January 4, 2008

TO:      Ward P. Beyermann, Department of Physics and Astronomy (Vice Chair)
        Andrew S. Jacobs, Religious Studies (Secretary Parliamentarian)
        Richard Arnott, Economics (Research)
        Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
        Richard A. Cardullo, Biology (Committees)
        Mary Gauvain, Psychology (Planning and Budget)
        John Haleblian, AGSM (AGSM Executive Committee)
        Manuela Martins-Green Cell Biology (Junior Rep to the Assembly)
        Douglas Mitchell, GSOE (GSOE Executive Committee)
        Mart L. Molle, Computer Science and Eng. (Sr. Rep to the Assembly)
        Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM (CAP)
        Leonard J. Mueller, Chemistry (Academic Computing)
        Thomas C. Patterson, Anthropology (CHASS Executive Committee)
        Richard A. Redak, Entomology (Faculty Welfare)
        Pete Sadler, Earth Sciences (Undergraduate Council)
        Dan S. Straus, Biomedical Sciences (CEP)
        Christopher Y. Switzer, Chemistry (Graduate Council)
        Kambiz Vafai, Mechanical Engineering (PRP)
        Frank Vahid, Computer Science and Engineering (COE Executive Committee)
        Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences (Biomed Executive Committee)
        Marylynn V. Yates, Environmental Sciences (CNAS Executive Committee)
        Juliet McMullin, Anthropology, Chair, Diversity

FR:      Tony Norman, Chair
        Riverside Division

RE:      Executive Council Agenda, January 12, 2009

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, January 12, 2009, at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building. Chancellor Tim White will be our guest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>I. Approval of the 12-08-2008 Agenda and Notes of 11-10-08 meeting. Conflict of Interest Statements – COR</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-6) 2 (pp. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>II. Chancellor Tim White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>III. Presentation by Martin Johnson Faculty Climate Survey and Faculty Exit Survey</td>
<td>3 (pp. 8-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>IV. NAMING OPPORTUNITIES FOR EC APPROVAL Highlander Union Building and Highlander Plaza – review and approve</td>
<td>4 (pp. 20-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>V. Proposed Change in Regulation R2.1.2, R2.1.3 and R2.1.4: Review and approve the proposed bylaw change by the Committee on Preparatory Education regarding the satisfaction of the American History requirement.</td>
<td>5(pp. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>VI. Proposed Change in Bylaw 8.18.1 Review and approve the proposed bylaw change by the Committee on Planning and Budget regarding the satisfaction of the additional members to the committee.</td>
<td>6 (pp. 25-26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>VII. Proposed Mid-Quarter Grades BCOE had submitted a proposal to the Senate with a suggestion that a senate policy be proposed that would require faculty to provide students with mid-quarter grades in an effort to improve the experience and retention of undergraduate students. The proposal was sent out to the appropriate committees and has now been reviewed. The EC needs to decide on whether or not it is necessary to establish this policy and also formulate a response to BCOE</td>
<td>7. (pp. 27-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information</td>
<td>VIII. Any other Business – Anthony Norman, Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 17, 2008

PRESENT:
Anthony W. Norman, Biochemistry, (Chair)
Ward P. Beyermann, Department of Physics and Astronomy (Vice Chair)
Andrew S. Jacobs, Religious Studies (Secretary Parliamentarian)
Richard Arnott, Economics (Research)
Richard A. Cardullo, Biology (Committees)
Mary Gauvain, Psychology (Planning and Budget)
Manuela Martins-Green Cell Biology (Junior Rep to the Assembly)
Juliet McMulin, Anthropology, (Diversity and Equal Opportunity
Mart L. Molle, Computer Science and Eng. (Sr. Rep to the Assembly)
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM (CAP)
Leonard J. Mueller, Chemistry (Academic Computing)
Thomas C. Patterson, Anthropology (CHASS Executive Committee)
Pete Sadler, Earth Sciences (Undergraduate Council)
Dan S. Straus, Biomedical Sciences (CEP)
Kambiz Vafai, Mechanical Engineering (PRP)
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences (Biomed Executive Committee)
Marylynn V. Yates, Environmental Sciences (CNAS Executive Committee)

ABSENT:
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
John Haleblian, AGSM (AGSM Executive Committee)
Douglas Mitchell, GSOE (GSOE Executive Committee)
Richard A. Redak, Entomology (Faculty Welfare)
Christopher Y. Switzer, Chemistry (Graduate Council)
Frank Vahid, Computer Science and Engineering (COE Executive Committee)

GUESTS:
Marcia McQuern
Margene Mastin-Schepps

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The items under the consent calendar were accepted as written.

