October 22, 2009

TO: Mary Gauvain, Acting Vice Chair, Psychology
    Dan Ozer, Secretary Parliamentarian, Psychology
    Richard Arnott, Economics
    Steve Axelrod, English
    Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering
    Christine Gailey, Women’s studies
    John Ganim, English
    George Haggerty, English
    Dan Hare, Entomology
    David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies
    Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences
    Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
    Doug Mitchell, GSOE
    Len Mueller, Chemistry
    Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies
    Erik Rolland, AGSM
    John Trumble, Entomology
    Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences
    Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering
    Alan Williams, Earth Sciences
    Jose Wudka, Physics
    Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences
    TBD- Diversity

FR: Tony Norman, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, October 26, 2009

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, October 26, 2009, at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.
I. Approval of the October 26, 2009 Agenda and September 28, 2009 Meeting Notes. 

Conflict of Interest Statements – Planning and Budget, Courses, General Education advisory Committee, Educational Policy, Academic Personnel, CNAS Executive Committee, CHASS Executive Committee, BCOE Executive Committee, Scholarships and Honors, Distinguished Campus Teaching, Distinguished Campus Service, Rules and Jurisdiction, Library and Faculty Welfare, International Education

II. Review of Bylaw No. 8.15.1 – International Education

For information only

III. Differential Fee Proposal: 

Discuss the proposal to charge differential fees for certain undergraduate majors -

IV. Day of Action letter from Dept of English

Discussion item

V. Senate Executive Council Luncheon with the WASC Visiting Team on Wednesday, October 28th, in Room 355 of the Highlander Union Building (HUB)

Discussion item – what is expected of Executive Council members

VI. Any Other Business

- Participate in the development of a Strategic Plan for UCR (by March).
- Participate in the budget cutting activities necessary for UCR for the next fiscal year (2010-20).
- UCR medical School; participate with the administration on generating a new business plan.
- Consideration of the Vice Chair succeeding to become the Divisional Chair process after one year.
- Professor of the Graduate Division (for Emeriti)
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 28, 2009

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Kathleen Montgomery, Vice Chair, AGSM
Dan Ozer, Secretary Parliamentarian, Psychology
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
John Ganim, English, Preparatory Education
George Haggerty, English, Gen Ed Advisory Committee
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Vivian Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
John Trumble, Entomology, CAP
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly
Alan Williams, Earth Sciences, Graduate Council
Jose Wudka, Physics, Educational Policy
Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS Executive Committee
   TBD- Diversity
   TBD – AGSM Executive

ABSENT:
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
Christine Gailey, Women’s studies, Committees
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
(Diversity and Equal Opportunity

GUESTS:
Chancellor Timothy White
Dean Steve Cullenberg
Mary Gauvain – Acting Vice Chair
Professor David Oglesby
David Bocian, Associate Vice Provost Academic Personnel

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The agenda was accepted as written.
Furlough Exchange Program
AVP David Bocian indicated that 7 campuses have already implemented the furlough exchange program which would allow faculty who are subject to the Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan to devote extra effort to extramurally funded projects in exchange for furlough time. These programs are open to full-time academic appointees in the Professor series (including adjuncts and Professors-in-Residence), Lecturers with Security of Employment series, Astronomers, Agronomists, and Cooperative Extension Specialists. VP Bocian indicated that eligible faculty may participate in either the Full-Year Furlough Exchange Program or in the Partial Year Furlough Exchange Program the details of which were listed on the APO website. VP Bocian described the two options that were available to faculty and that is – option one allowed faculty to participate for the entire period of the furlough programs, while option two allowed faculty to participate in the program on a partial basis.

A question arose about the fact that at the beginning of the budget crisis, the campus community was told that we were all in it together, however, now it is slowly splintering and staff remained at risk. The Chancellor indicated that it was not possible to allow staff to participate in the program due to union employee issues. He also mentioned that the UC Administration felt that it was important that they do all they could to retain its faculty and this was one mechanism that was available for those faculty that have grants. Also discussed was the issue of 19900 funds as well as endowment funds.

The three committees that reviewed the proposal were CAP which met face to face and unanimously endorsed the proposal. Faculty Welfare distributed it via email and some concerns raised were the issue of equity and accessibility. Planning and Budget met and all were in favor of implementation of the program.

After some discussions, the EC committee approved a motion to support the implementation of the Furlough Exchange Program as presented to the Senate.

CHANCELLOR:
Chair Norman indicated that he had asked the Chancellor to give the EC an update on the Medical School, and two, what part of qualities we might put forth in the search for UCR’s new EVC and Provost.

