December 10, 2009

TO: Mary Gauvain, Acting Vice Chair, Psychology  
    Kathleen Montgomery, Vice Chair, AGSM  
    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

FR: Tony Norman, Chair  
    Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, December 14, 2009

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, December 14, 2009, at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.</strong> Approval of the December 14, 2009 Agenda and November 9, 2009 Meeting Notes.</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.</strong> Conflict of Interest Statements – Preparatory Education</td>
<td>2(pp. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.</strong> Photo Roster for Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and Action item- VPUE Fairris and Tom Payne will appraise the EC on the idea and seek approval for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.</strong> Sustainability Plan for Learning Outcomes at UCR</td>
<td>3(pp. 7 - 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion item – see attached. Decide on whether the Senate should establish an Ad Hoc committee of the Senate or a Joint Administrative Senate Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.</strong> Course Enrollment Management – New Functionality for Population Restrictions:</td>
<td>4(pp. 9 - 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion item – see attached</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.</strong> Proposal to Divide Finance and Management Science into 2 Departments – Action item – see attached responses</td>
<td>4(pp. 14 - 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI.</strong> Any Other Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UCR Bylaws – calendar days vs. instruction days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSIDERATION OF THE VICE CHAIR SUCCEEDING TO BECOME THE DIVISIONAL CHAIR:
Chair Norman indicated that after having been Chair for 1 year, he has given a lot of thought to this issue and came to the conclusion that having a Vice-Chair elect designate makes for a much stronger chair. The current system leaves the chair at a disadvantage. Changing the bylaw will provide for a chair who is more prepared to represent UCR at systemwide and divisional meetings. He has also discussed this issue with other divisional
chairs and those who had similar arrangements as UCR felt the same way he did that the first year was a learning process. He went on to describe the arrangements at other UC campuses and in 4 campuses, the Committee on Committees (CoC) appointed the Vice Chair or Chair. Campuses that had 2 year terms include UCD, UCSF, UCSB, UCSC and UCR while UCLA, UCSB, UCI, UCSD and UCM had one year terms. He proposed that the EC consider an arrangement where the Vice chair is elected (or appointed by the CoC) for one year, after which he/she succeeds as Chair. The outgoing chair would remain a member of the Executive Council for a one year term. This would mean a total of three years. A member of EC felt that this was a great suggestion but thought that the Vice Chair should be elected and not appointed by CoC. A concern raised was that of finding suitable candidates who would commit to a three year schedule. After further discussion, the EC passed a motion to ask the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to review the current bylaws and prepare a draft set of bylaws that will change the process as described above. The motion passed unanimously (14-0).

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Another proposal brought forward by Chair Norman was to consider changing the current system of having a divisional meeting to having one of Legislative Assembly whereby, the membership would be made of a representative from every department within a college and would also include the members of the Executive Council. He indicated that he felt that this would be a fair way to represent departments. After some discussions, it was agreed that the Chair would prepare a packet for discussion and approval by the entire Senate.

Exit and Climate Survey:
The Exit survey was complete and all that remained to be done was to evaluate the data. The Climate survey was launched on Friday November 13. The problem we are currently facing is who will evaluate the data and prepare the report. The EC members thought it should be the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Diversity. Diverging a little, Chair Norman informed the EC that to date, we had no Chair for Diversity, and requested that members think of some suitable candidates who would be willing to chair the committee.

Strategic Planning:
Chair Norman indicated that his office staff had done an analysis of all the faculty members involved in the Strategic Planning process. Currently there were 122 faculty 34 of whom were non-faculty and 88 faculty – which accounted for roughly 37% of senate committee members. With this large number, he wondered if the EC felt that there was a need to add additional faculty to the committees. The EC members felt that there was enough senate representation and that there was no need for further action.

Concerned Faculty:
Chair Norman indicated that he had been contacted by a faculty member who is one of the organizers of the Concerned Faculty Group about creating an iLearn Blackboard site for the group to communicate with one another as well as with the senate. There was a suggestion that this should be a Senate sponsored website or blog. Chair Norman felt that this was an issue that needed deliberation by the entire Executive Council. He especially wondered if the EC members felt that this should be an official senate blog and whether the senate should even attempt to get involved.
A discussion ensued and some members felt that the idea of the Senate supporting the blog would help dispel some of the rumors and myths going around. It was also felt that it would provide the Senate an opportunity to correct misstatements and at the same time, give the faculty an opportunity to raise some of the issues they were concerned with. The members also felt that access to the blog should be given to every faculty member. In the end, the EC members agreed that Chair Norman should proceed and contact Leo Schouest from C&C to help with creating the iLearn blog.