NEW UCR WEBSITE
Marcia McQuern and Margene Mastin-Schepps gave an overview of the new UCR website and the underlying reasons for revamping the website and also discussed issues that have been raised by the faculty regarding the new website. The presentation in its entirety is available at the Senate Office.

PRESIDENT’S DRAFT ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT
Chair Norman informed the committee that the transmittal memo he received indicated that the purpose of the review was (i) to draw the report to the attention of the entire University community, and (ii) to provide feedback to the ongoing development of the report, which the
President plans to have produced, on an annual basis. Ultimately the primary audience will be the California legislature and the citizens of California.

The Executive Council members all unanimously felt that the objective of the report is sufficiently complex and important to warrant a much more thorough review by the Senate. Chair Norman raised four questions:

The UCR Senate’s Executive Council at its November 17, 2008 meeting reviewed UC President Yudof’s draft of his Accountability Framework Report. This document was prepared by the President as mechanism for him to fulfill his and the University's responsibility to the Regents, Legislature and citizens of the state of California to be “accountable for the University’s actions, past and present, and for its future developmental trajectories”. The Report consist of 10 Sections, each of which have on average 10 key indicators; these by and large consist of histograms or pie charts with little or no description beyond a title for each descriptor. This draft document will be published in final form in Spring of 2009 and will be updated annually thereafter. President Yudof will report annually.

Chair Norman informed the committee that the transmittal memo he received indicated that the purpose of the review was (i) to draw the report to the attention of the entire University community, and (ii) to provide feedback to the ongoing development of the report, which the President plans to have produced, on an annual basis. Ultimately the primary audience will be the California legislature and the citizens of California.

Some issues raised by the committee members include:

- How will the report be used?

- There has been no critical analysis of the data provided in the document. Even though this information is already in the public domain, the collection of it in a single document and its promotion as a measure of faculty merit is potentially dangerous without a critical analysis, especially to the smaller campuses. While the indicators may seem obvious to us, a more detailed discussion of these measures is needed to tell others what they really mean. One gets the impression that they are all equivalent.

- It would be best if the report included a broader scope on what Accountability is. It reads a lot like – are we doing our job – what are all the things are we doing to make the state feel that the faculty are doing the job they get paid for? But if you took a broader scope and looked at it from the perspective of what should a public university be doing for the state and look at issues like how do our graduates contribute to the state, the accountability criteria might be different.

- What is the justification for using these particular indicators? The analysis should also distill these data down into some more specific statements or conclusions that will have meaning to non-educators (i.e., the Regents, legislators, the general public). What accounts for the differences and similarities between campuses? Are these important? These accountability indicators need a context that relates them to our goals and objectives in a more thorough way than the simple statements at the beginning each section.
Other general more specific concerns include, what is the true cost to education for each undergraduate, not the cost of attending, which is in the report? This is not reflected by looking at just the student fees because public universities subsidize the educational costs with state funds. Comparing true costs would tell us sometime about our efficiency of operation in comparison to private universities.

The issue of graduate student salary also came up, especially the comparison that showed UCR students as being paid very poorly compared to the other UC campuses. This possibly had a lot to do with the fact that some graduate students were being paid for 9 months, and others for 11 months or whether they were in a medical school campus.

The EC committee members also felt that the report is light on outcomes, not just for the education of our undergraduates, but for graduate education, the research enterprise and the impact of all other facets of UC on the State and the Country. This is important for justifying our relationship to the Cal State system. Finally, many of the parameters of the data (e.g., details about the population demographics, etc.) are missing. They will often cite a source, but the reader must return to the source for this critical information.

Regarding the question on whether the Report used the right indicators, the majority of the EC members felt that they would have preferred to know what the indicators were to be used for? The general feeling was that they cannot change the indicators, but perhaps there should be a way of framing them so that they are compelling to the Regents and also include a broader scope.