The Chancellor indicated that the search for the inaugural Dean for the Medical school was going on well. They are negotiating with one individual and he was planning to put an offer out to him with the hope that he will start in Feb/March 2010. No funding from the state of ca – resources will come from an allied health grant and discretionary funds in his office. Basic model will change. Candidate feels strongly that establishing the graduate component should be the first step taken. There will be a new business plan which will be forwarded to the Senate for review. The salary for the inaugural dean will be paid based on a process where he/she will be required to meet certain milestones. The salary will include a base salary and an incentive based salary. The base does not build up. The Dean would be a tenured faculty member in the Division of Biomedical Sciences.
The Chancellor then discussed the on-going EVC and Provost search which he was co‐
chairing with Dean Steve Cullenberg. He indicated that the campus has engaged a company
to help with the recruitment. He expects the candidate to start in the spring of 2010 and
that they will be on campus. It was the Chancellor’s hope that he would get some advice
from the Senate EC committee on what kind of individual was best suited to the position.
Some of the suggestions made included:

1. A candidate with the skill set to deal with a lot of angry people – i.e., a
   compassionate candidate;
2. A candidate who had some knowledge of shared governance;
3. A candidate who had the ability to engage and understand the budget;
4. A candidate who understands the importance of protecting the core of the
   university;
5. A candidate who was a scholar and who had respect for faculty;
6. A candidate who respects diversity and understands the culture of diversity at UCR;
7. A forward leaning applicant.

A suggestion was made that the Chancellor consider returning control for the simple merit
process to the VP for Academic Affairs. This duty puts a lot of strain on the already full
portfolio of the EVC and Provost.

It was very important to protect the core of the University, and the EC members were
concerned that with the scarce resource, effort should be made to preserve what we are
good in. Acknowledging that the EVCP position had a big portfolio, the Chancellor restated
that what he was hearing was that the candidate should have the right set of experiences,
right academic credentials, understanding of finance and the ability to protect the core
activities of the university, being fair and able to handle criticism. On his own, he said that
he thought the individual should have the ability to communicate honestly and timely, and
should have an interest in knowing the faculty – academically as well as their frustrations,
and finally, be able to enable creativity of the faculty. A question arose about the
sequencing of the strategic plan and the hiring of the individual. The Chancellor indicated
he would hope that the individual would have an opportunity to look at the plan in
whatever shape it will be in around November and make sure that they buy into it and can
execute it. He was not eliminating the possibility of having the individual adding their own
thumbprint, but what he wanted to avoid was have the individual not accept the strategic
plan and the campus having to do a complete 180 turn around and have to start all over
again.

"LISTENING FORUM," OF THE PRESIDENT’S TASK FORCE ON POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS - DAN
HARE – CHAIR, FACULTY WELFARE:
Chair Dan Hare informed the EC members of a taskforce that had been appointed by
President Yudof to develop a comprehensive, long-term approach to managing the costs of
post-employment benefits for faculty and staff of the University of California earlier this
year. The task force is comprised of three teams, one to examine pension benefits, another
to examine retiree health benefits and a third to examine finances. Members of this task
force are visiting the campuses this Fall to hold forums to present their recommendations
and answer questions from faculty, staff and retirees. The forum at UC Riverside will be
held on October 19 in Room 302 of the Highlander University Building (HUB). The task force will be making three separate presentations at the times listed below. Although the first and third presentations may be slightly modified for their target groups, all presentations are open to all current and retired faculty and staff members. He wanted to find out from faculty in what form they wanted the presentation, e.g., via audio podcast. He wanted them to send suggestions to him as soon as possible.

**Mission Statement:**
The Executive Council members discussed various iterations of the Mission Statement that was created at the retreat. After further discussions, the EC agreed that the members would turn in their drafts to the Chair who will then ensure that we have a final document.

**2nd Annual Great California Shake-Out:**
Professor Oglesby from the Department of Earth Sciences indicated that for the second year in a row, UCR will participate in the largest earthquake drill and like he did the year before, he had come before the EC members to seek their endorsement in an effort to get faculty to participate in their classrooms. The EC members unanimously endorsed the motion to recognize the Great California Shake-Out and to encourage the faculty to participate.

**Suggestions to Faculty concerning a Major Medical Emergency from a Teaching Perspective:**
Chair Tony indicated that at the Cabinet meeting held that morning, the guest was from the Riverside County Health Physicians and the purpose of his visit was to discuss plans of how to handle a possible breakout of flu. He indicated that the handout sent out was an attempt to give the faculty guidance on what to do should they be sick. There was a strong sentiment from the members who felt that the issue should be left to the Deans and Chairs to handle rather than expecting the faculty to do it. If a faculty member has an illness, there are specific instructions on what to do. Tony indicated that what the Administration wanted was some kind of reminder to the faculty on how to handle any kind of illness.

In an effort to help the students, the EC felt that Tony should get the message across to the Health Center that they should try as much as possible to give students absence notices when they report sick with flu and have been out more than a day.

Finally, Chair Norman discussed the following topics that he would like the EC to tackle in the coming year.

1. Discussion of initiating the process of returning the Graduate Council back to the Senate
2. Strategic Plan – led by EVCP Rabenstein
3. Budget cutting decisions for 2010-11 – for consideration of the P&B and possibly Executive Council
4. New Business Plan for the School of Medicine
5. Consideration of the Vice Chair succeeding the Chair after one year. The EC touched briefly on this topic last year, and he would like the current EC to revisit this topic and find out whether this should continue as it is.
6. Berkeley has a program called the Professor of the Graduate Division – a program for faculty who retire but do want to continue being productive members of the system.