**Open Enrollment:**
Dan Hare, Chair of Faculty Welfare, wanted to bring to the attention of the EC members a new statement that had appeared on the open enrollment forms. The statement is as below:

The University of California intends to continue the benefits described here indefinitely; however the benefits of all employees, retirees, and plan beneficiaries are subject to change or termination at the time of renewal or at any other time by the University or other governing authorities. The University also reserves the right to determine new premiums, employer contributions and monthly costs at any time. Health and welfare benefits are not accrued or vested benefit entitlements. UC's contribution toward the monthly cost of the coverage is determined by UC and may change or stop altogether, and may be affected by the State of California's annual budget appropriation.

Following that, the "submit" button required the following:

You acknowledge and accept all terms and conditions of the UC-sponsored plants in which you are enrolled as stated in the plan booklets and UC's Group Insurance Regulations. OP was contacted about the problem and they were not able to indicate whether this was new language.

It was not clear whether this was new language or not.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

*Sellyna Ehlers*
*Executive Director*
*Academic Senate*
November 23, 2009

TO: A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: S. G. AXELROD, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Preparatory Education adopted the following conflict of interest statement:

In any situation, as determined by the Chair in consultation with other Committee on Preparatory Education members, wherein the personal affiliation of a committee member could be interpreted as a source of bias in committee deliberations, that member will be expected to exclude him/herself from making, seconding, or voting on any motion, made in the course of the deliberation. This exclusion will be noted in any report issued by the Committee on Preparatory Education.
Sustainability Plan for Learning Outcomes at UC Riverside
(Draft of 11-30-09)
Robert Gill

Approximately 2/3 of the departments and program faculty in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences have established multi-year assessment plans for their undergraduate majors. Deans Baldwin and Cullenberg will work with the remaining departments and programs to encourage them to prepare and submit to the Online Assessment Tracking System (OATS) their multi-year assessment plans.

Junelyn Peeples of Undergraduate Education and Leo Schouest of Computing and Communications will review and evaluate the OATS submissions. They will inform the deans of majors for which there are no multi-year assessment plans. They will inform the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy when a department or program has failed to submit to OATS, by the time set forth in its multi-year assessment plan, its assessment results (and, later, any subsequent actions taken). The Committee on Educational Policy will be expected to send a note to the department or program informing them that they are delinquent in submitting assessment results and actions to OATS, with a copy to the dean.

Junelyn Peeples and Leo Schouest will also be available for consultation with individual departments regarding learning outcomes assessment.

The progress made by a given department or program in the assessment process will be reviewed by the Committee on Educational Policy in the course its review of the department or program in the undergraduate program review process. This review will include an evaluation of the actions taken by the department or program, based on the assessment results.

The campus is establishing a Faculty Advisory Committee on Learning Outcomes Assessment, chaired by Dean Steven Bossert of the Graduate School of Education. There are faculty members on the Committee from each of the disciplinary areas of the campus (biological and agricultural sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, humanities, and arts). The Chair of the Academic Senate plans to propose to the Academic Senate Executive Council that the Committee be established as an ad hoc committee of the Academic Senate or as a joint administrative-Academic Senate committee. If this attempt is for some reason unsuccessful, the Committee will still exist as an administrative committee.

Junelyn Peeples and Leo Schouest will review the submissions in OATS to inventory the types of assessment processes proposed for the different majors, so workshops or training programs can be designed to assist departments and program faculty with the assessment process. The workshops or training programs will address best-practice approaches to collecting assessment materials, the best ways to store materials and prepare them for assessment, and the best ways of actually evaluating or assessing the materials (through such approaches as the use of rubrics). Where there is expertise on the Faculty Advisory Committee with respect to an assessment topic or process, those faculty will assist in the workshops or training programs. Where no such expertise exists on the Committee, attempts will be made to bring such expertise to the campus for the workshops. Junelyn Peeples and Leo Schouest will also comment to the Faculty
Advisory Committee on the validity of the processes that produced each of the assessment results.