The Report has absolutely no data on UCOP. This quasi 11th campus, must be included in the final version of this Report, with its own set of metrics.

Some specific concerns about UCR data
pg 137/section 6.12
pg 135/section 6.11

Possibly there may be a methodology issue with the "first-choice non-UC school" statistic for Riverside. This went from $12.5K to $10K going from 2004 to 2007. It should stay the same or go up, unless we became much less selective. Alternatively we have to wonder if someone was averaging zeros in, or averaging a small group that is not representative of the whole population due to poor reporting.

We have to question the methodology that led to the statistic that a large portion of UCR PhD graduates are "looking for work" -- 36% at Riverside. Just this week one EC member was queried by his Graduate Administrative Assistant in Chemistry to define the location of PhD graduates in an e-mailed spreadsheet. Of five recent PhD graduates listed just from this professor's group, three of them were listed as "location unknown." However, all three actually had jobs, and have had jobs either before graduation (postdoc) or shortly after graduation (industrial). We can only guess that the data rely on self-reporting, and therein lies the issue, we believe.
The EC members indicated that they would welcome the opportunity to review the next draft version of the Accountability Framework Report.

The Chair thanked the members for their participation and ended the meeting by inviting them to the November Division meeting that was taking place on the same day at 2:10 PM.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Selwyn Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
November 17, 2008

TO:      A.W. NORMAN, CHAIR
         RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:      R. ARNOTT, CHAIR
         COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE:      2008-09 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.
Thank you for participating in the UC Riverside Faculty Survey. This survey is designed to let you give your opinion on a variety of important matters at UCR. The Survey Research Center is conducting the survey, so please feel free to answer honestly and candidly. Your opinion is very important and your honest feedback is sincerely appreciated. This survey is being sponsored by the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor with input and support from the Academic Senate.

Let us assure you that your individual responses will be kept confidential. All survey results will be combined and reported to UCR by organizational unit or group. Only groups with 5 or more respondents will be reported. At no time will your survey code be connected to your individual responses.

Please enter your four digit survey code. (Randomly assigned code)

Please use the following response options when answering the survey items. If you are unsure, or have not experience with a particular item please mark “No Opinion”.

Strongly Disagree.....Disagree.....Neutral.....Agree.....Strongly Agree.....No Opinion

CAREER OPPORTUNITIES
I understand the career path for UCR faculty.
My Department Chair/Dean encourages me to build a career at UCR.
I understand the procedures for attaining tenures.

MENTORSHIP
I have had a mentor at UCR.
(if Strongly Agree or Agree to above, then ask.. My mentor has helped provide me with a positive experience working at UCR)
It is important that a mentor and mentee are the same gender.
It is important that a mentor and mentee are the same ethnicity.

FACULTY AND CO-WORKERS
I have good working relationships with colleagues in my department.
I am satisfied with the staff support I receive.
Faculty treat staff members with respect.
Faculty morale in my department is good.
Faculty morale has improved in my department over the past 2 years.
There is an atmosphere of collegiality among the faculty at UCR.

COMMITMENT
I am proud to say that I am a faculty member at UCR.
I expect that I will still be working for UCR in 5 years.
I would recommend UCR to people who are looking for a faculty position.
I am personally committed to help UCR achieve its goals.
(R) I would leave UCR immediately, if I could.

JOB ATTITUDES
I like my current job.
I am satisfied with the mix of research, teaching, and service in my position.
I am satisfied with my interactions with students.
I get a sense of accomplishment from my work.

PAY & BENEFITS
I understand the employee benefits that are available to me.
My employee benefits package meets my needs.
Compared to others in my rank and field, I am paid appropriately.

COMMUNICATION
There is open, two-way communication between my department chair and faculty.
There is open, two-way communication between deans and faculty.
There is open, two-way communication between senior administration and faculty.

DIVERSITY AWARENESS
Men and women are treated fairly at UCR.
Faculty of all age groups are treated fairly at UCR.
Faculty of different religions are treated fairly at UCR.
Faculty of different races are treated fairly at UCR.
Faculty are treated fairly at UCR regardless of sexual orientation.
UCR provides appropriate resources for faculty with disabilities.

