February 26, 2009

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

FR:    Tony Norman, Chair
       Riverside Division

RE:    Executive Council Agenda, February 9, 2009

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, March 2, 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>Action/Information 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>I. Approval of the March 2, 2009 Agenda and Notes of 02-09-2009 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict of Interest Statements – Prep Ed, Academic Computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information 1:10 – 2:10</td>
<td>II. Chancellor Tim White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information 2:10-2:30</td>
<td>III. EVC and Provost Dallas Rabenstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MOU on Administrative Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Norman would like to discuss with the members, the following memorandum and decide whether it should be sent forward as part of our shared governance commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Information 2:30 - 2:45</td>
<td>IV. Any Other Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update on Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2009

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

ABSENT:
Mart L. Molle, Computer Science and Eng. (Sr. Rep to the Assembly)
Pete Sadler, Earth Sciences (Undergraduate Council)

GUESTS:
Vice Provost David Fairis
Bill Kidder
Gladis Herrera-Berkowitz
George Haggerty
Tom Cogswell
Georgia Warnke
David Oglesby
Leah Haimo
CONSENT CALENDAR:
The items under the consent calendar were accepted as written.

DAVID FAIRRIS – COMMUNITY COLLEGE:
Dave Fairris’ presentation was with regards to transfer students and the need to do a comparison of transfer students and native students. This stemmed from a prior discussion with the EVCP who had indicated that it was important for UCR to begin to articulate agreements with the community colleges. The handout he gave the EC was prepared in an effort to determine how successful transfer students were when compared to UCR native students (those who enter the university as freshmen). The data collected for Fall 2008 transfer student cohort was made up of about 861 students with 82% in CHASS, 14% CNAS and 4% BCOE. The largest transfer is to Business Administration. Over 70% of these students were from Southern California – 31% from Riverside County, 25% from LA County and 18% from San Bernardino County. The ethnic profile indicated that 27% were Caucasian, 25% Asian, and 23% Chicano/Mexican. The overall conclusion when reviewing the data was that transfer students generally did better than native students in terms of grades and GPA. Dave Fairris indicated that the HSI grant that they just received will enhance the services for transfer students and hoped too, that it will help in increasing the numbers.

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Education Reform:
As background information, Chair Norman reminded the committee that the Ad Hoc Committee on Education Reform was appointed by Tom Cogswell, and was chaired by George Haggerty. Prof. George Haggerty informed the committee that they started their work about two years ago by reviewing various ways that general education was handled at other campuses. They also looked at Vivian Nyitray’s report about what was possible at our campus and talked about a lot of different models before they agreed on the current concentration model of concentrations where students would choose a concentration and the concentrations would be somewhat like a minor, i.e., a set of courses lower division, a set of courses upper division and a capstone course. The idea was that these concentrations that are about 36 units would provide the students an opportunity to do something more focused and to hold different fields together to see the reason why they are taking courses in other fields. It is a little more focused and the capstone course would help with learning outcomes. Each concentration will establish specific terms for achievement by defining learning outcome. Then learning outcomes of the students will be assessed in Capstone Seminars. The concentrations are structured to give students, in addition to basic reasoning, writing, and computation skills, working knowledge of a field, analogous to an academic minor, that will complement their work in their major field. In other words, there will be a rigorous system of assessment to determine the effectiveness of the program. The learning outcomes are consistent with the goals outlined in the proposal itself. Most crucially, the goal is that students who have completed this program will have learned how to integrate ideas and concepts from different fields. They will understand issues and concerns with a depth that the concentration offers. And they will write and reason with increased effectiveness because of this breadth of knowledge. Capstone courses will be one way to measure these outcomes, and we will look at results of such courses in order to determine the success of the program. We envision this program will be a major boost to our WASC reaccreditation.
The goals of the new program are as follows:

- Giving students a coherent program of classes that allows them to deepen their knowledge and broaden their experience in a range of related classes and group experiences.