Attention will also be devoted to developing the technical resources to assist departments and programs with the collection and storage of assessment materials, via electronic and other methods, where possible.
TO: Tony Norman, UCR Academic Senate Chair

FROM: Bracken Dailey, Registrar

CC: Theda Shapiro, Chair of the Committee on Courses

RE: Course Enrollment Management – New Functionality for Population Restrictions

DATE: November 16, 2009

At the request of the Committee on Courses, I, as Registrar, would like to formally and respectfully request that the UCR Academic Senate review and determine the required oversight process/policy for enrollment restrictions to be placed on courses.

Background

The Registrar’s Office, per a request from Dave Fairris, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, has worked with Computing and Communications to develop an enhancement in the Student Information System (SIS) which will allow very strategic, automated course enrollment management. This development, known as quota controls, provides functionality that can take the maximum enrollment of a course and control seat access by major, class level, learning community, etc. This functionality will likely be available for Spring 2010 registration.

The original request for the quota control enhancement was to facilitate the management of Learning Community (LC) courses by allowing sections that have LC students to be available to non-LC students prior to the make-up enrollment period. The process allows the department to determine X number of seats to be reserved or given priority for a specified population (i.e., exactly 10 seats are for LC students, no more than 10 seats are for LC students or at least 10 seats are for LC students).

During recent conversations with departments and colleges, it has become evident that this new automation that was designed for LCs will also be attractive to departments who are seeing an increased need to ensure students in their majors have access to courses required for graduation. Although not a documented procedure, an established precedent of restricting courses by major does exist, in that, Psychology and Economics courses were approved through the course approval process in 2004-2005 with a restriction based on major. As an example, “enrollment priority is given to Psychology majors” was added as a prerequisite/restriction to the Psychology courses based on the following justification:

To give priority enrollment to Psychology majors. This is an impacted course that is required for the Psychology major. Priority enrollment
allows Psychology majors to complete this course in a timely manner allowing them to move forward in their major.

There are approximately eight of these courses in the General Catalog (four are lower-division Psychology courses and four are upper-division Economics courses). This approved restriction has allowed these departments to fully restrict these designated courses to major students only. The oversight committee for this type of proposal and associated approval was the Committee on Courses.

Request

Recently, the CHASS Executive Committee requested guidance for review of new Sociology course proposals with restrictions based on major, and, in addition, the History department has inquired about the policy and procedures for making such a request. These new requests and the knowledge of the development of the quota control functionality have sparked new discussions among Committee on Courses, the Registrar’s Office and, in these specific cases, the CHASS Executive Committee. Committee on Courses did have some concerns which include the potential impact growing restrictions may have on interdisciplinary programs and other majors, such as Liberal Studies, Media and Cultural Studies, etc., that require coursework in more than one department.

Hence, I am requesting guidance from the Academic Senate to determine if designation of restrictions by student population is 1) at the discretion of the department offering the course and may be implemented by the department based on term-by-term enrollment management decisions or 2) at the discretion of a designated faculty body that must approve such enrollment restriction before implementation.

As standard protocol when considering policy and procedures, I queried our sister campuses to determine current practice on their campus. Out of six campus responses (not including UCR), only one campus requires course restrictions to be approved through the course approval process; the other five campuses noted that restrictions are at the discretion of the department (see Appendix A).

The Committee on Courses appreciates, in advance, your review and consideration of this request. Based on these conversations in the Committee on Courses and the intent of a Spring 2010 registration implementation for the quota controls, I respectfully request your opinion related to policy for enrollment restriction oversight.
Tony,

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Currently, Sociology is the only department who has submitted new courses for priority enrollment for majors. The courses they have submitted are:

SOC 129  
SOC 130  
SOC 133  
SOC 135  
SOC 140  
SOC 142  
SOC 144  
SOC 147  
SOC 149  
SOC 154  
SOC 159  
SOC 168  
SOC 169  
SOC 173  
SOC 174  
SOC 175  
SOC 180  

I know that Tom Cogswell from History is very interested and has talked to both Theda and me about the ability to restrict by major for History courses; however, he has not given us specifics related to which courses he is interested in. Please let me know if you need anything further from me.