PERFORMANCE FEEDBACK & EVALUATION
The evaluation process for faculty is fair at UCR.
The criteria for evaluation are applied consistently across campus.
Faculty in my department receive necessary information about what it takes to advance.
My rank and step accurately reflect my performance.
Service activities receive appropriate weight in the evaluation process.
Teaching accomplishments receive appropriate weight in the evaluation process.
Research activities receive appropriate weight in the evaluation process.
The evaluation process works efficiently at UCR.

RECOGNITION
Faculty receive recognition within the department for their research accomplishments.
Faculty receive campus wide recognition for their research accomplishments.
Faculty receive recognition within the department for their teaching accomplishments.
Faculty receive campus wide recognition for their teaching accomplishments.
Faculty receive recognition within the department for their service contributions.
Faculty receive campus wide recognition for their service accomplishments.

STUDENTS
I am satisfied with my current teaching load.
I am satisfied with the quality of incoming undergraduate students.  
Incoming students are academically prepared for collegiate work.  
The quality of incoming undergraduate students has declined over the last 5 years.  
UCR is able to attract high quality graduate students.

LEADERSHIP  
UCR senior administration respects faculty members’ opinions.  
Faculty members respect UCR senior administration.  
I have confidence in UCR senior administration.  
UCR senior administration understands faculty members’ concerns.  
My dean understands the concerns of faculty members in my college.  
My dean respects the opinions of faculty in my college.  
Faculty members in my college respect my dean.  
I have confidence in my dean.  
My department chair understands the concerns of faculty members in my department.  
My department chair respects the opinions of faculty in my department.  
Faculty members in my department respect my department chair.  
I have confidence in my department chair.  
UCR does a good job welcoming new faculty.

WORK AND FAMILY BALANCE  
My work schedule allows time for my personal/family responsibilities.  
I am satisfied with my schedule.  
I can balance my personal/family responsibilities with my current workload.  
UCR values a formalized work/life balance (i.e. family leave, stop tenure clock, etc.).  
I am satisfied with the housing options available in the area.  
I am satisfied with my commute.

WORK RESOURCES  
I am satisfied with my work space.  
I am satisfied with the start up support I received when I joined UCR.  
I am satisfied with the computing resources provided to me.  
I am satisfied with the library resources at UCR.  
I am satisfied with the intramural grants I’ve obtained to support my work.  
I am satisfied with the staff support I receive to attain external funding.

CAMPUSS COMMUNITY  
I am involved in the student recruitment process.  
I am involved in fund raising activities for UCR.  
I understand UCR’s seven strategic goals.  
UCR has effective options for conflict resolution.  
I am prepared to manage conflict situations that arise on campus.

OVERALL SATISFACTION  
Overall, I like working at UCR.
ATTRACTION FACULTY
Please indicate the importance of each of the following factors for attracting high quality faculty to UCR.

**Essential…..Very Important…..Important…..Slightly Important…..Not Important**

Flexible Schedules
Onsite Childcare
Affordable Housing
Advancement Opportunities
Competitive Salaries
Spouse/Partner Career Accommodation
Competitive Startup and Research Support
Health Benefits
Available Elder Care
Diverse Academic Community (Faculty, Staff, & Students)

SURVEY IMPRESSIONS
This survey was easy to take.
This survey adequately addressed issues that are important to me.
I believe that senior administration and deans will use the results of this survey effectively.

OPEN-ENDED COMMENT
Please provide any comments or suggestions that you believe may help improve UCR as a place to work.

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES TO CONSIDER INCLUDING IN DATAFILE
Gender
Race
Age
Tenured
Rank (Full Professor, Assoc. Professor, Asst. Professor, Instructor, other)
Hello Dr. <respondent>,

My name is <interviewer>, and I’m calling from the Survey Research Center at the University of California, Riverside. At the request of the Academic Senate and Provost, we are conducting a confidential survey with faculty who have left UCR.

The Senate and Provost are interested in better understanding the circumstances that have led faculty to leave UCR. We would like to take about 10-15 minutes of your time to ask you some questions about this. We recognize that some of these matters are quite private and sensitive. These data will not be used in any way that allows anyone to know your individual responses.

