June 18, 2009

TO: Ward P. Beyermann, Department of Physics and Astronomy (Vice Chair)
Larry Wright, Philosophy, (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)
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, June 22, 2009

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, June 22, 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> Action/Information 1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Approval of the June 22, 2009 Agenda and Notes of June 8, 2009 meeting. 1 (pp. 1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II.</strong> Information 1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td>EVC AND PROVOST DALLAS RABENSTEIN Budget Update 2(pp. 8-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.</strong> Action/Information 1:50-2:25</td>
<td>WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM: A PROPOSAL TO DIVERSIFY AND STRENGTHEN THE COLLEGES’ WRITING REQUIREMENTS: The proposed options have been approved by CHASS. The EC is being asked to endorse and approve the proposal on behalf of the Division 3(pp. 20-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV.</strong> Action/Information 2:25-2:45</td>
<td>PROPOSAL TO USE THE iEVAL PROCESS At its meeting on June 8, 2009, the EC approved a motion to accept the report of the Ad Hoc Committee that was established to review the iEval process. It also approved a motion that the Chair, at his earliest convenience bring up the issue at the next meeting so that the EC could decide on what options to chose regarding incentives to the students. A recommendation needs to be made to the VPUE who is waiting for some form of resolution from the Senate. 4(pp. 22-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.</strong> Action/Information 2:45-2:50</td>
<td>BUDGET REDUCTION OPTIONS: Review the letter from Yudof and come prepared to offer some options to be incorporated into the letter to systemwide on behalf of the division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI.</strong> Action/Information 2:50-3:00</td>
<td>ANY OTHER BUSINESS:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
JUNE 8, 2009

PRESENT:
Anthony W. Norman, Biochemistry, (Chair)
Ward P. Beyermann, Department of Physics and Astronomy (Vice Chair)
Richard Arnott, Economics (Research)
Richard A. Cardullo, Biology (Committees)
Mary Gauvain, Psychology (Planning and Budget)
Manuela Martins-Green Cell Biology (Junior Rep to the Assembly)
Douglas Mitchell, GSOE (GSOE Executive Committee)
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM (CAP)
Richard A. Redak, Entomology (Faculty Welfare)
Marylynn V. Yates, Environmental Sciences (CNAS Executive Committee)
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)

ABSENT:
Larry Wright, Philosophy, (Secretary Parliamentarian)
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
John Haleblian, AGSM (AGSM Executive Committee)
Mart L. Molle, Computer Science and Eng. (Sr. Rep to the Assembly)
Leonard J. Mueller, Chemistry (Academic Computing)
Juliet McMullin, Anthropology, (Diversity and Equal Opportunity
Thomas C. Patterson, Anthropology (CHASS Executive Committee)

GUESTS:
Chancellor White
Vice Chancellor Jim Sandoval
LaRae Lundgren
William Kidder – Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The agenda was amended to include a short presentation by William Kidder, Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor who was going to give a short presentation on “The Threat to Shared Governance”. The minutes were accepted as written.

CHANCELLOR:
Chancellor White indicated that he was more interested in hearing the thoughts and perspectives of the EC members. He was especially interested in having the Senate provide a group of faculty that he will be able to work and consult with in the summer about the
budget issues. He also mentioned that UCR received about $220 million in two bonds that were sold and that the Genomics building will be completed. He was not sure how many projects will be covered by these funds. He also indicated that the Provost is reconvening the Budget Advisory Committee and the Steering Committee to go back and review the budget further.

Regarding the email he had sent out to the campus concerning the budget, the Chancellor said that there was a large amount of people who had written to him; he asked Cindy Giorgio to give a summary of what the main concerns were. The concerns as summarized by Cindy were:

1. Can people use vacations rather than the paid holidays? And the response to this was no – vacations cannot be used because then there would be no salary savings realized;
2. Would furloughs affect retirement credit – the response was hopefully no, retirement will not be affected;
3. From the faculty, does the furlough apply to those on soft money – and the response was yes – the furloughs will be applied regardless of fund source. It was being done this way in an effort to maintain equity amongst all employees at UCR.

The Chancellor said that the faculty merits will continue to be paid. With regards to the use of vacation days, the Chancellor indicated that the academic year is already built around the 13 furlough days and it was thought that doing it this way would be the least destructive to the mission of the university which is teaching. He was not sure where an exempt salary cut-off would be, but there were discussions of a $30,000 or $46,000 threshold. Some EC members expressed their hope that the UC will ensure that the public understand the huge sacrifice that the people of the UC are making in taking these 16 day furloughs. Regarding the distribution of the furlough days, the Chancellor indicated that it was not confirmed yet, but it was probably not going to be evenly distributed. The devil will be in the details.