7. Finally, he wanted the EC to consider selecting the Chair of Committee on Committees.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30=20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Selunya Ehlers
Executive Director
Academic Senate
October 2, 2009

TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: CAROL LOVATT, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST 2009-10

The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed and revised their conflict of interest statement and has adopted the following Conflict of Interest Statement for 2009-10 by a unanimous vote:

Potential conflicts of interest may occur as members of the committee formulate recommendations concerning the allocation of faculty positions to the several academic units on campus. Accordingly, members of the Committee on Planning and Budget will be available to offer the Committee information and to participate in discussion, but will excuse themselves from the vote on matters pertaining to departments and programs of which they are members or through which they might materially benefit.
October 12, 2009

TO:    A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    T. SHAPIRO, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON COURSES

RE:    CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Courses approved the following statement at their October 12, 2009 meeting:

If an issue comes before the Committee on Courses that emanates from the department or program of a committee member, he/she will provide information, but will not vote on the issue.
October 12, 2009

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: GEORGE HAGGERTY, CHAIR
GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

RE: 2009-2010 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The General Education Advisory Committee met on October 8 and adopted the following statement on Conflict of Interest:

The committee has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. It is the obligation of the committee member involved and any committee member aware of a potential conflict of interest of another member to bring the potential conflict to the attention of the Chair. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
October 12, 2009

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR  
RIVERSIDE DIVISION  

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY  

RE: CEP 2009-2010 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT  

The Committee on Educational Policy unanimously (11 Yes votes, 0 No votes) adopted the following statement on Conflict of Interest at its October 9, 2010 meeting:

The CEP has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. It is the obligation of the committee member involved and any committee member aware of a potential conflict of interest of another member to bring the potential conflict to the attention of the Chair. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
September 23, 2009

To: Anthony Norman  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: John Trumble  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Conflict of Interest Statement for 2009-2010

In accordance with Division Bylaw 8.2.5, the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel has adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement for 2009-2010 by a vote of +9-0-0.

There is an expectation that Committee members will neither participate nor vote in departmental meetings when formal discussions and votes are held for merit, promotion or appraisal actions. Individual exceptions to this understanding will be reviewed by the Committee, and exception statements will be filed with a copy of this statement and maintained in the Academic Senate Office. In these exceptions, the Committee member will not participate in related discussions or votes taken by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

In addition, Committee members will notify the Chair of the Committee whenever they believe a conflict-of-interest exists regarding their own participation or the participation of any other Committee member in any action under consideration by the Committee. If the matter concerns the Chair of the Committee, members will notify the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Faculty members who are members of departmental search committees, or those voting on appointments in their home departments, will not participate in related discussions or votes taken by the Committee on Academic Personnel.

The Vice Chair of the Committee on Academic Personnel will assume the duties of the Committee Chair for the review of personnel files from the Chair’s home department.

A standing committee (Shadow CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel actions that involve current CAP members or their spouses/partners. This committee will consist of faculty who have previously served on CAP. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees.

The CAP recognizes its responsibility to maintain the utmost confidentiality and fairness in its deliberations. Accordingly, it is the duty of members of CAP to refrain from discussion of any personnel actions with anyone outside CAP either before or after CAP considers a file.
Date: September 29, 2009

TO: Anthony Norman
Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Marylynn Yates
Chair, Executive Committee
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

RE: Conflict of Interest

At its first meeting of Fall Quarter 2009, the Executive Committee of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences decided that if a member of the Committee perceives that a conflict of interest is present, he or she will bring it to the attention of the Committee. The Committee will then decide how the conflict of interest, if it is agreed that one exists, will be handled.

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

MY:cp
October 01, 2009

SUBJECT: 2009/10 Conflict of Interest Statement

ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
Academic Senate

The Executive Committee of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences met on October 01, 2009 and discussed the issue of Conflict of Interest. The Committee decided that if a member of the Executive Committee sees a conflict arise, he/she will bring it to the attention of the Committee, and the Committee will deal with it at that time.

David Herzberger, Chair
Executive Committee, CHASS
October 2, 2009

TO: Anthony W. Norman, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Jay Farrell, Chair
Executive Committee, Bourns College of Engineering

RE: 2009-2010 Conflict of Interest Statement

This was read and unanimously approved at the October 2, 2009 BCOE
Executive Committee meeting.

Bourns College of Engineering
Executive Committee
2009-10 Conflict of Interest Statement

If the personal affiliation of a committee member with an organization or
individual or individual bringing business before the committee might be
interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member
should bring this fact to the attention of the committee, and the committee
member may be asked to provide information, as appropriate, on the
business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any
motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the
committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive
discussions, motions, or votes.
September 29, 2009

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: A. HUANG, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON SCHOLARSHIPS AND HONORS

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST 2009-2010

The committee on Scholarships and Honors adopted the following conflict of interest statement.