Thank you  
Bracken
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>No formal policy as such at Irvine. The process is not overseen by any formal body; it is done at department discretion. No restrictions on number or percentage of restricted seats. We do have a code in place that limits a certain number of seats to new (incoming) students which is used in addition to major/minor restrictions to ensure incoming students get required courses. We work with the departments to ensure a consistent &quot;lift&quot; date of the restrictions listed above so that we can notify non majors and/or continuing students when to check back for classes. Naturally some courses are impacted to the level that the restrictions are never lifted and non majors only get in via the occasional petition. (Not many of these at Irvine, at least not yet.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>No policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Santa Barbara has a policy where the Senate committees that are a part of the course approval process (College Executive Committees, Committee on Undergraduate Academic Policy and Procedures) are involved during the approval process as major limitations can be specified there; these groups, many years ago, specified that departments could change some of the particulars about the course that were related to enrollment management, such as the major limitations, each term without going through the course approval process, as long as they were getting more restrictive than was formally approved; if they wanted to be less restrictive they had to go through formal approval; this however is under discussion right now and likely will result in some level of review, most likely the Dean of the college that works with undergraduate studies – so will remain a streamlined procedure but with some review no such restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Departments can place enrollment restrictions and take them off throughout the enrollment process. They can manage enrollment by major, minor, and level. It is at the department’s discretion. However, with the budget cuts, we experienced a shortage of classes for students to enroll in during the summer orientation sessions last year and this year. The director of the Orientation program worked with about 8 key departments with gateway courses for freshmen and transfers, and she negotiated a number of seats that she could roll out during the summer and either enroll the students in directly or use PTEs to enroll. This was very successful. There is now an enrollment management committee that is looking at the issues, but it has no authority to compel departments to either offer courses or to let non-majors in. Enrollment restrictions are not part of the course approval process. Restrictions can change throughout the enrollment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>At UCB, each department decides how to restrict their courses. It is not reviewed by the Senate. The department decides how many seats to reserve and whether or not to release them at any point in the enrollment period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>There is no formal policy. No central body—it is coordinated among the School requesting a restriction, campus advising representatives, and the Registrar’s office. The most recent need to restrict seats related to a high demand MATH class being restricted for Fall 2009 to students in certain majors. As Elizabeth mentioned, a restriction “lift” date was set so other students could check back to see if seats were available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>Concerning restrictions on courses, we permit departments to place restrictions and prerequisites by using the Course Approval process. I’m not aware of any other guidelines that are applied to restrictions on Course Approvals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 4, 2009

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: COURSE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT ISSUE

During its December 4 meeting, the CEP discussed the "Course Enrollment Management- New Functionality for Population" memorandum, and it was the Committee's opinion that enrollment caps be left to the department's discretion. The CEP was satisfied that the review of course changes are regularly carried out by the Committee on Courses, and where the impact on other majors is examined, is sufficient to regulate these changes.

The one remaining concern is for the possibility that enrollment will be limited in such a large number of lower division courses, that the students needing those for breadth requirements will be seriously affected. The CEP understands that this will also be monitored by the Committee on Courses at the time course change impact is reviewed.
NOVEMBER 17, 2009

TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: R. ARNOTT, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

At its November 17, 2009 meeting, the Research Committee discussed the Proposal to Divide Finance and Management Science into Two Departments. The Committee on Research found no significant research implications and therefore had no basis for objection to the proposal.
November 18, 2009

To: Anthony W. Norman  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: John Trumble  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Proposal to Divide Finance and Management Science into two Departments

CAP has no objects to the proposal to divide the Department of Finance and Management Science and form a new Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management (+9-0-0-0).
NOVEMBER 23, 2009

TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: DANIEL HARE, CHAIR
FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS

Procedures for the establishment of a new department call for the recommendation of a number of committees of the Academic Senate, including a recommendation from the Committee on Faculty Welfare. The Committee received the proposal to split the AGSM Department of Finance and Management Science into two departments on November 7, 2009 and discussed it by e-mail over the next two weeks. Whereas the proposal is formally complete, the justification lacked detail, and a substantial number of committee members were skeptical that the proposed action was driven by programmatic interests.

Others on the committee were concerned with the size of the new departments and their effectiveness in the merit and promotion process. Personal issues should play no role in evaluating a candidate's file, but such issues often creep into the review of files in small departments where candidates can easily infer how their colleagues may have voted. The Committee perceives this as being a serious concern for the smaller department that will have only three full professors to vote on each other's files. Although AGSM hopes to rectify this with future hires, it is unlikely that additional faculty positions can be allocated in the foreseeable future.

