3. Committee on Emeriti/ae and Retirement, consisting of a Chair, who is emeritus/a, and three (3) members, one of whom is also emeritus/a.

In addition there shall be at least two ad hoc committees dealing with awards:

1. **The Committee on Research Lecture**, consisting of at least three past recipients of the award and one Council member, to recommend annually the recipient of the Research Lectureship;
2. The Committee on Distinguished Teaching, consisting of seven members, two of which are past recipients of the award and one Council member, to recommend annually the recipients of the Distinguished Faculty Teaching Awards.

The Council Vice Chair will coordinate the administration of the award programs.

**SANTA CRUZ**

**Committee on the Faculty Research Lecture** - There are five Santa Cruz Division members, at least two of whom shall be previous Faculty Research Lecturers. [The Committee shall be fully constituted no later than December of the academic year in which it is to report.] It is the duty of this Committee to nominate for election by the
Santa Cruz Division a member of the Division who has made a distinguished record in research to deliver a lecture upon a topic of his or her selection. This nomination for the succeeding academic year shall be made not later than the final meeting of the Santa Cruz Division in the spring term.
January 19, 2007

TO: T.E. COGSWELL
CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION

HELEN HENRY, CHAIR
FACULTY WELFARE

ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
PLANNING AND BUDGET

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FM: STANLEY N. STEWART, CHAIR
FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER

RE: ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AWARDS AND THE COMMITTEE ON
FACULTY RESEARCH LECTURER

The Faculty Research Lecturer Committee unanimously opposes Chair T.E. Cogswell's proposal to change the composition and function of the committee, which has for decades honored an Academic Senate member on the basis of scholarly achievement, as perceived by a committee of previous Faculty Research Lecturers. We believe that, by employing criteria other than demonstrated merit in research in the selection of committee members and honorees, the proposed change, if adopted, will lower the prestige of the Faculty Research Lecturer award. We also believe that the creation of additional Faculty Research Lecturer awards would further dilute the significance of this singular honor.
January 30, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: ADDITIONAL RESEARCH AWARDS AND THE COMMITTEE ON
FACULTY RESEARCH

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed the proposal for additional research awards and felt that the proposal looked like a good idea. The only other observation raised was that since there would be a specifically junior award, should the other award be specifically senior?
February 2, 2007

TO:    Thomas Cogswell  
       Chair, Riverside Division

FM:    Helen Henry, Chair  
       Committee on Faculty Welfare

RE:    Additional Research Awards and the Committee on Faculty Research

The Committee on Faculty Welfare considered this proposal at its meeting today and approves with the following suggested change:

Paragraph 2; second sentence: These are designed to honor research excellence and innovation among professors at the Associate and early professor (for example, Step III) levels.

The CFW believes that Assistant Professors should not be included among mid career research lecturers because (a) they are not yet at the mid point of their careers and (b) it may be desirable in the future to add a third category of research lecturer at the Assistant Professor level.
To be adopted:

**PRESENT:**

**PROPOSED:**

R7.1 *Expected Progress.* A full-time undergraduate student is considered to be making Expected Progress toward a baccalaureate degree if he or she:

- R7.1.1 passes at least 45 units each academic year,
- R7.1.2 declares a major by the time the student earns 90 units, and
- R7.1.3 follows a program of study consistent with the requirements of the student’s declared major or undeclared student’s College or School.

R7.2 *Continued Registration.* A full-time undergraduate student is considered ineligible for Continued Registration if he or she:

- R7.2.1 does not pass at least 37 units in each academic year, or
- R7.2.2 does not complete the requirements as stated above in Sections R7.1.2 and R7.1.3.

R7.3 *Failure to Meet Criteria for Continued Registration.* Registration of a full-time undergraduate student who is ineligible for Continued Registration under any of the criteria described above in R7.2 shall be at the discretion of the faculty in the student’s College or School or Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs in each College or School.

R7.4 *Units Passed.* For purposes of determining eligibility for Continued
Registration, in addition to units earned by passing regularly enrolled courses, the following defines what shall be counted as units passed.

R7.4.1 Workload only, non-credit courses with passing grades shall be counted as units passed.