The Committee on Scholarships and Honors has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with a department, program, or individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. The committee member will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes related to the business. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
October 5, 2009

TO:    A.W. NORMAN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    SCOTT L. FEDICK, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED TEACHING

RE:    CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching unanimously approved the re-adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2009-10:

The Committee on Distinguished Teaching has adopted the following policy for situations in which personal affiliation of a Committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in Committee deliberations. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The Committee Chair may ask the Committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
September 29, 2009

TO:   A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    J. BRIGGS, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON DISTINGUISHED CAMPUS SERVICE

RE:    CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Distinguished Campus Service approved the adoption of the following conflict of interest statement for 2009-10:

The Committee on Distinguished Service has adopted the following policy for situations in which personal affiliation of a Committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in Committee deliberations. A member whom the Committee deems to be subject to a conflict of interest may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The Committee Chair may ask the Committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions or votes.
SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

TO:  A.W. NORMAN, CHAIR
     RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:  J. CIOFFI, CHAIR
     COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

RE:  CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT FOR 2009-2010

In accordance with Bylaw 8.2.4, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction re-adopted the following statement for handling potential conflicts of interest in the 2009-2010 academic year.

In cases where a committee member's affiliation with a department or program, or with an individual bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a potential conflict of interest, that committee member will identify himself/herself and the potential nature of the conflict. The other members of the committee will decide if a potential conflict does indeed exist. If so, the committee member may subsequently be asked to provide information on the business under consideration but will be excluded from participating in any consideration of said business. The committee member may be excluded from participation in substantive discussions, communications and deliberations concerning the matter, the making of motions, and/or voting.
October 14, 2009

TO: Anthony Norman, Chair
    Academic Senate, Riverside Division

FR: John Baez, Chair
    Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

RE: Conflict of Interest Statement

The Library and Scholarly Communication Committee has re-adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement covering the Committee’s business for 2009-2010.

If personal affiliation of individual committee members with departments, programs, or with individuals bringing business before the Committee may be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, such member(s) shall not participate in the relevant discussion and shall be recorded “not voting” in the event a vote is taken on that issue. Determination of such possible conflict of interest shall be made by the affected member him/herself or by the majority vote of the Committee.
September 30, 2009

TO: A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: D. HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT 2009-2010

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

The following policy has been adopted for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the Committee on Faculty Welfare might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. Members of the Committee on Faculty Welfare are asked to identify when they may have a potential conflict of interest on any items before any discussion. The Committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Faculty Welfare.
October 20, 2009

TO: A. NORMAN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: Y. YE, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

RE: 2009-10 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

At its meeting of October 20, 2009, the Committee on International Education adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement:

The Committee on International Education has adopted the following policy for situations where the personal affiliation of a committee member with departments, programs, or individuals bringing business before the committee might be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations. The committee member may be asked to provide information, where appropriate, on the business under consideration, but will be excluded from participating in any motions or votes in regard to the business under consideration. The committee chair may ask the committee member to leave the room during the period of any substantive discussions, motions, or votes.
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
DECEMBER 1, 2009

To be adopted:

PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
BYLAW 8.15.1

Present:

8.15.1 This committee consists of at least five members and (ex officio) the campus director of the Education Abroad Program, who may not serve as the Chair of the Divisional committee. The Dean of University Extension, the director of the International Education Center, the director of University Extension's International Education Programs, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student will serve as non-voting representatives on the Divisional committee. The representative on the Universitywide committee is normally the Chair of this committee. (Am 26 May 88) (Am 27 May 99) (Am 11 Nov 04)(Am 20 Nov 07) (Am __ _____ 09)

Proposed:

8.15.1 This committee consists of at least five members and (ex officio) the Associate Vice Provost – Undergraduate Education, who may not serve as the Chair of the Divisional committee. The Dean of University Extension, the director of the International Education Center, the director of University Extension's International Education Programs, an undergraduate student, and a graduate student will serve as non-voting representatives on the Divisional committee. The representative on the Universitywide committee is normally the Chair of this committee. (Am 26 May 88) (Am 27 May 99) (Am 11 Nov 04)(Am 20 Nov 07) (Am __ _____ 09)

Justification:
There is no longer a position for the Campus Director of the Education Abroad Program. The replacement for this position will be the Associate Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education.

Approved by Committee on International Education – October 20, 2009
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: October 21, 2009
Presented to the Executive Council for Information on: October 26, 2009
CHAIRS OF SENATE DIVISIONS
CHAIRS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

Dear Senate Division and Committee Chairs:

I am writing on behalf of Academic Council Chair Harry Powell to transmit Interim Provost Pitts’ request for “Senate input” on the proposal to charge differential fees for certain undergraduate majors. As you know, the proposal was presented to the Regents for discussion in September and is scheduled to be presented for action in November. The Academic Council will discuss the proposal at its October 21 meeting.

Harry is well aware that the time for this review is insufficient to permit a full consultation but will appreciate your efforts to gather the insights of your constituencies and as contributions to Council’s discussion. Any written comments you submit by October 20 will be forwarded to Council by email.

Thank you for your ongoing engagement and commitment.