On balance, the Committee found the justification for the proposed action to be unconvincing and questioned the impact of the proposed action on the welfare of faculty participating in the merit and promotion process in the new departments.
November 23, 2009

Anthony W. Norman, Chair
Riverside Division
Academic Senate

At its meeting of Thursday, November 12, 2009, the Graduate Council considered your request dated November 9, 2009 to divide the Department of Finance and Management into the departments of Finance and Operations and Supply Chain Management. The Council feels that this is a reasonable step for Management to make at this time and therefore is in favor of the division of the departments.

Alan E. Williams, Chair
Graduate Council

AEW/vb
November 30, 2009

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO SPLIT TWO DEPARTMENTS

On November 20, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the proposal to split off the Department of Finance and Management and create the Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management. Several members expressed concern that the new department would be small, below the critical mass needed to attract majors and faculty, but this was balanced by the expectation that this will be remedied as the financial crisis eases. The Committee voted in favor of the proposal (4 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 2 Abstention votes).
November 30, 2009

TO: Anthony Norman
   Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Carol J. Lovatt
      Chair, UCR Academic Senate Planning and Budget

RE: Proposal from AGSM/SoBA to divide the Department of Finance and Management Science into two departments

On November 20, 2009, the members of the Planning and Budget Committee reviewed the request of David Stewart, Dean of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management/School of Business Administration (AGSM/SoBA), submitted through Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Dallas Rabenstein, to create a new Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management and rename the Department of Finance and Management Science the Department of Finance. Eligible voting members of the Planning and Budget Committee were unanimous in approving the request. Our positive vote was based on the following.

(1) The proposed change is consistent with the School of Business Administration’s newly adopted strategic plan and will purportedly foster collaboration between the operations and supply chain management faculty and faculty in the Department of Accounting and Information Systems, whereas none exists with the finance faculty in the current department structure.

(2) The proposed change was endorsed by all faculty who would be impacted by the change, except one who saw no benefit, the Executive Council of the School of Business Administration and by the Dean of AGSM/SoBA.

(3) There is no financial impact of the requested change to the campus. The only associated expense is a stipend for the chair of the new department, which is borne by the Dean of AGSM/SoBA.

(4) With regard to the small size of the two resulting departments, which is not atypical for the SoBA, the School holds 15.58 unfilled faculty
FTE that can be used to strengthen both departments once the current budget crisis ends.
December 3, 2009

TO: A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: J. BAEZ, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS

The proposal for the newly proposed Finance Department is based solidly on the current Finance faculty. However, it seems that the newly proposed Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management will engage in significant hiring when the budget situation improves. The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication has concluded that this will put more pressure on the library. Due to budget cuts, the library has had to cut its monograph (book) budget from its previous annual expenditure of $1.2 million by more than 50% for FY2009 and FY2010. It has also had to cancel many serials and impose other cost-cutting measures.

Thus, in order to develop both departments as "spires of excellence", as indicated in the cover letter from Dean Stewart, additional library funding will be required.
November 6, 2009

November 9, 2009,

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR EDUCATIONAL POLICY
    CAROL LOVATT, CHAIR, PLANNING AND BUDGET
    ALAN WILLIAMS, CHAIR GRADUATE COUNCIL
    JOHN TRUMBLE CHAIR COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
    VIVIAN-LEE NYITRAY, CHAIR, UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS
    DAN HARE, CHAIR, FACULTY WELFARE
    RICHARD ARNOTT, CHAIR, RESEARCH
    JOHN BAEZ, CHAIR, LIBRARY

FM: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS.

Attached, please find a proposal to divide the Department of Finance and Management into two departments.

I would appreciate receiving your response by November 30, 2009.