R7.4.2 If a student receives a grade of D in a course and then repeats and passes the course, the units from each enrollment shall be counted as units passed during the quarter the course was taken, provided the student has not accumulated more than a total of 16 repeated units. (SR 780.D.4)

R7.4.3 Units earned during a summer session, either at UCR or another accredited school and transferred to UCR, shall be counted as units passed during the academic year immediately preceding the summer session.

R7.4.4 Units passed by examination shall be counted as units passed during the quarter in which the examination was taken.

R7.4.5 Units graded IP (In Progress) shall be counted as units passed.

R7.4.6 Units graded I (Incomplete) are not counted as units passed. When the grade of I is replaced by a passing grade, the units shall be counted toward Expected Progress for the quarter in which the I grade was awarded.

R7.5 Units for Courses Taken at other Institutions. A student is prohibited from obtaining transfer units for courses taken at a non-University of California campus in a quarter during which the student is enrolled as a full-time student at UCR. Summer session course work is exempt from this restriction.

R7.5.1 To request an exception, a petition must be submitted to and
approved by the appropriate College or School committee or administrative officer prior to the quarter of concurrent enrollment.

R7.5.2 In those instances where approval has been granted, units earned from courses taken at a non-University of California campus shall be counted toward the Expected Progress in the quarter(s) in which the concurrent enrollment occurred.

JUSTIFICATION:
From Andrew Grosovsky, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, after consultation with the Associate Deans:

BACKGROUND
In Spring ’06, a working group of faculty and administrators began meeting regularly to discuss ways of improving the UCR conversion ratio. The group was convened by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and included the Associate Deans for Student Academic Affairs from each College, the Executive Committee Chairs from each College, and the Chairs of the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy and Committee on Courses.

Not long into their discussion, the working group identified as significant the difference between the current campus culture that seems to consider 36 units per academic year as the norm for a full-time student and the UC definition of one full-time enrollment (FTE) as 45 units per academic year. The group looked to the other UC campuses for guidance and reviewed several of their minimum progress documents. As a result, the working group proposed the institution of a regulation for Expected Progress for Undergraduate Students and their draft of such a regulation was forwarded to the Committee on Educational Policy.

KEY ELEMENTS OF PROPOSAL
The following outlines the key elements in the proposed regulation.

A full-time student is considered to be making Expected Progress if he or she:
- passes at least 45 units each academic year (fall through spring quarter),
- declares a major by the time 90 units are earned,
- follows a program of study that is consistent with the requirements of his or her declared major or undeclared College, and
- graduates when degree requirements are completed.

A full-time student is considered not to be making Expected Progress and ineligible for Continued Registration if he or she;
- does not pass at least 37 units each academic year, or
- fails to meet the other criteria of Expected Progress described above.

For the student who has a GPA in good standing, but does not meet the criteria for Expected Progress, Continuing Registration shall be at the discretion of the faculty in the student’s College or School or its authorized agent, who will be the Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs in each College.
ROLE OF ASSOCIATE DEANS
The Associate Deans will take the lead in developing a system for Expected Progress counseling for their Colleges and will be responsible for determining when, and with what requirements, under-enrolled students shall be eligible for Continued Registration. This section of the regulation was intentionally written to set up a mechanism that will
- identify students in good academic standing who are under-enrolled, and
- direct them into individualized academic advising.

For the student who is legitimately unable to perform at this level, the Associate Deans can waive the unit per year requirement, in the same spirit that reduced course-loads are approved currently for students with disabilities or those on part-time status.

RELATIONSHIP WITH ACADEMIC DIFFICULTY
The proposed Expected Progress regulation will operate in tandem with the Academic Progress regulations for each College. However, in all cases of academic difficulty, the College’s Academic Progress regulations will trump any failure to make expected progress. A student who ends up in academic difficulty and fails to achieve expected progress would follow his or her College’s procedures for Academic Probation/Subject to Dismissal.

In order to decrease confusion, the terms “probation” and “subject to dismissal” were not incorporated into the draft of the UCR Expected Progress regulation. Other UC campuses use these terms and have built in sanctions, however the working group decided against a stricter set of rules in favor of an advisement model.