Sincerely,

Martha

Martha Kendall Winnacker, J.D.
Executive Director, Academic Senate
(510) 987-9458

From: Yvonne Perrelli On Behalf Of Lawrence Pitts
Sent: Wednesday, October 07, 2009 3:37 PM
To: Henry Powell
Cc: President's Office; Daniel Simmons; Nathan Brostrom; Patrick Lenz; Martha Winnacker; Jan Corlett
Subject: Differential Fee Proposal, Second Revision

On behalf of Interim Provost Lawrence Pitts, I am transmitting the attached letter regarding a differential fee proposal. This letter is a second revision to the letter distributed on October 6, 2009. This letter provides clarification on when the Advisory Group for Budget Strategies met and identifies those participating in the Group from the Academic Council. For your convenience and reference, the text of the letter is pasted below. The signed letter is attached as a PDF file.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR HENRY POWELL

Re: Differential Fee Proposal, Revised

Harry,

The President has proposed that the University establish a $900 annual fee for upper-division business and engineering students, effective 2010-11, with a 33% return-to-aid. As you are aware, this proposal was included in the September Regents discussion item on the UC budget and fee increases:
President Yudof would like to bring this proposal to the Regents for action in November. Enclosed please find two documents that summarize the proposal and provide background information on differential undergraduate fees at other universities around the country. The proposal had been discussed by the UC Advisory Group for Budget Strategies that met in the Spring of 2009 and included Academic Council Chair Mary Croughan, UCPB Chair Pat Conrad, UCAP Chair Steve Plaxe, and UCSB Division Chair Joel Michaelsen.

I am writing to formally request Academic Senate input on the proposal and details of its implementation prior to the November Regents meeting.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President Academic Affairs

Enclosures

cc: President Yudof
Academic Council Vice Chair Simmons
Interim Executive Vice President Brostrom
Vice President Lenz
Executive Director Winnacker
Chief of Staff Corlett
October 7, 2009

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR HENRY POWELL

Re: Differential Fee Proposal, Revised

Harry,

The President has proposed that the University establish a $900 annual fee for upper-division business and engineering students, effective 2010-11, with a 33% return-to-aid. As you are aware, this proposal was included in the September Regents discussion item on the UC budget and fee increases:


President Yudof would like to bring this proposal to the Regents for action in November. Enclosed please find two documents that summarize the proposal and provide background information on differential undergraduate fees at other universities around the country. The proposal had been discussed by the UC Advisory Group for Budget Strategies that met in the Spring of 2009 and included Academic Council Chair Mary Croughan, UCPB Chair Pat Conrad, UCAP Chair Steve Plaxe, and UCSB Division Chair Joel Michaelsen.

I am writing to formally request Academic Senate input on the proposal and details of its implementation prior to the November Regents meeting.

Please let me know if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Enclosures

cc: President Yudof
Academic Council Vice Chair Simmons
Interim Executive Vice President Brostrom
Vice President Lenz
Executive Director Winnacker
Chief of Staff Corlett
Differential Charges by Undergraduate Program of Study

Issues Summary

Context

The relationship between declining state support for public higher education and rising undergraduate tuition has been well documented. Another emerging practice among public research universities is to charge differential tuition rates for students pursuing different majors. Long a practice among graduate programs, universities are increasingly seeking to refine their pricing of undergraduate programs in search of new revenue streams. Business and engineering programs have been the most common targets for differential charges since the early 1990’s. However, recent years have seen the practice expand to a wide range of professional fields such as architecture, journalism, and health sciences; and traditional liberal arts and science fields such as physics, chemistry, and life sciences.

While the practice of charging differential tuition by program has become more widespread, little research has investigated it. One study assesses the prevalence and magnitude of differential fees in 2007-08 through a survey of 162 public research institutions. All of the findings below, along with the figures in Attachment 1, come from this study unless otherwise indicated.

Prevalence

In 2007-08, 46 percent of public research institutions assessed differential charges by undergraduate field of study. More than half of those did so in multiple fields. About 53 percent of the AAU Public Institutions assessed differential charges in 2007-08. Business and Engineering are the most common fields for differential charges. Two-thirds of the surveyed public institutions that assessed differential undergraduate charges in 2007-08 did so with their business or engineering programs.

Magnitude

In 2007-08 the average differential tuition charge across all disciplines was an 11% premium over the base tuition rate. Engineering programs charged an average premium of 14 percent above undergraduate resident tuition, which ranged from $50 to $1,896.2

A targeted search of UC’s public four comparators and other public research institutions showed 9 out of 12 institutions assessing differential undergraduate charges in 2008-09, with all of them doing so in business and engineering. These differential charges range from $266 to $4,152.3 Attachment 2 at the end of this report summarizes these findings.

---


2 Nelson, 2008. Represents additional tuition only charge. Additional course fees not included.

3 Source: institutions websites. Differential charges reflect all additional tuition and fees charged.
Budgetary Impact

The incremental revenue generated by differential tuition for undergraduate programs averaged 2% of an institution’s total tuition revenue in 2006-07. The majority of differential tuition revenue is returned to the programs charging it. Differential tuition revenue returned to the programs is commonly earmarked for specific purposes including teaching expenditures, equipment, technology needs, and financial aid.

