March 24, 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, March 29, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, March 29, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 210 2nd Floor University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong> 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td><strong>Approval of the March 29 Agenda and February 22, 2010 Meeting Notes.</strong> 1 (pp. 1-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong> 1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td><strong>NAMING OPPORTUNITIES FOR EC APPROVAL:</strong> Greenock – proposed name for Summer Ridge and Charger Student Promenade – Proposed by VC Jim Sandoval School of Medicine Building – proposed name for Statistics and Computer Building – proposed by VC and Dean R. Olds 2(pp. 10-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong> 1:45 – 2:00</td>
<td><strong>PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.20 COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH</strong> Action – for approval by EC 3(pp. 19 - 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong> 2:00 – 2:30</td>
<td><strong>CHANGES IN POST-EMPLOYMENT BENEFITS RESEARCH</strong> Update From Dan Hare – Chair, Faculty Welfare - Carol Lovatt, Chair, Planning and Budget, and Helen Henry, Member, President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits. 4(pp.22-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong> 2:30 – 3:00</td>
<td><strong>ENGLISH 1C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong></td>
<td><strong>NEW BUSINESS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 22, 2010

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM, Vice Chair
Dan Ozer, Psychology, Secretary Parliamentarian
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Erik Rolland, AGSM Executive Committee
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:
Christine Gailey, Women's studies, Committees
John Ganim, English, Physical Resources Planning
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly

GUESTS:
George Haggerty, English, Gen Ed Advisory Committee
G. Richard Olds, Vice Chancellor Health Affairs, and Dean, School of Medicine
Robert Hanneman

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

FOUNDING DEAN, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE:

Chair Norman introduced G. Richard Olds, Vice Chancellor Health Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine and invited him to give a brief overview of what are his plans for the Medical School.
Dean Olds indicated that the current plan for the medical school is to go from the current 2 + 2 model (where students spend their first two years at UCR and then last two years at UCLA) to a four year school. The target for opening the school is the year 2012 and it is hoped that the school will grow to 100 students per class by 2016. Dean Olds discussed the reasons why the medical school is important to the Riverside and San Bernardino county area and stated that the population of the Inland Empire is forecast to grow over 50% during the next two decades. There is a severe shortage in primary care doctors with Riverside County having only 36 physicians per 100,000 inhabitants while the target is supposed to be 80 physicians for every 100,000. Also, more than 40% of the physicians in the inland empire are 55 and older. He mentioned the unique missions of the UCR Medical School and why it was going to be different from other medical schools. UCR will focus on more culturally competent doctors; on physicians who focus on prevention and wellness and on doctors that work in teams. Dean Olds indicated that the medical school plan is to build on UCR’s nationally recognized student diversity. We need to stimulate more interest in serving medically underserved populations, and to develop more need-based scholarships and finally we need to build GME programs.

Regarding accreditation, Dean Olds mentioned that for the medical school to be accredited there has to be evidence of public funding for five years, and also that there has to be a number of appointments of senior leadership position, and suitable facilities.

Dean Olds also discussed the hiring plans he had which include the areas of academic affairs, student affairs, hospital relationships and administration and finance.
BYLAWS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE – BYLAW 8.28 AND BYLAW 8.5.1 –

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

The bylaws that were being presented were for the newly created General Education Advisory Committee which would formalize their position as a permanent standing committee of the Senate. The question at hand was how to respond to the reminder about the need that the campus has for engagement in and consideration of whether there should be modifications to the present general education requirements. Chair Norman indicated that there was interest by both the Chancellor and the VPUE in updating our general education requirements.

One Executive Council member was opposed to the creation of this bylaw as it was written and asked why one would create a standing committee for a pilot program that would only last 4 years. They thought it was better to create a committee that would continuously oversee the entire spectrum of general education programs on campus because that would be an on-going issue and that would need a standing committee.

Another point raised was the name of the committee. It was felt that the name as it written was misleading and gave the impression that it dealt with all aspects of general education.

Professor George Haggerty, the chair of the committee indicated that once the bylaws are passed then the General Education Advisory Committee could be charged with the authority to also engage in review and consideration of other aspects of general education
requirements as well as deal with issues related to learning outcomes if that is what the EC wanted. The pilots already have learning outcomes and assessments built in. Also raised as a concern was what safeguard existed to ensure that once the bylaw passed as written, the committee would go back and rewrite it to include the points raised by the EC. The Secretary Parliamentarian indicated that this was no problem because the bylaw as written is very narrow and thus it would be safe to approve it.