IMPACT ON STUDENTS
Of the 2776 freshmen students who entered UCR in Fall 05 and completed three quarters of coursework, 27% or 752 students did not pass 37 or more units. Slightly over half (401/752) of these students were found to be in academic difficulty, therefore would proceed under the Academic Progress regulations of each College. With the proposed regulation, the remaining 351 students who failed to make expected progress would be identified and directed into academic advising.

The Associate Deans have no intention of mechanically dismissing students under this regulation, but unanimously believe that the proposed Expected Progress regulation will help them to motivate students to maintain an appropriate unit load. This seems to follow the pattern of the other UC campuses; administrators agreed that few students are ever dismissed under their Expected Progress Regulation.
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December 8, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: FINAL REPORT OF THE STUDENT SUCCESS TASKFORCE

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed the Student Success Taskforce report and agreed that overall, the report lays out ways to begin addressing some of the issues. The committee felt that the changes recommended will be necessary and that emphasized the need to have adequate staff in advising.

Planning and Budget liked and endorsed the Taskforce report and recommend that some kind of check mechanism be implemented in two years so that it will be possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the recommendations contained in the report.
January 16, 2007

TO:    T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

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

RE:    FINAL REPORT OF THE STUDENT SUCCESS TASK FORCE

The Committee on Courses members reviewed the Final Report of the Student Success Task Force and has no additional comments.

mj
December 13, 2006

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: EUGENE NOTHNAEGEL, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: STUDENT SUCCESS TASK FORCE REPORT

The CEP has read the Task Force Report on Student Success and would like to offer its congratulations on the depth and range of the report. The Committee would like to offer these general comments about the report and its implementation:

The Freshman Experience

The plans for increasing student success by enhancing Freshman programs are impressive. “Increased attention to persistence of currently enrolled students” makes perfect sense, and seems readily achievable, especially through the office of the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education. “Learning Communities,” of which the CEP has heard various positive reports without being involved in their planning and execution, are another great and reasonably achievable idea. As the report suggests, “To be most effective, learning communities require that faculty and student-affairs professionals collaborate in a variety of ways to ensure that the sharing of courses and activities provides for a coherent educational experience, one that is intentionally structured to promote student education.” The CEP is in favor of such collaboration and looks forward to the positive results of these changes.

The CEP supports the report’s recommendation to centralize such already successful programs as CHASS-Connect, CNAS Scholars, and the University Honors Program. We also hope that funds can be found to support and extend these already proven units. Creating structural connections between these innovative programs will be essential, and we thus support the proposal to create a Director of First-year Programs in the office of the VPU.

The CEP supports the concept of Freshman Discovery Seminars and hopes that the questions about this program can be resolved. General Education requirements need to be revised with the Freshman experience in mind. A member of CEP is in fact chairing the Senate and Administrative Committee that is beginning this process of revision.

Increased support of the Learning Center and the increased financial support of students will be important to student success. The CEP supports this endeavor but does not truly have direct oversight on these matters.
Student Advising

The CEP supports the changes in student advising and recommends that they be implemented as soon as possible.

Student Surveys

It makes sense to rationalize the surveying of students and to pay careful attention to results of such surveys. The CEP has found surveys useful in reviewing undergraduate programs, and the Committee feels that the results of such surveys could be more broadly useful to the campus as a whole.

University Investments in Teaching and Learning

"Dynamic, innovative, and learning-centered pedagogies" are of course greatly interesting to the CEP, and the Committee would be pleased to see the creation of a Center for Instructional Outcomes, although it remains to be seen how such a Center would be funded and staffed. The CEP is of course behind the plan to make UCR a center of innovative teaching and a leader in teaching technology. Plans to involve the libraries more directly in student instructional support are deeply thoughtful and persuasive.