Potential UC Budgetary Impact

Differential charges would have to be set at a fairly high level to generate a significant amount of additional revenue. Table 1 below displays estimates of the additional revenue that would have been gained in 2007-08 from various levels of differential charges for business and engineering majors. As it shows, assessing a differential fee of $500 would have generated between $8 million and $13 million depending on whether the charge was assessed on upper division business and engineering majors only or on all declared majors. This would have represented less than 1 percent of UC’s core funds in 2007-08. Assessing a differential business and engineering fee of $2,500, which is on the higher end of the spectrum found in Nelson (2008) and other sources, would have generated up to $66 million in additional revenue, or just over 1 percent of UC’s core 2007-08 funds. Additional factors, such as the undergraduate return-to-aid rate and whether the differential charge would apply to nonresident students, would likely further reduce this amount.
Table 1. Estimated Additional UC Revenue From Differential Charges for Undergraduate Business and Engineering Majors Based on 2007-2008 Academic Year Average Enrollment by Declared Major Field of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differential Charge Scenario</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500 Differential For Upper Division Only</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase Over 2007-08 Systemwide Undergraduate Resident Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Students in 2007-08</td>
<td>16,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Additional Revenue ($ millions)</td>
<td>$8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2007-08 UC Core Funds¹</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 Differential For Upper and Lower Division</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase Over 2007-08 Systemwide Undergraduate Resident Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Students in 2007-08</td>
<td>26,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Additional Revenue ($ millions)</td>
<td>$13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2007-08 UC Core Funds¹</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 Differential For Upper Division Only</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase Over 2007-08 Systemwide Undergraduate Resident Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Students in 2007-08</td>
<td>16,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Additional Revenue ($ millions)</td>
<td>$24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2007-08 UC Core Funds¹</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 Differential For Upper and Lower Division</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase Over 2007-08 Systemwide Undergraduate Resident Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Students in 2007-08</td>
<td>26,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Additional Revenue ($ millions)</td>
<td>$39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2007-08 UC Core Funds¹</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 Differential For Upper Division Only</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase Over 2007-08 Systemwide Undergraduate Resident Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Students in 2007-08</td>
<td>16,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Additional Revenue ($ millions)</td>
<td>$41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2007-08 UC Core Funds¹</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500 Differential For Upper and Lower Division</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Increase Over 2007-08 Systemwide Undergraduate Resident Fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Students in 2007-08</td>
<td>26,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Additional Revenue ($ millions)</td>
<td>$66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of 2007-08 UC Core Funds¹</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differential charge amount is equal for business and engineering majors in all scenarios.
Business majors include business and management, but does not include economics majors.
Engineering majors include Computer Science.

¹ The 2007-08 UC Core Funds is $5,213,436,000 and is comprised of revenue from:
State General Funds, Education Fee, Nonresident tuition, Registration Fee, Application for Admission, Selected Professional Fees.
Motivations

Cost Recovery

Cost recovery has been a principal motivator of undergraduate tuition differentials. Program-specific revenue streams enable programs to make otherwise unaffordable improvements to their equipment and physical space that directly benefit students. This rationale often applies more to science and engineering programs, and tuition differential proponents argue that it reduces the need for other lower-cost programs (humanities) to cross-subsidize their operations. In some cases, student groups have voted in support of tuition differential to ensure quality improvements of their educational programs.

Remain Competitive for Faculty

Other programs cite the need to remain competitive for high quality faculty as a key reason for charging differential tuition. This includes covering costs to retain high-priced faculty and to meet their goals for faculty expansion. Business, computer science, and engineering programs often must compete with industry for faculty members, and the 1990’s booms in the financial and technology sectors made this more difficult. Whether the recent declines in the financial sector will relieve some of this pressure for business schools remains unclear.

Align With Graduates’ Earnings Potential

Another rationale offered for differential tuition is the belief that students in particular programs can bear higher costs due to their likely post-graduate earnings potential and programs see it as an opportunity to capture otherwise foregone revenue for improving the quality of the program. While this is sometimes the case for students in business and engineering programs, many people also change career paths several times and undergraduate major remains a poor predictor of lifetime earnings.

Impacts on Student Choice

To date no research explores the impact of differential undergraduate tuition by program on student access or success. However, the Nelson (2008) study showed that concern over the potential impacts on student access was one of the most frequently cited reasons for institutions’ choosing not to adopt differential tuition by undergraduate program in 2007-08.

---

4 A July 2007 New York Times article specifies “expenses of specialized equipment” as one of the main reasons for differential tuition gleaned from interviews with public university officials. A May 2008 article in the University of Wisconsin newspaper mentions the need for “frequent updates to lab equipment” as a reason for the college of engineering’s differential tuition. See http://www.news.wisc.edu/15284

5 Texas A & M Vice President G. Dan Parker III indicated that his institution was considering differential tuition in its business school due to the high starting salaries it needs to pay assistant professors.