A question was posed as to how confident the Chancellor was that the 40 million dollar deficit was as bad as it got? Chancellor White indicated that he could not give a definite answer about this but continued to say that UCR’s budget is about 8% of general funds and the $40 million deficit is based on that percentage.

In discussing the situation we are in, the Chair of Faculty Welfare wondered what OP is doing to better educate the public and the legislature so that we never find ourselves in this situation again. It was noted that having UC fight the legislature was not effective. The Chancellor indicated that the Office of the President has hired some new people to talk to the Legislature. He also discussed his plans of creating a mailing/communication system that he can use to send out information on a weekly basis to the faculty, staff, students, alumni, community and the legislature on what we are doing.

**Bill Kidder - Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor**

Bill Kidder indicated that he wanted to apprise the EC on the legislation that is being proposed by Senator Leland Yee and others. Bill Kidder indicated that one major
implication of this proposal would be a profound erosion of the UC Academic Senate’s role under shared governance, and would affect all areas of the Senate’s delegated authority (admissions, degree requirements, etc.). So far, the news and information he is getting from Office of the President indicate that the amendment may be withdrawn.

JIM SANDOVAL – VICE CHANCELLOR FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS – LARAE LUNDGREN:
VC Sandoval indicated that for Fall 2009, the freshman target was 4000 students and had we achieved this target, UCR would have been over enrolled by 1000 students. Putting that into the systemwide context, they were anticipating about 11,000 students. He indicated that we received an increase in the number of students who applied directly to UCR. We have the largest increase in applicants this year for undergraduate students.

14% of our total entering class is from the referral pool. This year we did not admit all students in the referral pool we deselected about 2500 students in order to stay closer to our target. In terms of academic profile the major benefit of us going selective this year is that the average GPA scores went up from 3.41 to 3.48 and SAT scores went up from 1059 to 1071. The difference between direct applicants and the referral pool, the GPA for applicants who applied directly to UCR went from 3.4 to 3.48 compared to the referral pool which was 3.53 and last year was 3.44. For the SAT scores, the difference between the direct applicants and the referral pool was 1069 to 1085. He also indicated that both of these numbers are for last year, but generally the referral pool carries with it higher achieving students. Lastly, to give the EC a better sense of what selective enrollment will have on our colleges, he indicated that for 2009, the total increase for incoming students for CHASS to date is 1.9% or 63 students CNAS – 220 students or 12.4% and the COE 7.7% or 47 students. For CHASS, the freshmen number went down but there was a big surge in transfer students.

For Fall 2010 the target is 4000 students. The campus is facing a tremendous decision on what we will be doing for Fall 2010. What they are hearing from the faculty is that there is a need to improve the academic quality of our students while still maintaining diversity. We will be going selective by college and or major. They are looking at impacted majors within each college. They are giving the colleges as much latitude as they can to become selective and the important piece being the mechanism that is used to become selective. The one thing that his office needs to do is to ensure that the campus meets its enrollment target. The VC office will use the standing senate policy on selective admissions to select which students they will admit and as they do this, they will work with the colleges to determinate where they want the enrollment cap – either at the college level or on individual majors. The decision on selection will be a joint administration/senate approval process. Dr. Peter Sadler gave a brief overview of the Regents Policy that guides admission. He discussed the concept of eligibility which is unique to the University of California. The Master Plan for Higher Education stipulates that the top 12.5% of California public high school graduates are eligible for admission to at least one UC campus. Students become eligible by completing a defined set of college-preparatory courses, by achieving appropriate grades in those courses, and by achieving appropriate scores on college admissions tests. Individual campuses then evaluate the applications from eligible students and make admissions decisions using a process known as comprehensive review.
CLIMATE SURVEY – MARTIN JOHNSON:
The underlying intention of the climate survey is to focus on job related specifics at UCR. The Ad Hoc Committee met several times with Faculty Welfare and the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity. They have also received comments from the CAP Chair, Prof. Kathleen Montgomery. The intention was to now accept the survey instrument. The EC discussed the time frame for the survey and there were concerns raised because much had changed on campus since the project began. It was feared that it would not be easy to interpret the data collected. There was also concern that sending out the survey in June 2009 might not generate enough useful data. The EC members voted unanimously – 15-1 to accept the survey instrument and release the survey on October 15, 2009 and that the time for consideration for the survey will be July 1, 2008.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE BIOENGINEERING MAJOR REQUIREMENTS:
The EC approved the changes to the Bioengineering Major requirements on behalf of the Division. According to the Bylaws, this will be reported in the November agenda.