The Secretary Parliamentarian indicated that it was not possible for the EC to rewrite the bylaws but that it would be best to accept the bylaws as written and then send them to the division with an understanding that as soon as possible, it would be rewritten to include these other issues.

A motion was moved that the Executive Council recommend to the Division that the bylaw be approved as submitted. The motion passed with 11 approvals and 3 opposed.

**PROPOSED CHANGE IN BYLAW 8.8.2.1 AND 8.8.2.3 – COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES:**

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 was now up for discussion by the Executive Council and then the division. There was concern over the addition of 1 member from BCOE and the feeling was that this addition was not fair to larger schools i.e., CHASS and CNAS. Some members also questioned the wisdom of having one member that alternates terms from AGSM and GSOE. In the end, the EC members voted 8 in favor 3
opposed and 2 abstentions to recommend the approval of the bylaws as written and forward it to the division.

**BOB HANNEMAN – CLIMATE SURVEY:**

Prof Hanneman was present at the EC meeting to present the preliminary analysis of the faculty climate survey.

**Executive Summary:**

The University of California, Riverside Survey Research Center (UCR SRC) conducted this Faculty Senate Survey on behalf of the UCR Academic Senate. The population of interest was tenure-track faculty members at UCR, including professors *emeritus*. The UCR SRC helped develop the survey instrument and other elements of the research design with the guidance of the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity, Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Executive Council of the Academic Senate, and an *Ad Hoc* Survey Committee. The survey was available to potential respondents from November 6, 2009, through December 31, 2009. The response rate was 51.2%. Here we summarize major findings of the survey.

**PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION:**

Chair Norman indicated that the Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD) is a program that would be available to UCR retiring/retired faculty who are fully engaged in research and/or other departmental and campus activities and who wish to continue to contribute to UC and UCR with distinction after their retirement from official active faculty status. The proposal is modeled on a similar program at UC Berkeley, which has been in place since 1991. He indicated that the next step would be to write it up and send it to the appropriate
committees. He had already surveyed the most recent retirees and most responded that they were interested in it. He had also discussed it with Prof. J. Childers who is the Graduate Dean who also indicated that he had no problem with the proposal. The EC members indicated via a straw vote that they were in favor of the proposal and that it should be sent out for review.

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY:**

Chair Norman also discussed the issue of introducing the concept of a Legislative Assembly that would take the place of what is currently known as the Division meeting. The Legislative Assembly is the principal “body” of a UC Campus senate charged with making decisions on matters pertinent to the faculty and to the institution. At present, 5 of the UC campuses employ the Legislative assembly format. Membership on the Legislative Assembly normally includes one or more elected members from every department of campus, pro-rated on department size. Any faculty member can attend the Legislative Assembly meetings but they cannot vote. The benefit of having a Legislative Assembly is that it guarantees that all faculty units would be represented. Currently, we have a quorum of 35 and sometimes this does not reflect representation from the entire campus. Also, with each departmental unit having elected representation, the department can debate issues and determine its position.

The next step, if the EC was agreeable would be to send the proposal out to departments in an attempt to gauge faculty interest before proceeding further.

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS:**
Chair Norman distributed a memo he had received from Eddie Valencia, a student at UCR who is a member of the student-run Social Justice Alliance. Mr. Valencia also forwarded the press release for a rally to be held on March 4th, Day of Action in Riverside.

Chair Norman also mentioned that the Chancellor had mentioned that Prof. Robert J. Sternberg, candidate for the EVCP position was going to be invited back to the campus for a second interview.

Finally, Chair Norman discussed the town hall meeting scheduled for the 23rd. He also mentioned that we don’t know much about the budget – however the Chancellor and Gretchen Bolar had looked over all the accounts and were paying special attention to the various donor accounts which currently has about $27 million of unspent money. The Chancellor has the authority to get to that money and he will be bringing it up at the town hall meeting. Chair Norman asked the EC members to pass the word on to their colleagues as this was becoming an issue.

Meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Selleyna Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
February 22, 2010

Chair Norman
Academic Senate

RE: Campus Naming Committee

Dear Tony:

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

- Greenock is the proposed name for Summer Ridge, an apartment complex recently purchased by the University. This naming has been recommended by the Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, James Sandoval.
- The Charter Student Promenade is the proposed name for the location where concrete slabs that were signed by the original graduating class of UCR. This naming opportunity has been recommended by the Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, James Sandoval.
- The School of Medicine Education Building is the new proposed name for the Statistics and Computers Building. This naming has been requested by Vice Chancellor, Health Affairs and Dean, School of Medicine, Richard Olds.

Please review the attached requests and summary details. These proposed names need approval by the Academic Senate before they are endorsed by the Campus Naming Committee. Please respond with your recommendation by Friday March 5th, 2010.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gretchen Bolar
Vice Chancellor

Attachments

xc: Vice Chancellor Hayashida
    Vice Chancellor Sandoval
    Vice Chancellor Olds
    Assistant Vice Chancellor Kim
    Assistant Vice Chancellor Plumley
    Executive Director Lehr
    Executive Director Ehlers
    Director Wingate
    Campus Space Manager Pippert
SUMMARY INFORMATION

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

Proposed Name:  Greenock

Building Background:

- Project Name: Summer Ridge
- Official Building Name: Greenock (A – H, J, OF)
- Capital Asset Account Numbers: P5661 - P5670
- Building Basic Gross Square Feet: 106,840 gsf
- Number of Beds: 208
- Location: UCR Core Campus

Description: The tradition and practice of naming UCR housing buildings and communities after cities and areas in Scotland began with our first Residence Hall, Aberdeen-Inverness Residence Hall. “Greenock” is a city in Scotland, which is a major port on its western coast.

See attached Background Information.

Site Map:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
FOR
Greenock – SUMMER RIDGE

September 29, 2009

TO: JAMES SANDOVAL
Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs

RE: SUMMER RIDGE: NAME CHANGE TO “GREENOCK”

The tradition and practice of naming housing buildings and communities after cities and areas in Scotland began with our first Residence Hall. Aberdeen-Inverness Residence Hall, which opened in 1959, is named after two port cities in Scotland, Aberdeen and Inverness. Lothian Residence Hall opened in 1963, and is named after the Lothian Borders in the south of Scotland. Bannockburn, which was originally an off-campus housing facility before the university purchased it, is named after a famous battle site.

In 2000 when we opened the Pentland Hills Residence Halls and the Stonehaven Apartments, we engaged our residents in the naming process. During the development of our Strategic Plan for Housing, we further engaged our residents in the naming of future housing buildings. We named our newest apartments Glen Mor after an area in Scotland that cuts through the Scottish Highlands, much like the arroyo cuts through the campus. That year we also acquired an apartment complex “Highlander Ridge” which we changed to Falkirk.

We have just acquired another existing apartment complex, currently named “Summer Ridge.” We are requesting to change the name of this complex to keep with our tradition. Greenock is the new name being proposed. Greenock is a city in Scotland, which is a major port on its western coast. Attached, please find a map of Scotland for your reference.

I am requesting that you bring this naming request to the campus naming committee. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Andy Plumley
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Housing, Dining & Residential Services
SUMMARY INFORMATION

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

Proposed Names:  Charter Student Promenade

Building Background:
- Project Name: Charter Student Promenade
- Location: UCR Core Campus

Description: The Highlander Union Board of Governors unanimously approved the naming a portion of the grounds, between Highlander Plaza and the upper Commons Mall, the Charter Student Promenade.

See attached Background Information.

Site Map:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
FOR
CHARTER STUDENT PROMENADE

February 2, 2010

Gretchen Bolar
Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning & Budget

Dear Gretchen,

At their January 12, 2009 meeting, the Highlander Union Board of Governors unanimously approved naming a portion of the grounds the Charter Student Promenade. This location holds the concrete slabs that were signed by the original graduating class of UCR. The slabs were moved during the demolition of the old Commons and reinstalled in the between the Highlander Plaza and the upper Commons Mall. This continues the Highlander Union’s celebration of the UCR student and its position as the center of campus pride at UCR.

The Charter Student Plaza is scheduled to be dedicated with a large number of the original class in attendance as part of Homecoming activities on February 13, 2010.