- Training students in the literacies of writing, mathematics and computer technology by foregrounding the importance of these skills in a coherent program of classes.

- Emphasizing reasoning, analysis, and research, wherever possible, and giving students multiple opportunities to exercise and hone these skills.

- Offering topics of compelling contemporary or historical interest that challenge students to study the world around them with new critical skills in contexts that can be readily translated to careers and life beyond the University.

- Engaging student civic awareness in a multivalent culture and globalized world culture.

Educational benefits that this program will achieve:

- Kindle student interest in general education by focusing it on topical issues
- Provide coherent connections of content between courses in diverse disciplines.
- Deepen knowledge of content by extending Gen Ed to more substantial upper division courses
- Emphasize basic reasoning, writing, and computation skills
- Prepare students to embrace technological advances
- Initiate life-long learning habit with engagement in multicultural civic issues
- Encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration in Gen Ed teaching
- Make room for students in required major courses in the first two years
- Reduce class size
- Improve retention
- Provide general education with a distinctive Riverside brand for recruitment
- Use mostly existing courses and not add to unit requirements
- Incorporate the best features of CHASS Connect, Learning Communities, and Freshman Discovery/Advising Seminars

Prof. Haggerty also indicated that each concentration will be structured as follows:

At the lower division, there will be an introductory course, which will, among other things, introduce basic university skills. These will be followed by lower division courses in Science and Math/Statistics as well as courses in Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences. These courses will be offered as options in keeping with the direction of the concentration. (The lower division requirement is therefore 12-16 units.)
At the upper division, students will be expected to complete courses in three distinct fields. One or more of these classes emphasize research; one or more will address issues of civic engagement; and one or more will be writing intensive. When the Writing Across the Curriculum proposal alternatives to English 1C have been approved by the Senate, such courses will be incorporated into each concentration; concentrations will therefore complete the English 1C requirement in writing intensive courses. (The upper-division requirement is therefore 12-16 units.)

Upper division requirements will also include, where appropriate, an internship. Internships will require a faculty advisor and will be structured in the same way as internships in the various majors that include them.

Each concentration will also include a Capstone Course that will follow a seminar format and emphasize written and oral communication.

At the completion of the concentration, students will have completed their General Education requirements.

In summary, if a student took the above courses, they would meet all the requirements for general education except for the Ethnic Studies requirement.

The EC members voted 19 yes to approve the General Education proposal with 2 members abstaining.

**PROPOSAL TO MOVE PROCESSING OF PAPER UCR FACULTY COURSE EVALUATIONS TO ONLINE:**

A short summary was presented by David Fairris who indicated that course evaluations are run through his office, and that early in 2008, there was a move to completely move the evaluations to 100% online instead of the 50-50 scenario that continues today. He also indicated that one of the guiding factors for him was the cost of processing the paper evaluations, and it has become very expensive so he is considering cutting this service completely. He indicated that the savings from moving to where we are now to all online could save his office approximately $50,000. When they did a survey of students and faculty on course evaluations the students were quite happy with the online. Both expressed satisfaction at not spending class time to engage in this survey. The faculty felt that quality of the written comments from the online survey was better. Gladis Herrera-Berkowitz in Dave’s office compared the number of words on average in paper form vs online and the differences were dramatic. There were fewer profanities when done online. An additional benefit is that his office has student id information associated with the online evaluations and they can link evaluations back to grades and courses. He has not given much thought on how to use this data. The big downside is that the response rate is much lower. The difference is about 70% for paper and 50% for iEVAL.

The EC discussed at length, the proposal to move processing of paper UCR faculty course evaluations to online iEVAL format. The members were still concerned about the low response rate by students – and especially the effect of the low response rate when it came to CAP’s evaluation of files for merits and promotions. Many felt that it was important that
the data received when evaluating faculty using these evaluations was good data, especially since the Senate has fought hard to make teaching a part of merits and promotions.