If you would be willing to help us by answering a few questions, we can do this in any one of three ways. We can continue this phone interview right now, or we can schedule a more convenient time to talk on the phone.
<if elects to do survey, proceed>
<if elects re-contact, confirm phone number and time. Say: > Thank you very much for your help. An interviewer will contact you to complete the survey.

Or

We can direct you to a secure web-site where you can complete the survey on –line.
<collect contact email, say: > You will receive an email message with a link to the website within the next several days, we would appreciate your earliest possible response.

Or

We can mail you a paper copy of the survey with return postage.
<collect contact mailing address, say: > you will receive a copy of the survey with return postage very soon. When you do receive it, we would appreciate your earliest possible attention
First, could you share with us some information about your situation since leaving UCR? I’m going to read a list, and ask you to indicate whether each item describes you, or not. Please tell me which of these best describes your situation.

After leaving UCR, my occupation was:
- [ ] Ladder faculty at a private university or college
- [ ] Non-ladder faculty at a private university or college
- [ ] Ladder faculty at a public university or college
- [ ] Non-ladder faculty at a public university or college
- [ ] Non-academic job in the private sector
- [ ] Non-academic job in the public sector
- [ ] Returned to school
- [ ] Not working outside the home for pay
- [ ] Other, please describe

Thanks for sharing this.

Next, we would like to find out what factors were important considerations for you in leaving UCR. We’re going to divide the questions into research, teaching, and service areas. We also have a few questions about campus, community, and family issues.
First, let’s talk about research. I’m going to read you a list of factors that various people have told us played some role in their leaving UCR. After each item, would you tell us whether this factor was very important, important, somewhat important, or not important in your leaving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor- Research</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial/infrastructure support for my research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of my research in the review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Graduate program in my department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative quality of program at UCR vs. present institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Research Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of graduate student researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you care to elaborate on any of these items that were very important?  

Were there any other factors related to your role as a researcher at UCR that impacted your leaving? Please describe:  

Next, tell us about factors relating to your teaching role. After each item, would you tell us whether this factor was very important, important, somewhat important, or not important in your leaving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor: Teaching</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall teaching load and/or teaching load equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support resources for teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate teaching opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of my teaching contributions in the review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Interaction with undergraduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Interaction with graduate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you care to elaborate on any of these items that were very important? `<cite items>`

Were there any other factors related to your role as a teacher at UCR that were very important or somewhat important in your leaving? Please describe: `<text box, or record as near to verbatim as possible>`
Next, tell us about factors relating to your service role. After each item, would you tell us whether this factor was very important, important, somewhat important, or not important in your leaving?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor: Service</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall service load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support, opportunities and resources for the service role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of service contributions in the review process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you care to elaborate on any of these items that were very important?<cite items>

Were there any other factors related to your service role at UCR that were very important or somewhat important in your leaving? Please describe: <text box, or record as near to verbatim as possible>
Now we would like to know about the influence of other features within the institution on your decision to leave UCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor: Institutional</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social climate on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity or equity concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus administrative leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus academic leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you care to elaborate on any of these items that were very important? 

Were there any other institutional factors at UCR that were very important or somewhat important in your leaving? Please describe: 


Finally, can you comment on the importance of these issues from outside the campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor: Off-campus</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air quality, pollution, population density, transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of housing, or living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s educational opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cultural amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career opportunities for spouse/partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/family issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you care to elaborate on any of these items that were very important? <cite items>

Were there any other off-campus factors at UCR that were very important or somewhat important in your leaving? Please describe: <text box, or record as near to verbatim as possible>
Thank you very much for taking the time to share your experience and reasons for leaving UCR with us.

Can you think of any issues or concerns that were particularly important in your decision to leave UCR that we haven’t discussed?

<record as close to verbatim as possible>

From your experience, are there any changes that you might suggest that would help UCR retain faculty?

<record as close to verbatim as possible>
Chair Norman  
Academic Senate  

RE: Campus Naming Committee – Building Name Change  

Dear Tony:  

As Chair Designee of the UCR Committee on Naming Campus Properties, Programs and Facilities, I am requesting the review and approval by the Academic Senate Executive Council for these naming opportunities.  

- **Highlander Union Building** is the proposed name for the Commons Expansion building project. This naming opportunity has been recommended and approved by the Commons Board of Governors.  