James W. Sandoval
Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs

Cc: Danny Kim, AVC Student Affairs Administration
    Todd Wingate, Director, University Commons
SUMMARY INFORMATION

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

Proposed Name: *School of Medicine Education Building*
In the School of Medicine

Building Background:
- Official Building Name: Statistics Computer Building
- Building Name (12-byte): STAT COMP
- Capital Asset Account Numbers: P5588
- Building Basic Gross Square Feet: 41,938 gsf
- Location: UCR Core Campus

Description: School of Medicine Education Building is recommended as the new name for the Statistics Computer Building. This will be the location for the new School of Medicine. The Statistics Department will be moving to Olmsted Hall estimated for December 2010.

See attached Background Information.

Site Map:
February 4, 2010

Gretchen Bolar
Vice Chancellor of Finance and Business Operations

Dear Vice Chancellor Bolar,

I write to request that the name of the Statistics and Computers Building be officially changed to the “School of Medicine Education Building” effective immediately. Please let me know if there is additional information you require from me to finalize the name change.

Sincerely,

G. Richard Olds, M.D.
Vice Chancellor, Health Affairs and
Dean, School of Medicine
To Be Adopted

Proposed Change to Bylaw 8.20 Committee on Research

PRESENT

8.20.1 The Committee consists of at least seven members. The Chair normally also serves on the University Committee on Research Policy. (Am 5 Feb 87)

8.20.2 It is the duty of this committee to formulate and recommend to the Chancellor and to inform the Division on:

8.20.2.1 General policies, not otherwise provided for by University policy, concerning the research activities on the Riverside campus that are supported by funds at the disposal of this committee or by extramural subsidies;

8.20.2.2 Budgetary needs for support of research in the Division;

8.20.2.3 It serves as campus agent in reviewing applications from eligible staff members for support from intramural-research funds, research travel funds, or other research monies for which the committee may be made responsible. It recommends allocation of these funds to applicants within the limits of University policies governing the grants. (Am 9 Oct 69)

PROPOSED

8.20.1 The Committee consists of at least seven members. It considers all matters pertaining to research policy on the UC Riverside campus. (Am 5 Feb 87)

8.20.2 In addition to this general charge, it also has the following specific duties:

8.20.2.1 Advise the Academic Senate on general policies and budgetary needs concerning research activities that are supported by the funds at the disposal of this committee.

8.20.2.2 Cooperate with the Office of Research to advise on the selection of campus nominees or applicants for research awards from foundations and other granting agencies that restrict the number of proposals submitted.

8.20.2.3 Review and evaluate faculty applications for support from intramural research funds, research travel funds or other research funds for which the committee may be made responsible and to recommend application of these funds within the limits of University policy governing the grants.
JUSTIFICATION:

8.20.1 The current bylaw makes reference to the University Committee on Research Policy which no longer exists. This sentence has been eliminated from the proposed bylaw.

8.20.2 The current bylaw refers to “the Division”. The proposed bylaw replaces this with “the Academic Senate.”

The Committee wishes the proposed bylaw to give future Committees discretion concerning matters considered, while at the same time committing it to a few specific duties. The wording of the proposed bylaw reflects these aims.

8.20.2.1 The clause in the current bylaw, “--- not otherwise provided for by University policy, concerning the research activities on the Riverside campus”, seems to be at variance with shared governance.” Also, the references to “the Riverside campus” and “extramural subsidies” are outdated. The proposed bylaw eliminates this clause and this phrase, and also rewords the bylaw to refer to one specific duty: “Advise the Academic Senate on general policies and budgetary needs concerning research activities that are supported by the funds at the disposal of the committee.” The intent here is that the Committee has a role in advising the Senate on the adequacy of funds at the disposal of the Committee, as well on their disposition.

8.20.2.1 of the current bylaw seems to define the Committee’s responsibilities residually, as concerning “General policies, not otherwise provided for by University policy, ---”, which seems inconsistent with the principle of shared governance. In recent years, the Committee has devoted most of its time to the allocation of the intramural research funds at its disposal. The Committee would like to expand its charge to include “all matters pertaining to research policy on the UC Riverside campus.” A sentence to this effect has been included in the proposed revision of 8.20.1.