Attachments
Date: November 16, 2009

TO:     David Stewart
        Dean, School of Business Administration

FROM: Erik Rolland
      Chair, Executive Committee
      School of Business Administration

RE:     Recommendation for the creation of a new department

During the 2008-2009 academic year a group of faculty within the School of Business Administration (SoBA) met to discuss the possible formation of a department focused around the academic field of Operations Management. With several new hires, both at the senior and junior levels, the faculty felt that the group was sufficiently large to warrant its own department. Further, this group is currently in a department joint with Finance, which in itself is an unusual constellation. In most business schools, Operations Management is its own department, possibly joint with information systems. Thus, the (single) information systems faculty was included in the proposed SoBA department as well. The formation of such a department is in line with the school’s strategic plans, as one of the focus areas of the School of Business Administration is Supply Chain Management -- one of the main components of Operations Management.

After submitting the proposal for the new department to the dean, the proposal was discussed within the three current departments. In the Finance department, one faculty member opposed the proposal on grounds of lack of critical mass of faculty and students. In the Accounting & Information Systems (AIS) department, the proposal was supported, albeit the department wanted to retain the information systems group (1 faculty member) within AIS. This modification of the new department proposal was grounded in the development of both new academic programs, as well as joint research programs, where information systems was for the time being better aligned with the AIS department. Finally, the Department of Marketing and Management supported the formation of a new department as well.

After the above faculty consultation, the proposal was submitted to the Executive Committee. During its October 27 meeting of the Fall Quarter 2009, the Executive Committee of the School of Business Administration voted all in favor of creating a new Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management. The committee expressed that the creation of this department further strengthens the school with respect to its spires of excellence.
Erik Rolland, Ph.D.
Universal: 951.971.3745
E-Mail: erik.rolland@ucr.edu

Date: October 27, 2009

TO: Tony Norman
Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Erik Rolland
Chair, Executive Committee
AGSM/SoBA

RE: Division of the Department of Finance and Management Science

During its October 27 meeting of the Fall Quarter 2009, the Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management/School of Business Administration voted all in favor of creating a new Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management within AGSM/SoBA. The creation of this department further strengthens the school with respect to its spires of excellence.
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 30, 2009

TO: Dallas Rabenstein, EVC and Provost

FROM: David W. Stewart, Dean

SUBJECT: Division of Department of Finance and Management Science Into Department of Finance and Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management

The Faculty of the Department of Finance and Management Science have requested that the department be divided into two departments, the Department of Finance and the Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management. I believe this a reasonable request that is consistent with the way in which most other business schools are organized and with the strategic plan of the School of Business Administration.

The current department structure is highly unusual and appears to have represented an organization of convenience at the time of its creation. The current department structure appears to reflect needs to manage personalities among faculty members at the time the department was created rather than programmatic or strategic objectives. There are few synergies between discipline of finance and the disciplines of operations and supply chain management. Indeed, the disciplines of operations and supply chain management have more in common with other business disciplines such as accounting and marketing than with finance.

This division of the department will produce two departments that are not only very similar to departments found in other departmentalized schools of business but that are also more closely aligned with the strategic plan of the School. In late 2008 the Faculty of the School of Business Administration unanimously approved a strategic plan that identified five specific “spires of excellence.” Two of these spires are empirical finance and supply chain management. The Faculty would like to align our administrative and organizational structure with these spires. This reorganization also has advantages in dealing with external constituencies such as employers, potential donors and corporate partners because it cleanly separates two business disciplines that have very different constituencies, even within the same business organization.

This reorganization will result in a Department of Finance with seven ladder faculty members plus a research active emeritus faculty member. The School also has a fully endowed chair in finance that we plan to fill with a distinguished senior faculty member. The Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management would initially be composed of four faculty members, including three
full professors. However, this is also an area where the School has lost faculty members in recent years and that we anticipate building over time. We also anticipate that some other members of the current faculty, notably those in information systems, may wish to migrate to this department. The School currently has 15.58 unfilled faculty FTE, so once the current budget crisis ends there is ample opportunity to add to the faculty of both departments.

The cost of this division is minimal. The School of Business Administration currently uses a central business unit model for supporting departments and faculty members. This means that no staff members are assigned to individual departments.

The chair of the current department is in finance and would remain in the role of chair of the new Department of Finance. We have also identified a senior member of the operations and supply chain management faculty who is willing to take on the role of chair of the new Operations and Supply Chain Management Department.

There is agreement among the faculty within the School, including departments that are unaffected by this change, that this division of departments is in the best interests of the School and is consistent with our recently adopted strategic plan. The Executive Committee of the School has unanimously endorsed this proposal. As Dean of the School I see this change in departmental structure as critical to our continuing efforts to create a school of business administration of the highest quality.