The CEP would like to congratulate the Task Force and to commit itself to help with the implementation of various details here, especially those affecting Freshman Programs.
DATE: 4 January 2007

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
    UCR Academic Senate

FROM: T. D. Paine, Chair
       Undergraduate Council

SUBJECT: Undergraduate Council evaluation of Student Success Task Force Report

The Undergraduate Council discussed the final report of the Student Success Task Force in some detail. In general, the Council was supportive of the recommendations of the Task Force. Rather than dwell on the details of the specific suggestions, the Council focused on the broad fundamental issues in the report.

The Undergraduate Council recognized the amount of effort and the sincerity of the members of the Task Force in developing the information summarized in the report. Although the material makes a number of substantive recommendations, the overriding impression was that the outcomes were modest rather than bold. The recommendations would modify a century-old system of transmitting information that is not student-focused. For example, students are faced with asynchronous classes with conflicting exam schedules, multiple advisors with multiple messages, and overriding student confusion. The report was not aggressive in exploring or promoting different ways of learning (e.g., mastery or project-based approaches), preferring to rely on technological solutions rather than articulating a philosophical approach to teaching.

Student success in the classroom is a complex problem. The report did not address the critical issue of how to effect a cultural change in the campus academic community to make teaching quality and innovation a priority for the faculty. While the report did address the technology of teaching, it did not explore modifications to the merit and promotion system to reward teaching that would be more sustaining and systemic than increasing the number of annual awards. The issue of reward is also linked to the question of who should be teaching the large and most challenging classes that the students often face early in their academic lives. The report did not address the complicated question of how to encourage and reward the best faculty to be fully engaged in teaching those freshman classes. Similarly, the report did not address the issue of educational evaluations that extend beyond traditional examinations. There is no consistent and clearly articulated campus philosophy of evaluation of student learning.
Consequently, there is no philosophical articulation of the differences between exams as filters or demonstrations of mastery of material.

We were pleased to see that the Task Force fully endorsed the report of the Undergraduate Council on student advising. The initiation of developmental advising is an innovative solution to an emerging need among the student population. However, the role and contributions of faculty mentors was not developed in the report. The importance and contributions of faculty (and peer mentors) can be very significant to student success. It would have been useful to see recommendations in the report to foster mentoring opportunities across the campus.

The Undergraduate Council is very supportive of continuing to survey students at various points in their careers on campus and then periodically after they graduate. It is vital to develop a data-driven culture to guide the process of making decisions and investment of resources. The recommendations from the Task Force start a continuing long-term process; however, the success of the process requires a continued commitment of financial support to be successful. Anything less would consign the recommendations to failure.
Date: January 17, 2007

TO: Thomas Cogswell, Chair
   Riverside Division

FROM: Theda Shapiro, Chair
       Committee on Preparatory Education

RE: Comments on the Report of the Student Success Taskforce

The Committee on Preparatory Education met on January 10, 2007 and discussed the report of the Taskforce on Student Success. Overall, we would like to congratulate the taskforce on a fine report that offers some excellent suggestions to promote a more satisfactory sense for UCR undergraduates that they belong to a community, greater engagement by students in their courses, better orientation of students into university-level expectations and access to support for their learning needs, more proficient and efficient advising, and timely investments by the campus administration in technology and other support structures that promote optimum teaching and learning.

From the standpoint of our committee’s charge and our collective expertise on issues concerning entering students, we have the following comments and suggestions to offer:

1. We feel that the focus on learning communities is an excellent strategy to improve student engagement, but we also predict that the expansion of such opportunities to a far larger student cohort will pose problems that should be considered carefully in advance. Up to now, the academic courses that function as learning communities have been taken largely by self-selecting groups of students, many of whom are already good performers who understand how to fully engage in their studies. Our concerns for future expansion include the following:

   A. As the size and number of these sorts of courses expands it will become increasingly difficult to schedule multi-course sequences and to compel continuation by students who are less engaged and have many competing priorities for their time, such as entry into prerequisites for their majors, necessity (or perceived necessity) to work long hours off-campus, family obligations, etc.