NAME CHANGE:
The EC approved the proposed name change of the Liberal Studies & Interdisciplinary Programs Office to Office of Interdisciplinary programs.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO BIOCHEMISTRY UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM:
The EC approved the changes to the Biochemistry Undergraduate Program on behalf of the Division. According to the Bylaws, this will be reported in the November agenda.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR BS AND BA IN STATISTICS:
The EC approved the changes to the BS and BA in Statistics on behalf of the Division. According to the Bylaws, this will be reported in the November agenda.

REPORT FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE REVIEWING THE IEVAL PROCESS:
The Ad Hoc Committee to evaluate the iEval process was asked to address the issue of low response rate from students on the online process as compared to written responses and to come up with alternative solutions that would allow the campus to move to a complete online evaluation process. The Ad Hoc Committee chaired by Frank Vahid had completed its work and they came up with the following as ways to provide incentives to the students. They felt that the 1st option was the most effective one.

1. Give students access to partial evaluation results
2. Inform the students of the importance of evaluations
3. Simplify the evaluation form and
4. Provide grade-related incentives

After a brief discussion, the EC moved to accept the report as written. The EC then approved a motion that the Chair of the Senate at his earliest convenience will make a decision on whether to add it to the June 22, 2009 agenda for the 2008 EC members to accept one of the incentive options given above, or whether to leave it to the incoming 2009 EC members.
Meeting adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers  
Executive Director  
Academic Senate
June 3, 2009

TO: Anthony, Norman, Chair
    Riverside Division,
    Academic Senate

FROM: Thomas C. Patterson, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: May 26, 2009 Revision of Writing Across the Curriculum Proposal

The CHASS Executive Committee met on June 3, 2009 to review the proposal: Writing Across the Curriculum: A Proposal to Diversify and Strengthen the College’s Writing Requirements (revised May 26, 2009). It approved the document but wishes to make four points that might improve clarity.

1. A flow chart showing the two tracks described in Resolution 3 (p. 4) would be useful.
2. Clarification of footnote 7 on p. 9. Do the TAs come from the budget of the Writing Program or the home department?
3. Will there be enrollment caps on section size or course size in writing intensive courses as there are now in English, Creative Writing and Philosophy?
4. Writing intensive courses should be designated as such; the language of point 8 on the implementation is confusing—writing and half-writing (W and HW) should be related to the flow chart.

Cc: John Briggs, Director
    University Writing Program
Writing Across the Curriculum: A Proposal to Diversify and Strengthen the Colleges’ Writing Requirements
May 26, 2009

Background and Justification

In recent years, Senate committees and task forces have called for strengthening and diversifying students’ options for satisfying the campus’s writing requirement. There has been strong Senate support for maintaining a three-quarter requirement. At the same time, the Senate has urged that the third quarter of instruction be diversified so that students are able to satisfy the requirement in a variety of courses and disciplines, not only by taking ENGL 1C or 1SC. One of the reasons the new University Writing Program was created in 2008 was to develop options for writing across the curriculum.

Senate Chair Martins-Green, reporting in 2005 on comprehensive Senate discussions regarding the UCR writing requirement, outlined the following recommendations resulting from that review:

All committees (including the Executive Council) agreed that the first two quarters should be standard Freshman English Composition. However, for the third quarter, several alternatives were offered. Among the possibilities are:

- The existing courses, ENGL 1C, ENGL 1SC, ENGL 1HC;
- New or existing College-based courses approved by each of the respective Executive Committees with subsequent Senate approval;
- Adoption of “Writing Across the Curriculum” by identifying a specific set of courses, from which students of a given College can choose. If this is adopted the appropriate resources have to be put in place to assist the faculty teaching the courses targeted to fulfill “Writing Across the Curriculum.” (Senate Chair’s Memo, 2/17/05)

Following these consultations, a joint faculty and administrative Implementation Committee was formed to create the University Writing Program. According to the Charter of the new writing program, which became an independent unit in July, 2008, “[T]he development of the UWP acknowledges the continued growth” of the campus’s responsibility for “writing and composition instruction . . . as well as the need for the

---

1 The Implementation Committee consisted of faculty and administrators: Steve Cullenberg (Senate Representative and then CHASS Dean), Katherine Kinney (English Chair), Theda Shapiro (Senate Representative), Melanie Sperling (Senate Representative), Andrew Grosovsky (Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education), Gretchen Bolar (VP, Academic Planning and Budget), Betty Lord (Academic Personnel), Susan Hunter Hancock (CHASS Dean’s Office), Carolyn Stark (EVC Office), Dave Fairris (CHASS Dean’s Office) and Jim Sandoval (VP-Student Affairs).
campus as a whole to be engaged in the composition and writing instruction of its students.” The University Writing Program has been charged with developing various options and ideas for implementing alternatives to English 1C.