- **Highlander Plaza** is the proposed name for the Commons Piazza, a large outdoor patio just east of the Commons Expansion. This area will be used by student orgs, vendors, and campus groups as outdoor seating for dining and small scale concert venue.  

Please review the attached request and summary details. This proposed name needs approval by the Academic Senate before it is endorsed by the Campus Naming Committee. Please respond with your recommendations by Friday December 19th, 2008.  

Sincerely,  

[Signature]  
Gretchen Bolar  
Vice Chancellor  

Attachments  

xc: Vice Chancellor Diaz  
Interim Vice Chancellor Aldrich  
Director Lehr
SUMMARY INFORMATION

UCR: NAMING CAMPUS PROPERTIES, ACADEMIC AND NON-ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, AND FACILITIES

Proposed Names: *Highlander Union Building (HUB)*
*Highlander Plaza*

Building Background:
- Project Name: Commons Expansion Building
- Capital Asset Account Numbers: P5514
- Building Basic Gross Square Feet: 119,871 gsf
- Building Assignable Square Feet: 68,860 asf
- Location: UCR Core Campus

Description: The Commons Board of Governors unanimously approved the renaming of the student commons from the Commons to the Highlander Union Building (HUB) and the commons piazza to the Highlander Plaza.

See attached Background Information.

Site Map:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
FOR
COMMONS EXPANSION BUILDING AND COMMONS PIAZZA

November 12, 2008

Gretchen Bolar
Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning & Budget

Dear Gretchen,

At their October 24, 2008 meeting, the Commons Board of Governors unanimously approved renaming the student commons from the Commons to the Highlander Union Building (HUB). They also unanimously approved naming the piazza the Highlander Plaza as identified in the attached drawing. I am now submitting these two names for approval by the UCR Naming Committee.

While there are other areas and rooms in the Commons the complex itself and the piazza require naming at this time. The Commons is in the midst of an environmental and way-finding signage study which is expected to conclude by December and will require finalizing the two names for fabrication.

HIGHLANDER UNION BUILDING

Over the years, and through many changes in its membership, the Commons Expansion committee consistently endorsed the naming of the student commons as The Highlander Union Building, or HUB. The acronym HUB accurately captures the role of the student commons as the community center of the university and its location at the crosswalks of many activities and campus life at UCR. The word "union" brings the campus in alignment with the convention used at many other campuses for their student centers. Examples include the Ackerman Student Union at UCLA, the Memorial Union at UC Davis, and Titan Student Union at CSU Fullerton.

Earlier in 2008-09 VCSA conducted a focus group with students to acquire their reaction to different names for the student commons. HUB emerged as their top choice.

HIGHLANDER PLAZA

The Highlander Plaza is a large outdoor patio designed as a programmable space to be utilized frequently by student orgs, vendors, and campus groups for tabling and other activities. The area will also be used as outdoor seating for dining and small scale concert venue during after hours. Naming this area is needed for way-finding, marketing the piazza as a venue, and identifying the location of activities occurring in the piazza.

James W. Sandoval
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

Co: Danny Kim, AVC Student Affairs Administration
    Todd Wingate, Director, University Commons
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
FEBRUARY 17, 2009

Proposed Change in Regulation R2.1.2, R2.1.3, R2.1.4

To be adopted:

Present:

R2.1.2  By the successful completion of the requirement in a junior college or other accredited institution;

R2.1.3  By successful completion of the examination in American History and Institutions;

R2.1.4  By the successful completion of one college course in the field of American History or one college course in the field of American Government. A list of courses which fulfill this requirement may be obtained in the College offices or the Office of the Registrar.

Proposed:

R2.1.2  By the successful completion of the requirement in a community college or other accredited institution;

R2.1.3  By the successful completion of one college course in the field of American History or one college course in the field of American Government. A list of courses which fulfill this requirement may be obtained in the College offices or the Office of the Registrar.

Justification:  The Committee on Preparatory Education has reviewed the history of R2.1.3 and the very few instances when it has been utilized as a means to satisfy the American History requirement. At one time, "the examination" referred to a standardized history exam that was to maintain on file in the Senate office. Previous Committee on Preparatory Education membership, in consultation with History faculty, concluded that such a method was unworkable. In 1993, Committee on Preparatory Education voted to alter the wording of R2.1.3, but the motion was never forwarded to the Division for approval. This proposed change to R2.1.3 is viewed as unnecessary by the current Committee because credit for any class (including those identified under R2.1.4) can be obtained through a petition to challenge the course by examination. The change in wording from junior to community college reflects current usage without making any substantive change.

