February 18, 2010

TO:  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, February 22, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, February 22, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 1st Floor, University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Action/Information 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Approval of the February 22 Agenda and February 8, 2010 Meeting Notes. 1 (pp. 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Information 1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Statement – Academic Computing 2(pp. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Action/Information 1:45 – 2:00</td>
<td>FOUNDING DEAN, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE – Dean Richard Olds 3(pp. 8 - 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Action/Information 2:00 – 2:05</td>
<td>BYLAWS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE – BYLAW 8.28 AND BYLAW 8.5.1 – EXECUTIVE COUNCIL Action – This item was tabled until further discussions took place. 4(pp 11 - 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Action/Information 2:05 – 2:35</td>
<td>PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.8.2.1 AND 8.8.2.3 -- COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES Action – Discuss and approve proposed changes 5(pp. 13 - 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Action/Information 2:35 – 2:50</td>
<td>BOB HANNEMAN – PRESENTATION OF THE CLIMATE SURVEY RESULTS Discuss the results and determine the next step 6(pp. 16 - 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Action/Information 2:50 – 3:00</td>
<td>PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION Action – Discuss and approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ANY OTHER BUSINESS Legislative Assembly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 8, 2010

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM, Vice Chair
Dan Ozer, Psychology, Secretary Parliamentarian
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
Christine Gailey, Women’s studies, Committees
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
John Trumble, Entomology, CAP
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Alan Williams, Earth Sciences, Graduate Council
Jose Wudka, Physics, Educational Policy
Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
John Ganim, English, Preparatory Education
George Haggerty, English, Gen Ed Advisory Committee
Erik Rolland, AGSM Executive Committee
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The agenda and the minutes were accepted as written.

BYLAWS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE –BYLAW 8.28 AND BYLAW 8.5.1 – EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:
The EC discussed the new bylaws describing the proposed duties of the General Education Committee which if approved, will be a new standing committee for the senate. An objection was raised by a member who indicated that at the 2/17/09 Division meeting an amendment was made to accept the pilot programs, and that amendment indicated that a committee would be formed that would not only evaluate the pilot programs but would continue to have a broader discussion about general education requirements since there were concerns that the pilots did not necessarily do the job that people might want them to do.
The EC then passed a motion to table this discussion until the February 22, 2010 meeting to allow Chair Norman to bring this issue up with Dr. George Haggerty.

**Naming Opportunities for EC Approval - Delfino Family Plant Laboratory:** The proposal to approve the naming of the Screenhouse was approved with one abstention.

**Proposed Changes in Procedures for Election of the UCR Division Senate Leadership Positions:**
A lengthy discussion ensued about the pros and cons of the proposed changes. Some concerns involved the 3 year term. Some members felt that the 3 year commitment might limit the number of people who might want to be the chair of the Senate. Regarding the Immediate Past Chair, many felt that approving the proposed change would formalize what is currently happening anyway and thus the members felt that this was the right step to take. The following changes were made to item 2 of the proposal

*The Vice Chair and Chair, will serve as voting members on the Executive Council. The Chair will serve as Chair of the Executive Council. The Immediate Past Chair will serve as a non-voting member of the Executive Council.*

Under approval and implementation, the following changes were made

*If approved, the new election procedure will be implemented in Spring 2010, when a Vice Chair/Chair Designate will be elected for the three-year term to begin September 1, 2010. The elected individual will serve as Vice Chair during 2010-2011, as Chair during 2011-2012, and as Immediate Past Chair during 2012-2013. In addition, a Chair will be elected for a two-year term to begin September 1, 2010, serving as Chair during 2010-2011 and Immediate Past Chair in 2011-2012. The Current Chair shall serve as Immediate Past Chair in 2010-2011.*

The following motions were passed in connection to the proposed changes in procedure for election of the UCR Division Senate Leadership positions:

1. Motion that the EC accept the changes to the proposal for election of senate officers as described in the revised bylaw 2.1. *(Chair, the Vice Chair (Chair Designate), the Immediate Past Chair, and the Divisional Representatives to the Assembly of the Academic Senate. Their election is conducted in accordance with the procedure prescribed for elections. The appointed officer of the Division is the Secretary-Parliamentarian. The terms of office begin on September 1 following election or appointment to a normal term of office.)* This motion passed with 12 yes, 1 against and 1 abstention.

1. Motion that the Immediate Past Chair be a non-voting member of the Executive Council. This motion passed unanimously with 17 votes.

2. Motion that the position of Immediate Past Chair in September 1, 2010 be filled by the current chair of the Senate. This motion passed 16 yes and 1 abstention.
3. Motion that there be an election in the Spring of 2010 for the two positions of Chair and Vice Chair (Chair Designate) each for a one year term. This motion passed unanimously with 17 votes.