6 University of Kansas Provost Richard Lariviere labels the student earnings rationale as the weakest and least widespread argument for undergraduate differential tuition.
DRAFT

Questions

Concerns about the effects of differential tuition seem to focus almost exclusively on the undergraduate experience including enrollment patterns, student learning experience, and financial aid policies. Questions for further investigation include:

- Would differential tuition discourage low-income students from choosing business and engineering majors? How would it affect diversity?

- Would students in higher-cost programs feel less inclined to take cross-disciplinary courses to ensure they get their money’s worth in their home programs? How would this affect the breadth of students’ education?

- Would the practice erode the university commitment to access, exploration, and the unfettered pursuit of knowledge?

- What are the financial aid policies at institutions that have implemented differential tuition by program at the undergraduate level and do they mitigate or exacerbate the impact of the differential on student choice of major?

- In California, would the state Cal Grants cover the additional charges associated with select undergraduate programs of study?

Sources


“Paying by the Program.” Inside Higher Education. March 26, 2007


Attachment 1 – 2007-08 Differential Tuition by Discipline

% of Institutions with Differential Tuition by Undergraduate Program

- Public Research Institutions
- AAU Public Institutions
- Land Grant Institutions

Source: Nelson, 2008

Number of Institutions with Differentials by Discipline

Differential Tuition as a Percent of Published Tuition

Source: Nelson, 2008
### Attachment 2. Summary of Differential Charges by Field of Study and/or Student Level Among Select Public Research Universities

Resident Undergraduates, 2008-09

#### Differential Charges by Field of Study Only

| Institution                  | Resident Base Fees | Liberal Arts | Business | Engineering | Other  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>$8,682</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,528</td>
<td>$2,290</td>
<td>$232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>$12,240</td>
<td>$4,152</td>
<td>$4,152</td>
<td>$4,152</td>
<td>$1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>$7,724</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,735</td>
<td>$1,096</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>$11,562</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
<td>$1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td>$8,090</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,264</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>$7,569</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$999</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Differential Charges by Field of Study and/or Student Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Uniform Charges</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$900 to $1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>$438</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$770</td>
<td>$200 to $500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$9,490</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### No Differential Charges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Uniform Charges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUNY - Buffalo</td>
<td>$6,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>$7,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>$6,802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: admissions and financial aid websites of each institution.

1. All figures reflect additional charges assessed on a full-time resident undergraduate over the 2008-09 academic year compared to the base rate.

2. Disciplines vary by institution, and include some of the following:
   - Dental Hygiene
   - Pharmacy
   - Kinesiology
   - Environmental & Biological Sciences
   - Journalism
   - Agriculture, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences
   - Second-Career Nursing
   - Architecture
   - Music
   - Economics
   - Fine/Applied Arts

### Notes:

- Students in dual degree programs charged higher rates.
- Began in 2004. Liberal Arts charges limited to Chemistry/Life Sciences.
- Course Fees. Do not apply to new freshman. Differentiate across 8 disciplines. Pharmacy has largest premium, and Education the smallest.
- Differential is greater for nonresident students.
- Engineering differential fees began in 2005. Engineering fees to be spent on expanding faculty, teaching more sections, and adding equipment.
- Began in 2007-08. Rationale for business/economics charges based on graduates' future earnings potential. Other departments on cost recovery.
- Described in the brochure as a "computer fee" for each field.
- Liberal Arts charge for upper division applies to all majors.
- Entering Virginia residents pay a $190 premium. The additional charge is removed for continuing students.
Differential Fees for Undergraduates by Discipline

Proposal: The President has proposed that the University establish a $900 annual fee for upper-division business and engineering students, effective 2010-11, with 33% return-to-aid.

Background: At the September Regents' Meeting the following text regarding differential fees appeared in Discussion Item F1, “Update on the 2008-09 and 2009-10 Budgets, Preliminary Discussion of the 2010-11 Budget, and Proposed 2009-10 Mid-Year and 2010-11 Student Fee Increases”:

Differential Undergraduate Fees by Discipline. The University also intends to ask the Regents to establish differential fees for undergraduates in certain disciplines, effective for 2010-11, similar to professional differential fees at the graduate level. The University is currently exploring implementing differential fees for students at the upper-division level (i.e., undergraduates in their junior and senior years) in business and engineering, in recognition of the higher costs associated with offering these programs. It is expected that differential fee levels in 2010-11 would be under $1,000 annually. Various implementation issues will need to be addressed, including the return-to-aid component and impacts on access, affordability and diversity, in order to assess this fee in 2010-11.

Many other public institutions charge differential fees by discipline; in 2007-08, 46 percent of public research institutions and 53 percent of Association of American Universities (AAU) public institutions assessed differential charges by undergraduate field of study. More than half of those did so in multiple fields. Business and engineering are the most common fields for differential charges. In 2007-08, the average differential tuition charge across all disciplines was an 11 percent premium over the base tuition rate, and the incremental revenue generated by differential tuition for undergraduate programs averaged two percent of an institution’s total tuition revenue in 2006-07.