Approved by the Committee on Preparatory Education:  November 6, 2006

Approved by the Executive Committee:  CHASS:  11/29/06
Approved by the Faculty-CHASS:  1/10/07
Approved by the Executive Committee:  CNAS:  11/28/06
Approved by the Faculty-CNAS:  11/3/08
Approved by the Executive Committee:  College of Engineering:  11/27/06
Approved by the Faculty - COE:  12/18/06
Approved by the Executive Committee:  AGSM:  8/7/08
Approved by the Faculty -AGSM:  8/7/08
Approved by the Executive Committee:  Graduate School of Education:  1/7/07
Approved by the Faculty - GSOE:  1/16/07

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: November 7, 2008

Endorsed by the Executive Committee:
Proposed change in bylaw 8.18.1
Committee on Planning and Budget

To be adopted:

Present:

8.18.1 The committee will have eight members of tenure rank. One committee member shall be appointed from the social sciences departments and programs of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; one member from the arts departments of that college; and one member from the humanities departments and programs of that college. One committee member shall be appointed from the natural sciences departments and programs of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences; one member from the biological sciences departments and programs of that college; and one member from the physical sciences departments and programs of that college. Two committee members shall be appointed from the professional colleges/schools. The Chair normally also serves on the University Committee on Planning and Budget. (Am 25 May 95) (Am 28 May 98).

Proposed:

8.18.1 The committee will have nine members of tenure rank. One committee member shall be appointed from the social sciences departments and programs of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences; one member from the arts departments of that college; and one member from the humanities departments and programs of that college. One committee member shall be appointed from the natural sciences departments and programs of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences; one member from the biological sciences departments and programs of that college; and one member from the physical sciences departments and programs of that college. One committee member shall be appointed from the College of Engineering, one from the Anderson Graduate School of Management and one from the Graduate School of Education. The Chair normally also serves on the University Committee on Planning and Budget. (Am 25 May 95), (Am 28 May 98), (AM --- Feb 09).
Justification:
This composition would enable us to always have on hand a representative from each of the core campus units, which is important when issues come to P & B. In recent years many issues from the professional schools and colleges have come up and this type of representation would have been very useful. A broad and representative membership also creates more direct lines to convey information from P & B back to the campus units.

Effective: Winter 2008

Approved by the Committee on Planning and Budget: November 6, 2008
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: November 12, 2008
Endorsed by the Executive Council
October 23, 2008

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: RAYMOND RUSSELL, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM

RE: MID-QUARTER GRADES

The Committee on Academic Freedom discussed the proposal to require mid-quarter grades in all lower division courses at its first meeting of the year on October 10.

Members of the Committee thought that the goal of giving mid-quarter feedback to students was very desirable. Committee members were concerned, however, that to require instructors to issue mid-quarter grades might violate the academic freedom of those instructors, by limiting their choice of evaluation criteria. Some instructors may currently grade students on the basis of quarter-long projects that are evaluated only at the end of the term. This proposal would require such instructors to find ways to assign letter grades to students’ intermediate progress. This might make these instructors feel constrained to replace or augment their current system of evaluation with a more segmental one.

Given that this proposal, if adopted, might require a number of instructors to alter their evaluation practices, Committee members also felt that not enough had been done in the proposal to document the magnitude of the problem and to show how this requirement would help.

The Committee on Academic Freedom recommends that instructors should be encouraged to issue mid-quarter grades, but should not be required to.
November 5, 2008

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DANIEL STRAUS, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: BCOE MID QUARTER GRADE POLICY PROPOSAL

The CEP discussed the BCOE Mid Quarter Grade Policy proposal at its meeting on October 31. We believe that the following are good general principles for the grading of courses:

- Students should be provided at the beginning of all courses with a clear and accurate explanation of how the course is graded.
- Actual grading of each course should be consistent with the standards set forth at the beginning of the course.
- Students who are in danger of failing a course should be notified of this as early as possible and counseled regarding means of improving their performance.