**Changes to Bylaws 3.3, 3.6, 3.7, 6.2 and 7.3.1 – Replacing “days of instruction” with “days”:**

Chair Norman gave a brief overview of the reason for changing “days of instruction” to “calendar” days. This is largely due to wording left over from the days of “snail” mail. The version offered replaces “days of instruction” with “calendar days”. The only point brought up which was of slight concern was that the change would reduce to just 48 hours, the notice for an emergency meeting. However, given how rarely this happens, it was not seen as a major issue. Another related matter was the proposed change to bylaw 7.3.1 which changed the number of days allowed for the counting of votes – from 20 to 14 and is similar to that allowed at systemwide.

After further discussions, the EC passed a motion to accept the bylaw changes as proposed. The motion passed with 16 voting yes and 1 abstention.

**Any Other Business:**

**Strategic Plan Timeline:**

Chair Norman indicated that he had put together a timeline describing how the Senate might provide a critique and review of UCR’s emerging Strategic Plan. The question is what form shared governance should take. It is important to remember that this Strategic Plan is a living document and will inevitably be subject to modifications. The expectation was that the first draft of the Strategic Plan would be completed by March 1st, the second draft by May 31st and the third draft would be completed by June 4th. The proposal is that by the end of March a select group of senate committees will have reviewed the 1st draft of the Strategic Plan and prepared a critique or comment for the Senate and other individuals. The suggestions and comments will be incorporated into draft number 2 which is supposed to be available by April 19th. The third draft will be made available to the senate during the first week of June and hopefully completed by June 30, after which nothing will happen until the fall when the next chair of the division will decide whether it is necessary to have a vote by the academic senate during the fall meeting or at a special meeting.

The Chair also indicated that the EVCP has checked with four other UC campuses and they did not submit their strategic plan for senate vote. The EVCP is scheduled to attend the next meeting of the Council and at that time will discuss his plans further.

Some EC members questioned why Senate committees were being asked to review the Subcommittee Reports. It was pointed out that the original intent was to pair the senate Committee with the subcommittees because by doing so, the senate committee would be better able to understand how the first draft came about by seeing the report on which the substantive decisions were made by EVCP and the steering committee and it would give the senate committee an opportunity to comment on how appropriately that material had been incorporated into the final report. The EVCP and Chair Norman wanted the Senate to review those reports so they would know the origin of the ideas and proposals. Another question raised was when the faculty at large would have access to the document. Chair
Norman responded that all Strategic Planning documents will be posted on the campus website. Also, there was concern that if the faculty did not endorse the document prior to the hiring of the new EVCP, there was a risk that if the new EVCP was not in agreement with the strategic plan, it would be abandoned.

The Secretary Parliamentarian added to the discussion the fact that he was concerned with what a “vote of the senate” means. It was not clear what exactly a “Yes” or “No” vote would mean, and as such, it was important that more feedback and input from the Senate should be gathered at the beginning.

**Division Meeting – Concerned Faculty Concern**

There has been a request from Karthik Ramakrishnan who is a member of the Concerned Faculty about a massive statewide rally planned for the defense of public higher education, which will involve not only UCs but also CSUs and CCs. In Riverside, students, faculty, and staff from UCR will join with others from CSU-SB and RCC in a march to Riverside downtown, starting at 1pm, and a rally at 2pm. In many ways, the public relevance of this action will be much larger than what happened on September 24 on the various UC campuses. He was requesting that Chair Norman call for a postponement of the division meeting by a week, or a change in time. Chair Norman asked the EC members their opinion and it was agreed that they would accommodate the request and change the date to March 5, 2010.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

_Sellyna Ehlers_
*Executive Director*
*Academic Senate*
February 16, 2010

TO: A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: L. J. MUELLER, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

RE: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The Committee on Academic Computing and Informational Technology has re-adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement for the 2009-10 year:

In cases where a committee member's association with departments or programs, or with individuals bringing business before the committee might be considered as a conflict of interest, the committee member(s) affected may participate fully in all discussions of the business, but will refrain from any voting. Members of the Committee on Academic Computing and Informational Technology are asked to identify when they may have a potential conflict of interest on any items before any discussion.
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
March 4, 2010

To be adopted:

BYLAW 8.28 – GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PRESENT:  

PROPOSED:

8.28 This committee consists of a minimum of seven faculty. The membership includes at least one member from Bourns College of Engineering, School Of Business Administration, College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and an ex officio member from the Honors Executive Committee and an ex officio Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) representative.