8.20.2.2 The current clause is outdated. The proposed clause defines a new specific duty for the Committee, to “Cooperate with the Office of Research on the selection of campus nominees or applicants for research awards from foundations and other granting agencies that restrict the number of proposals submitted.” This new duty has the support of the current administration.

8.20.2.3 This clause refers to the major current duty of the Committee, the allocation of intramural research funds. The current bylaw contains the outdated term “staff members” applied to faculty members. The proposed
bylaw replaces “staff members” with “faculty”, and makes clear that the Committee’s duty is not only to review and evaluate applications for intramural research funds but also to decide on the awards and to allocate the funds.

Approved by the Committee on Research: February 23, 2010

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: March 16, 2010

Endorsed by the Executive Council:
As faculty of the University Writing Program at the University of California, Riverside, we deplore the attempts to eliminate or adulterate the third quarter writing requirement. We view English 1C as the essential capstone course to the composition series where the skills developed in the previous two quarters of first-year composition are solidified and augmented. Nearly from its inception in 1954, the University of California, Riverside has had an effective and efficient system in place whereby students have been required to take three quarters of composition (English 1A, English 1B, and English 1C) as part of their graduation requirements. However, recently due to the budget crisis, English 1C has been essentially suspended (though the requirement still exists) and is in danger of being eliminated altogether. In the meantime, two proposals are circulating within UCR that would effectively dilute—if not destroy—English 1C as a substantive course. These proposals are:

1) To replace English 1C with a Writing Across the Curriculum Program which substitutes the actual writing course—now taught by professional teachers of writing—with discussion led by teaching assistants from other disciplines. Additionally, these teaching assistants and the content of their discussions would have minimal oversight by the University Writing Program.

2) To abolish the third quarter writing requirement altogether.
English 1C helps students improve their writing and critical thinking skills. English 1C student essays show evidence of a distinct improvement of writing skills, particularly those related to critical thinking, analysis, and interpretation of texts. Individual rhetorical skills learned in English 1A and English 1B are dramatically strengthened in the third quarter course in which student writing skills continue to improve in part because the curriculum moves beyond specific formats to requiring students to synthesize both modes of writing, content, and skills.

In short, English 1C is a capstone course that admirably fulfills its role in the composition program at UCR, and there is ample evidence for this. The contribution of this course to student development is not in question; the funding is. Quality should not be sacrificed on the altar of expedience because ultimately the quality of an institution is measured by its decisions in times of crisis.

For these reasons, we, the undersigned, ask that the University uphold academic standards and not sacrifice student learning. We demand that English 1C be reinstated for Spring Quarter, 2010 to meet the needs of students.

Note: This statement reflects the opinions of instructors in the University Writing Program, and as such it is not representative of Writing Program policy or of the Writing Program Committee.

Signatures of faculty follow:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Title &amp; yrs exp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Stamp</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lecturer 9 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Harder</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lecturer 11 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Baringer</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Ph.D. Lect &amp; Inst 18 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen L. Polster</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>PhD Lecturer 10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Brett</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lecturer 27 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Clark</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lecturer 10 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Tuell</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lecturer 29 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy D. Ballard</td>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Lecturer 12 yrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NAME | SIGNATURE | TITLE & YRS EXP
--- | --- | ---
Gray Scott | Gary Scott | Lecturer (8 yrs)
Terry Spera | Terry Spera | Lecturer (21 yrs)
Cherie Masih | Cherie Masih | Lecturer (27 yrs)
Joshua Fenton | Joshua Fenton | Lecturer (4 yrs)
Don Jobe | Don Jobe | Lecturer 20 yrs
Pedram Parvar | Pedram Parvar | Lecturer (9 yrs)
David Mincey | David Mincey | Lecturer (9 yrs)
Kimberly Turner | Kimberly Turner | Lecturer (5 yrs)
Jim Candon | Jim Candon | Lecturer (5 yrs)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>TITLE &amp; YRS EXP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (14 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Cummins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (10 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Kenyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (17 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keri Barber</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon Stavne</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (20 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Innes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (16 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Manous</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (10 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan McIlvaine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (8 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew J. Snyder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer (3 yrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerned Faculty, UCR
English 1C Petition
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>TITLE &amp; YRS EXP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Hepler</td>
<td>Dan Hepler</td>
<td>lecturer (25 yrs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>