Nevertheless, we doubt that imposition of a rigid one-size-fits-all policy on mid quarter grading is desirable. We commend BCOE for their efforts in this area; however, the proposed plan has been in effect in BCOE for only one quarter, allowing inadequate time for feedback from students and faculty. Aside from identifying students at risk for failure, assignment of a letter grade (i.e. A,B,C,D,F) to students at mid quarter is not always feasible because of the importance of the second and third midterm exams, the final exam, and final term papers in many courses. We therefore cannot recommend adoption of this proposal by the Senate (0 Yes, 7 No, 0 Abstentions). Instead, we encourage all departments to consider the best way of providing early feedback to students regarding performance in courses presented by that department.
June 23, 2008

TO: PIERRE KELLER, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

ROBERT L RUSSELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

FM: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

Re: Mid Quarter Grade Policy

The Executive Council met and discussed the proposal from the BCOE Executive Committee and they unanimously voted to have the same forwarded to your committees for further review.

Please send your response to me by **August 1, 2008**.

Attached
Thomas,

BCOE is actively seeking to improve the experience and retention rates of our undergraduate majors. Based on many years of interactions with students, mid-quarter grade feedback appears to be an area where improvements are sorely needed and could have great impact. In many courses, students do not receive good grade feedback during the quarter, due to significant graded items appearing only very late in the quarter, to delays in grading, to ambiguous grade information (e.g., showing scores but without relation to grades), and/or to other factors. As such, students often do not realize that they should be working harder or seeking help, or that they should consider withdrawing from the course to take it again when better prepared or better able to focus on the course. Please note: We entirely understand that blame also resides with students in many cases; we are also seeking to improve our students, while simultaneously improving our courses where clear problems exist.

Mindful of academic freedom issues and of the importance of avoiding overly-cumbersome bureaucratic hurdles, while also seeking to improve the experience and retention of undergraduate students, BCOE requests that the campus develop a campus-wide mid-quarter grade policy for UCR LOWER-DIVISION courses (where retention is critical and where student ability to gauge progress is lesser developed than in upper-division courses). A policy might exhibit the following:

- A clear definition of course points and grading scale should be provided (these already should be included in a standard course syllabus)
- Several school days before the quarter's last day to withdraw, a grade based on substantive course points should be provided to students and (minimally) to college student affairs staff also.

Substantive means that the percentage of total course points should be appropriate for mid-quarter (while a hard cutoff may be unwise, 10% would clearly be too low), should be reasonably reflective of key course components (e.g., a course with a midterm and a final of equal weights should probably have the midterm included in the mid-quarter grade), and should use the course’s defined course points and grading scale.

BCOE has adopted the above policy for all its own lower-division courses, implemented for the first time in Spring 2008. In our case, instructors demonstrated to a designated BCOE Student Affairs Advisor that grade feedback had been provided to students (typically via iLearn), and instructors also sent spreadsheets to the advisor indicating student names, mid-quarter grades, and percentage of total course points that grade reflects. A campus wide policy may require a different approach, perhaps similar to iGrade in which instructors report not only grades but also the percentage of total course points.
While we recognize that other UCs may not utilize mid-quarter grades, we not only also recognize that UCR students have backgrounds that may make university success more challenging, and we also seek to see UCR grow to become a top institution that is unique in its commitment to each student's success. We also point out that many excellent universities, such as CMU, have established mid-semester grading -- e.g., http://www.cmu.edu/hub/reg/grading_policies.html states that "Mid-quarter grades provide valuable feedback to students as they assess their performance in courses. Furthermore, mid-quarter grades and the QPAb identifying and dealing in a timely way with students in academic trouble." We also note that UC Merced appears to have a formal mid-quarter grade policy; see: http://registrar.ucmerced.edu/2.asp?uc=1&lvl2=73&lvl3=73&lvl4=83&contentid=121.

Thank you for attention to this important student matter.

Frank Vahid
------------
Professor, Computer Science & Engineering Chair, Faculty of the College of Engineering University of California, Riverside, CA 92521-0304 vahid@cs.ucr.edu, http://www.cs.ucr.edu/~vahid
(951)827-4710 (Fax: 827-4643)