8.28.1 The charge to the committee will be to oversee the alternative breadth concentrations as defined in R6.4.4, coordinate their distribution, and approve them once they have demonstrated their feasibility.

8.28.1.1 Once a concentration has been formulated, it will be reviewed for approval, consistent with Bylaw 10, by each Executive Committee, then the Committee on Educational Policy, before being reported at the Division for final approval.

8.28.2 The committee will work closely with the Associate Deans and student affairs staff to insure that they (and the students involved) obtain necessary information about the requirements and course offerings.
8.28.3 During the fifth year of the optional general education plan (academic year: 2013-14), the committee will conduct a review to assess the feasibility of continuing the program and/or expanding it. The report will be delivered to the Division meeting.

**JUSTIFICATION:**
To implement a charge for the newly formed General Education Advisory Committee as defined in the report on a Pilot Program for General Education Reform which was approved unanimously at the February, 2009 Division meeting.

R & J approved of the attached revised bylaws with the following statement, along with their approval:

The Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction approves the Revised Bylaws for General Education Advisory Committee. This approval rests on our interpretation of the proposed bylaws that ensures that all curricular changes follow the procedures set forth in Bylaw 10. In particular, our interpretation of the proposed bylaws posts that the approval of a new concentration under R 8.28.1 is subject to the terms of R 8.28.1.1, which requires "approval, consistent with Bylaw 10, by each Executive Committee, then the Committee on Educational Policy, before being reported at the Division for final approval." Hence, the requisite approvals Under Bylaw 10 are required prior to implementation and any post-implementation feasibility assessments of proposed concentrations.

Approved by the General Education Advisory Committee: 10/8/09
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: 10/30/09
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate: January 26, 2010

Reviewed by the Executive Council:
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

To Be Adopted

Proposed Changes to Bylaw - 8.5.1 Executive Council

PRESENT

8.5.1 This committee consists of the Chair of the Division, who is also Chair of this committee, the Vice Chair, the Secretary-Parliamentarian, the senior representative to the Assembly, the Chairs of the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology, Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Committees, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Graduate Council, the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Physical Resources Planning, the Committee on Research, the Undergraduate Council, the Committee on Preparatory Education, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity and the Executive Committees of the colleges and schools at Riverside. (Am 8 Jun 78)(Am 5 Nov 87)(Am 27 May 93)(Am 9 Feb 95)(Am 29 May 97)(Am 5 Feb 98) (Am 21 Feb 06)(Am 30 May 06)

PROPOSED

8.5.1 This committee consists of the Chair of the Division, who is also Chair of this committee, the Secretary-Parliamentarian, the senior representative to the Assembly, the Chairs of the Committee on Academic Computing and Information Technology, Committee on Academic Personnel, the Committee on Committees, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Graduate Council, the Committee on Planning and Budget, the Committee on Physical Resources Planning, the Committee on Research, the Undergraduate Council, the Committee on Preparatory Education, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity, General Education Advisory Committee and the Executive Committees of the colleges and schools at Riverside. (Am 8 Jun 78)(Am 5 Nov 87)(Am 27 May 93)(Am 9 Feb 95)(Am 29 May 97)(Am 5 Feb 98) (Am 21 Feb 06)(Am 30 May 06)

Justification:
The change in bylaw 8.5.1 will make the addition of the General Education Advisory Committee to the Executive Council official. The General Education Committee is charged with overseeing alternative breadth concentrations at UCR.

Reviewed by the Executive Council: Date
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: Date
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
March 4, 2010

Proposed change in Bylaw 8.8.2.1 and 8.8.2.3 -- Committee on Committees

PRESENT

8.8.2
The members of this committee are elected as follows: (Am 24 Apr 75)

8.8.2.1
The membership includes four representatives each from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, and one member each from the College of Engineering, and the Anderson Graduate School of Management or the Graduate School of Education. No more than one member of any one department or program may be on the committee. (Am 24 Apr 75)(Am 25 May 95)(Am 30 May 06)

8.8.2.3
The election of a college representative is conducted entirely within the Faculty which he/she represents. Elections are conducted according to the procedure described in Chapter 7 and are held in time to be reported to the Division for confirmation at its last stated meeting of the academic year. (Am 24 Apr 75)

PROPOSED

8.8.2
The members of this committee are elected as follows: (Am 24 Apr 75)

8.8.2.1
Only tenured faculty may serve on the Committee on Committees.
The membership includes four representatives each from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, two members from the College of Engineering, and one member that alternates terms from either the Anderson Graduate School of Management or the Graduate School of Education. Candidacies for this seat alternate, but members of both schools’ faculties may vote in each such election, given that this is a collective seat for representational purposes. If a COC member representing the alternating slot does not complete the regular term, he or she will be replaced by a new member from the same school to complete the term. No more than one member of any one department or program may be on the committee. (Am 24 Apr 75)(Am 25 May 95)(Am 30 May 06)