The EC members felt that it was important to find out ways that they can encourage students to take the online evaluation. They agreed that Chair Norman should convene a taskforce to determine ways to move on to iEVAL as well as figure out a way to get the response rate up. The following members volunteered to serve on the Ad Hoc committee – Manuela Martins-Green, Frank Vahid, Len Mueller and Richard Arnott.

**Naming Opportunity: France Cordova Auditorium**
After some discussion, the EC members voted 19 yes – 1 abstention– 0 not to approve the above naming. The Committee felt that there was a significant opportunity related to the ultimate opening of the Genomics Institute for a naming opportunity in return for a significant financial gift to UCR. There was also concern about setting a precedent to name buildings after people who had not been at UCR for a significant number of years.

**Proposed Change in Bylaw 8.6.3:**
The EC members unanimously approved the proposed bylaw change by the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity regarding the committee name change.

**Proposed Change in Bylaw 8.6.3:**
The EC members unanimously approved the proposed bylaw change by the Graduate Council which is seeking to increase its membership with a slight amendment to include the following wording – *at least one member from every school and college*

Any other Business – Anthony Norman, Chair
Chair Norman reported on the following:

**Budget scenarios** – As a consequence of the push back from the faculty, the administration has now added a third additional scenario of 6.5% to the 10% and 15% budget scenarios that were previously proposed. At this point, the EC members felt that it was important to take a position and support the letter that was written by R. Redak, Chair of Faculty Welfare, and convey to the Chancellor that they have reviewed the letter and they fully endorse the contents, and finds that it expresses an issue of importance to the campus.

**UCRP** – Chair Norman indicated that contributions to the UC retirement plan was planned for the last quarter of 2010. The proposal was to have the faculty contribute 2% and the state 4%.

**The Blue and Gold Opportunity Program** was unanimously approved – that proposal will cover all the campuses and will pay the fees for all UC undergraduate students with a household income of $60,000.

**The BOARS** proposal was approved almost unanimously. It will have a significant effect for UCR’s admission process– it is not effective until 2012 and so there will be time to get ready. Faculty will be involved more actively in the admissions process.
Finally, he reported that the homecoming was a big success. There was a massive turnout for the men’s basketball game against UC Davis, it was completely sold out – which meant there was a total of about 2,725 students and in total, there were about 10,000 people in the evening for the concert.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sel lyna Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
February 19, 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.
February 9, 2009

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 2008-09 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.
August 2, 2007

TO:    T. E. COGSWELL, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISON

FR:    W. P. BEYERMANN
       COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

RE:    MOU ON ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

While the Academic Senate acknowledges the administration’s purview to appoint administrative committees, we believe consultation with COC during the process strengthens shared governance, which is in the best interest of the campus community. To improve on past practices, COC and the administration engaged in a more active exchange during the process of appointing several recent administrative search committees, and it is our view that the outcome of this new arrangement is an overwhelming success. The purpose of this MOU is to document this new arrangement with the hope that it becomes an entrenched procedure.

The process begins with the EVC, or EVC designate, providing COC with a draft charge of the committee and a brief description of the desired committee membership, including non-senate membership. The administration can also include a list of Senate faculty that it wants to consider for the committee. COC will then review and comment on the request. The feedback offered by COC may include comments on the names suggested by the administration, new nominations by COC, and when possible, rationale for participation on or exclusion from the nomination list. In some cases, COC may also recommend that representatives from standing Senate committees be included, either as regular members or as non-voting liaison members, which will ensure the bi-directional flow of information between the administrative committee and the Academic Senate. After the recommendations of the COC are returned, the administration has the responsibility of appointing the committee from the list of nominees. When the committee is appointed, the committee’s confirmed membership should be reported to COC before an announcement is made to the campus community. If the committee’s membership deviates from the approved list of nominees, COC would appreciate an explanation for the deviations from the list. In some cases, it maybe more expedient to execute this procedure or parts of it with face-to-face meetings between COC and the administration in place of the written exchanges mentioned above.

If the administration opposes or wants to modify any aspects of this MOU, the COC would like to meet with the Chancellor to discuss this issue.