   B. Quality control of instruction will become increasingly important as the number of sections of these courses multiplies. Students inevitably make invidious comparisons, and unequal quality of instruction will be greatly resented. It will be very important to deploy the best instructors on campus for these efforts.
C. As learning-community-type courses are extended to larger numbers of students, it will be even more important to expand early-intervention assessments and programs. The report tends to view work with struggling students as complementary to the creation of learning communities, but we feel that assistance to students in difficulty should be an integral part of such communities and continually functioning within them/alongside them. We feel very strongly that most students need instruction in time-management skills alongside their entry into their first UCR courses.

D. Evenhanded assessment of student performance is also very important in the large courses that rest on a learning community approach. Ideally, student preparedness for entry into UCR, as well as performance in multi-section courses intended to help students engage and adapt, should be tested uniformly and graded by teams of instructors, not on a section-by-section basis. This method will also permit self-study so as to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of entering students and improve the courses and learning-related services over time. At present UCR has few or no spaces where exams can be administered to very large groups of students, and no proctoring service available for such large-group exam sessions.

2. Although the report acknowledges the academic deficiencies of so many of our entering students, it does not discuss this matter in detail. We should be able to expect that students arrive with English composition and pre-calculus solidly acquired, but the opposite is the case. Even with an AP score of 3 in math, many students are not ready for calculus. Since a large majority of the entering freshmen arrive with the need for preparatory, and often remedial, courses in English and/or Mathematics, one of the most important things the campus could do to promote student success would be to identify these deficiencies before the students matriculate and help them achieve remediation. Advisory achievement exams should be offered as early as possible to students who intend to matriculate at UCR. Based on the findings, “at risk” students should be directed to appropriate courses and required or very strongly urged to take them before matriculation. Above all, students needing remedial help not available on campus, such as a course in intermediate algebra, should be informed that they must take an extramural remedial course before they will be allowed into pre-calculus (Math 4, 5, or 8a). Above all, if we can forestall failure in these courses by realistically directing students to opportunities at their current level of achievement before they enroll at UCR we will give “at risk” students a greater chance to succeed.

3. We strongly support the recommendations of the Task Force Report concerning the necessity to raise more funds for scholarship support and to provide more work opportunities on campus. We believe that better financial support and greater possibilities of employment on-campus will promote student engagement and provide students with fewer distractions and more time for academic work.

4 While we recognize the financial and other imperatives for the campus to meet its enrollment targets, we also know that more selective admissions practices would
largely solve the above-mentioned student deficiencies. We believe that more aggressive marketing of the campus, to raise its image in the minds of higher performing students, will be necessary to improve the outlook for success of entering students. The campus website, in comparison with those of competing campuses, needs a great deal of improvement. It should display the accomplishments of our faculty and students attractively and effectively. Better scholarship support, as mentioned above, will also make the campus more attractive to more engaged students; and a more realistic and effective communication with admitted students about their actual preparedness to do the required work at a research university, as noted above under item #2, will eventually pay off with a student body more ready to succeed and more realistic about what efforts success will take.

5. We note in Appendix C of the Taskforce Report, which deals with the establishment of a Director of First-Year Programs, that there is little or no mention of this director interacting with faculty who teach in-coming students, and little mention overall of academic matters. The description of a workgroup “to bring together learning community partners,” includes no participation by faculty other than the associate deans. The extremely lengthy job description strikes us as a managerial rather than realistically relating to the curriculum of a research university. We would like to see faculty participation at the center of these efforts, not only vaguely at the periphery, at least in an advisory capacity to the Director.

6. Finally, we would like to add two recommendations not dealt with in the Taskforce Report.

A. The report does not discuss the entry-period experience of first year “transfer” students. Currently both the UCR leadership and the Office of the President are keenly interested in the transfer student population, and in their transition and retention. As faculty we are very much aware of the adjustment difficulties experienced by many of these students who transition from community colleges. This is another major group for whom better advising and appropriate attention to retention should be a focus of on-going efforts by UCR leadership, faculty, and staff advisors.

B. Freshmen are greatly distracted in the middle of their first quarter, or indeed throughout their first year, by rushing for fraternities and sororities. We recommend that a study be made of the extent to which students in academic difficulty are allowed to participate in these activities. In the case of marginal students, we feel that almost anything that distracts them from academics puts them even more at risk. Every effort should be made through early intervention to keep them on track for success.