8.8.2.3
The election of a college representative is conducted entirely within the Faculty which he/she represents. To be nominated, representatives must have previously served on at least two standing academic senate committees for a total of at least four years of service. Elections are conducted according to the procedure described in Chapter 7 and are held in time to be reported to the Division for confirmation at its last stated meeting of the academic year. (Am 24 Apr 75)
JUSTIFICATION:

The UCR Committee on Committees is proposing two changes to existing bylaws 8.8.2.1 and 8.8.2.3. These changes are necessitated by the specialized demands on COC that have evolved as the campus has grown over the past decade. The changes were reviewed and approved by all members of the Committee on Committees and now requests that the modified bylaws be approved by Executive Council in a timely manner.

The specific changes are detailed below:

- The first change to 8.8.2.1 limits membership to tenured faculty. The primary reason is the Committee on Committees staff the Committee on Academic Personnel. This would give the appearance of conflict of interest is untenured faculty, whose continued service in the UC depends in part on decisions by CAP, would be helping to staff the committee. An important secondary consideration is that the Committee's operations rely on familiarity with a wide range of senior and junior faculty across campus. This is normally impossible for a junior faculty member to achieve.

- The second change to 8.8.2.1 increases the membership of COC by one additional member from the College of Engineering. This change is required due to the increased size of that college and the diversity of disciplines within the college. This change would increase the total membership of the committee from ten to eleven members (four from CHASS, four from CNAS, two from COE, and one from either AGSM or GSOE).

- The third change to 8.8.2.1 requires one senate member alternate terms from either AGSM or GSOE. Given the small size of these units and the demand for service on other committees COC feels that the Academic Senate is best served by having only one member from one of these professional schools.

- The change to 8.8.2.3 now requires at least four years of service on a minimum of two academic senate committees before a senate member is eligible for election to COC. Active participation on COC, guaranteeing shared governance for all senate members, requires substantive knowledge of specific committees and the Academic Senate in general. COC members who have been elected with little, or no, previous senate experience are unable to contribute to the committee and, as a result, do not serve either the Senate or the constituents of their college or school. Further, if COC members are unable to contribute to discussions concerning membership on senate committees the workload unfairly falls on other COC members who may, or may not, be able to fairly represent another college or school.

Approved by the Committee on Committees: June 13, 2009
Additional change to 8.8.2.1 approved by Committee on Committees: October 9, 2009
Additional change to 8.8.2.1 approved by Committee on Committees January 21, 2010
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: January 31, 2010
Endorsed by the Executive Council:
Barebones Draft PROPOSAL FOR
PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION (PGD)

Prepared by Tony Norman in consultation with Kathleen Montgomery on February 18, 2010

A. Background (from UCB)
   The Berkeley Professor of the Graduate School has been operative since 1991. A description of their program and endorsement by two recent appointees will be in an Appendix.

B. General Description of Proposed UCR PGD
   1. Objectives of the PGD
      To focus on retiring faculty who are fully engaged in research and/or other departmental and campus activities and who wish to continue to contribute to UCR with distinction.
   2. Prerequisites
      Retiring faculty should have submitted a Merit file in the past 3 years or, alternatively, provide a Self Statement describing how the applicant would benefit from a PGD appointment and what would be their contribution to the campus.
   3. Length of appointment
      First appointment for 3 years, then renewed annually based on review by the procedures listed in heading C, 1.
   4. Remuneration
      No remuneration for appointees will be provided.

C. Faculty Application Process
   1. Department
      Applicant provides (a) a Self Statement of the perceived benefits to the candidate and the campus from having a PGD appointment, (b) an updated UC Bio-bibliography form, (c) a summary of scholarly activity in the past three
years (e.g. publications, grant applications, graduate student and/or postdoctoral training, invited talks).

2. Dean

The Dean should provide a statement of endorsement of the applicant

3. Review by the Graduate Dean
4. Review by CAP
5. Review by VPAP
6. Final approval by the EVC

D. Review Process of this PGD proposal.
1. Executive Council general comments and suggestions
2. Review and Comment by Senate Committees
   (Faculty Welfare, CAP, Graduate Council, and Educational Policy)
3. Formal endorsement by Executive Council and approval by the Divisional Meeting in May, 2010.