Please let me know if you have questions or need further information. I would appreciate an expeditious decision.

David W. Stewart, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Business Administration and
The A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management
Anderson Hall 122
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

agsmdean@ucr.edu
http://agsm.ucr.edu/
May 22, 2009

To: David Stewart, Dean
    Anderson Graduate School of Management

From: Richard Smith, Chair
    Department of Finance and Management Science

Bifurcation of Department

You recently indicated that members of the management science faculty within the Department had indicated to you their interest in forming a separate department. I have raised this issue with the finance members of the Department and have found that with one exception the finance faculty are in agreement that bifurcation would result in a more effective structure (one junior member has indicated no preference). The majority are clearly in favor of bifurcation.

An over-riding consideration for me and others is that there are few if any synergies between the two parts of the Department. When I joined UCR, I thought there might be an opportunity to create departmental synergy around a curriculum designed to meet the needs of students interested in financial engineering. While I tried to encourage some collaboration around this opportunity, in my experience, the success of such efforts depends on there being champions for the initiative from both disciplines. Unfortunately, there is no such champion among the MS faculty, and, if anything the strategic focus of the school on supply chain management, tends to discourage collaboration around financial engineering.

Department member from MS, in general, have been good citizens in the finance recruiting efforts this year, as they often attended the candidate seminars and were available to meet with candidates. However, I believe the new collaborative effort across all AGSM departments which is to include within-school outside members on search committees will be a more effective way of ensuring that school-wide concerns are appropriately weighted in department-level hiring recommendations.

Moreover, in some important respects, the two groups in the department have not worked well together. Illustrative of the problems and reflective of the view held by several finance faculty members, one member of the faculty indicated:

I am strongly in favor of the split.

As you have observed, there is no synergy in research and teaching between the SCM/MS faculty and the finance faculty. [During my tenure at UCR], I have not seen a single collaborative research or teaching effort between [the longer term management science faculty] and the finance faculty.
Also, we do not quite understand the expected productivity, research outlets, and market condition of each other. Yet, there have been several occasions where the MS faculty basically decided (or attempted to decide) hiring and merit/promotions of finance faculty. Note that some of MS faculty cast votes even without meeting the job candidates or attending their seminars.

Splitting the department would solve this problem....

The faculty member who is not in favor of bifurcation sees no benefits and indicates that:

1. The intellectual balance that currently exists in the department will be destroyed
2. The decency balance in the department will also be destroyed

This view is in sharp conflict with the views of those who favor bifurcation.

My own view, as chair, is that even on simple matters the MS group seeks to act with almost complete autonomy. For example, on the simple matter of preparing a paragraph of text that could be placed on the Department website to help steer users into a set of pages related to MS, which paragraph needed to parallel a similar paragraph on finance, the MS group met a couple of times and after two or three weeks returned a multi-page discussion that was not usable. It took several more meetings and two or three more iterations before they finally produced a draft that could be used. This difficulty in working with them on the website has essentially stalled our efforts to develop the site.

Problems related to course staffing in the Department are exacerbated because two members of the MS faculty are program deans and see a diminished role of the Department in setting the curriculum and staffing the courses. I largely agree with them that they need to take the lead in this effort, as they know better than I what needs to be offered in the SCM/MS area, but under the current structure this has resulted in a number of miscommunications and convoluted communications with staff. Bifurcation would solve this problem.

There are other issues related to how the Department has functioned. Some of them are symptomatic of the personalities involved. I have tried not to focus on those issues, and instead to concentrated here on problems that are more of a structural nature that would likely exist no matter who the individuals might be.
November 6, 2009

Professor Anthony Norman
Chair, UCR Academic Senate

Re: Proposal to Split Department of Finance and Management Science

Dear Tony:

As you are aware based upon recent correspondence from Professor Eric Rolland, Dean Stewart and Chair Smith favor creation of a new Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management that would be split-off from the existing Department of Finance and Management. The AGSM/SoBA Executive Committee also supports this proposal.

Consistent with University policy, I am forwarding this proposal to the Academic Senate for a recommendation. Supporting documentation from the Dean, department chair and executive committee are enclosed. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dallas Rabenstein
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

cc: Dean Stewart
Chair Smith
Professor Rolland
Executive Director Ehlers