Process: The appropriate OP units will be consulting with the following groups:

- Executive Vice Chancellors
- Vice Chancellors for Planning and
- Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs
- Undergraduate Deans
- Engineering Deans
- Business School Deans
- Budget Directors
- Institutional Research
- Registrars
- Financial Aid Directors
- Academic Senate

1 The full text of the item is available at http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/sept09.html; click on the September 16, 10:15a Finance Committee meeting and agenda.
Campus representatives from each of these groups should also collaborate to develop recommendations.

Current Recommendations:

- Fee Type: Current proposal is to establish the differential fee as another level of the Educational Fee (vs. a campus-based fee) so that differential fees will qualify for Cal Grant coverage.
- Campus Participation: Once an agreement is reached defining the types of programs to be included, all campuses must charge the fee for programs fitting that definition. The fee would not vary by campus.
- Financial Aid Policy: Financial Aid Directors support treating the fee as part of the student budget in the EFM model; needy students would have the same loan/work expectation as students not subject to the fee.
- Terms Charged: Fee would be charged for all terms starting with the seventh quarter or the fifth semester of enrollment; equivalent to the fall term of the junior year for most students. The fee would not be charged to students enrolled during the summer term.
- Use of Funds: Because the fee is being implemented to address the University’s budget shortfalls, rather than engineering and business program quality issues, at the campus level, funds would be allocated at the discretion of the Chancellor.

Additional Questions:

Programs:

- What programs/majors would be covered? How should the category of “business” majors be defined? Would campuses without business schools be required to charge the fee to students majoring in “business economics”? Should social science economics majors be included? Would computer science majors be included in the engineering category?
- What guidelines should be used to determine which programs would charge the fee, now and going forward?
- How many of these programs have normative time-to-degree above four years?

Applicability:

- When are students required to declare a major?
- Would fifth-year students be charged the fee?

Change of major:

- If a student opts out of a major after paying the fee, will the student be eligible for a refund?
- If a student opts into a major after some period of not paying the fee, will the student be charged retroactively?
- How should double majors be treated? How should business/engineering double majors be treated?
Other:

- Educational Fee revenues are normally treated as equivalent to State funds and redistributed across campuses according to General Funds budgets, but other fee funds are generally retained by source campuses. Should the revenue generated by the differential fee be distributed among the campuses to address systemwide needs or retained by the source campus?
- Do students paying the differential fee also pay Course Materials Fees, or should only non-majors pay these?

Future Steps:

- OP to develop materials for Regental approval of differential fees.
- OP to convene a systemwide group with a representative from every campus to discuss implementation issues, develop recommendations, and develop a plan for monitoring the impact of the fee on students.
We, the faculty of the UC Riverside English Department, join with our many colleagues throughout the UC system in supporting the principles behind the current campus protests, as expressed most recently in the Day of Action on September 24, 2009. Our support is predicated on the following:

- Our commitment to our students, many of whom will no longer be able to afford to continue their education in the face of continually and steeply rising tuition (“fees”);
- Our concern for UC’s most vulnerable employees, those earning the least and those without long-term contracts, who are having to endure cuts to their already low salaries and the prospect (in some cases, the actuality) of mass lay-offs;
- Our opposition to the ever-widening gap between the salaries of UC’s top administrators and the frozen or plummeting salaries of those university employees (faculty and staff) whose labor constitutes the very heart and backbone of the UC system;
- Our dismay at the continuing erosion of both the ideal and the reality of a system of public higher education offering access to all Californians;
- Our consternation that the Master Plan for Higher Education in California—a document that has served us so well for so long and that has helped produce a top-ranked university system, the model and envy of others throughout the country—is being dismantled bit by bit, to the detriment of both the reputation and the quality of the university;
- Our solidarity with the students, faculty, and staff of the California State University system and the California Community Colleges, who also face severe budget cuts, fee increases and enrollment limits, further undermining the Master Plan’s guarantee of access to higher education for all Californians;
- Our desire for complete transparency with regard to UC’s finances and budgetary allocations, which includes a full accounting of how much money is being earmarked for what purposes, and by whom;
- Our belief in a system of shared governance whereby faculty views and input, as (for example) expressed in positions taken by the Academic Senates on the several campuses, are respected and heeded, not summarily dismissed or overruled by the administration.

In light of the points listed above, we support the following measures:

- No further increases in student tuition (“fees”);
• No salary reductions at all for employees earning $40,000 or less; and no further salary reductions for faculty or staff earning more than $40,000;

• A halt to mass layoffs of faculty until the consequences of such layoffs—in terms of increased work loads, larger class sizes, fewer classes offered, the difficulty of students’ getting the courses they need to graduate, etc.—are fully examined and weighed in an open forum;

• A full and open accounting of UC’s budget and finances to the UC community at large;

• A reaffirmation—and an actual putting into practice—of the principle of shared governance.

In addition, we urge President Yudof to expand the membership of the Gould Commission so that it doesn’t simply reflect the views of the business sector and professional schools but is truly representative of the university as a whole.
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