E. Target date for implementation (start of 2010/11 academic year).

F. Remaining questions or issues that should be addressed.
   Should there be any limit on the number PGD per year?

G. Appendices
1. Appendix A: UC Berkeley’s Professor of the Graduate School program and two letters of endorsement.
2. Appendix B: Query to 60 most recently retired UCR faculty
3. Sample Application form for UCR’s PGD.

See next page >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD)

(AWN Dec. 8, 2009)

Message to ~ 60 most recently retired UCR faculty

This email is being sent to the most recent faculty retirees here at UCR (out of a total of 235 UCR Emeritus/a). I am writing to bring to your attention a program for recently retired faculty that has been operative since about 1991 at UC Berkeley. Their program focuses on retiring faculty who are fully engaged in research and/or other departmental and campus activities and who wish to continue to contribute to UC with distinction. There are a number of privileges for individuals who participate in the Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD), some of them are:

(i) Identification in the campus catalog and elsewhere as “Professor of the Graduate Division” (PGD) instead of “Emeritus/a”.
(ii) Having an official title rather than Emeritus/a when submitting grant applications.
(iii) Formal acknowledgement of your professional contribution(s) to a graduate program, your College/School and the UCR campus.

The first attached PDF describes the current 2003 version of the Berkeley PGS program. The second PDF has testimonial letters sent to me from two UC-Berkeley faculty persons; one has been a Professor of the Graduate School since 2006. Given the current hard budgetary times for the University, we should probably not count on, or even request financial support for a proposed PGS Program.

If you have an interest in the development of a comparable program here at UCR please let me know. I am interested in convening a meeting in the first week of January, 2010 to discuss and explore whether a PGS might be a viable project here at UCR. In view of some very recent email problems (again) for Emeritus/a, I encourage each person to reply to me, (even with a “no thank you”) so that I will know that you successfully received this message.
Background Information on a
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Prepared by Tony Norman in consultation with Kathleen Montgomery for the
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL
February 15, 2010

A. What is a Legislative Assembly?

1. It is the principal ‘body’ of a UC campus’ Senate charged with making
decisions on matters pertinent to the faculty and to the institution (under the
rubric of shared governance).

2. Alternative names of this body are as follows. Representative Assembly
(UCSD), Faculty Legislature (UCSB), Divisional Senate Assembly (UCI) and,
Legislative Assembly (UCLA)

3. Membership on the Legislative Assembly normally includes the following:
   (a) One or more elected members from every department on campus, pro-
rated on department size (maybe 65 Departments). On some campuses a
   substitute for each member is also elected. Terms vary on UC campuses
   from 1 -2 years (to be checked).
   (b) Chairs of all standing Senate committees
   (c) Members of the Executive Council (20; some overlap with ‘b’ above)
   (d) Elected Assembly representatives (2 persons; some overlap with ‘b’
       above)
   (e) Senate Chair, Vice Chair and Parliamentarian (3 persons ; overlap with ‘b’
       above)
   (f) The total size of a Legislative Assembly at UCR could be about 100
      representatives.

4. The hierarchy of the governing units of the Senate would be as follows
   (bottom-to-top)
   (a) Senate Committees
   (b) Executive Council
   (c) Legislative Assembly
(d) Senate Divisional meeting

(Would be utilized mostly for emergency meetings or topics that engaged a large number of faculty that was not based on department affiliation.

5. The Legislative Assembly (LA) would be required to meet at least quarterly. (to be decided) Any faculty members would be welcome to attend LA meetings and to speak (to be decided). However only members of the LA could vote on motions.

6. Presently 5 UC campuses (UCLA, UCSD, UCI, UCSC, UCM) employ the Legislative Assembly construct.

B. Benefits from having a Legislative Assembly

1. The existence of the Legislative Assembly guarantees that all faculty units would be represented at all LA meetings. Thus at every LA meeting the collective attendance will reflect the breadth of views on the entire campus. It has happened more than one time in recent years that one campus college had weak faculty attendance at a Divisional meeting, and then subsequently was unhappy about a vote that was passed by the faculty members present.

2. With each departmental unit having elected representation on the LA, the department can debate issues and determine its position.

3. The size of the proposed Legislative Assembly (~ 80 -100 members) will likely result in involving new faculty in the Senate activities. Over time this broadening of faculty participation could result in more UCR faculty with Senate leadership expertise that is appropriate for participation and leadership on Systemwide committees, leading to strengthening UCR’s position on the Academic Council and elsewhere systemwide.

C. Status of Divisional Meeting

1. Divisional meetings would not need to be scheduled regularly every quarter.

2. Divisional meetings can be called under Bylaw 3.2 (Special meetings) or Bylaw 3.3 (Emergency meetings) where large components of the faculty have an interest and/or concerns.