There is widespread faculty interest in writing instruction that is closely related to the subject matters and methodologies of the disciplines. When students are writing in a variety of classes, the competencies they have developed in freshman writing courses are more likely to carry over into their writing and learning in the disciplines. An effective, targeted diversification of responsibilities for the writing requirement can thus strengthen the overall curriculum. Students are more likely to use writing as inquiry and communication in the upper division as well as the lower. They are more likely to achieve an articulate grasp of what they are studying, both in breadth courses and the required courses of their majors. They are more likely to master forms of written communication that are characteristic of particular disciplines. As a result they are likely to become more engaged, and more able to meet the faculty’s expectations in all their courses.

This proposal responds to the Senate recommendations and follows the charter of the University Writing Program. It proposes policies and strategies to involve and support faculty members across the campus in writing across the curriculum. Following the Senate recommendation to focus on the third quarter of the requirement, it sets out two templates for alternatives to English 1C. English 1C would continue to be offered, but the number of 1C sections would diminish as more students took one of these alternative paths:

1) Writing-Across-Curriculum (WAC) Courses that are writing-intensive courses offered by various departments and standing in place of English 1C;
2) Writing-Across-the-Curriculum (WAC) Courses offered by various departments that are somewhat less writing-intensive, but which stand in place of English 1C when students simultaneously enroll in and pass a related two-unit writing course taught by the University Writing Program (the UWP). The course proposal for the two-unit offering is under consideration, and will be sent forward to the Senate as a separate matter of deliberation.

This plan addresses the practical challenges of mounting such a program, particularly with regard to TA-training and workshop/tutorial services. It makes use of tutoring and workshop support that the UWP has been developing over the past year. It also provides logistical and advisory support to faculty developing and teaching writing-intensive courses.

---

2 Departments so far expressing strong interest in offering one or more full-replacement courses are History, Religious Studies, and Comparative Literature. We are working with other departments that are in various stages of experimenting with courses that might be full or partial alternatives to 1C: these include the departments of Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Philosophy, Creative Writing, Anthropology, Women’s Studies, and Political Science. Some of the courses under discussion are restricted to majors. Some are not. We anticipate hearing about additional courses as we contact more departments and as other departments hear about the program.
In addition to its academic advantages, the proposal would reduce the campus’s overall costs of teaching the third-quarter writing requirement. Savings would be realized as various departments offered courses that were alternatives to English 1C. To assist departments, the University Writing Program would provide instructional support: course-specific tutorials, workshops, TA-training, and pedagogical counsel for faculty.

This plan would be implemented as a five-year pilot program, to be evaluated by the Senate in its fifth year for its effectiveness in comparison to the effectiveness of ENGL 001C. On the basis of that evaluation, the Senate would determine whether the program should continue.

---

3 Since the proposal sets out a voluntary program, there are no mandatory costs to be borne by units outside of the writing program. Small courses that do not need TA support and larger courses with TA support already in place will be the best candidates for WAC status. Finding funding for additional TA support, if it is necessary to teach the approved WAC course according to Senate requirements, will be the responsibility of the department offering the course.

4 If we weigh the cost of the UWP’s tutorial/workshop/training support to departments against the savings that would accrue when fewer sections of English 1C were offered, we estimate a savings of approximately 70% of the expense of enrolling students in conventional sections of 1C. Although exact savings are difficult to estimate, the enrollment of approximately one thousand students per year in full-replacement alternative courses (alternative #1) would save the campus approximately $225,000 per year. Savings from alternative #2 for the same number of students would be approximately $150,000 per year.
Resolutions to be Voted on By the Academic Senate

1. The Senate approves the creation of a five-year pilot program in Writing Across the Curriculum, to be implemented by the University Writing Program according to Senate-approved policies and guidelines. The program will offer alternatives to ENGL 001C. During the pilot period, the University Writing Program will be responsible for evaluating 1C-alternative courses for their effectiveness in comparison to ENGL 001C. On the basis of that evaluation, the Senate will determine whether the program should continue.

2. The pilot program allows students to fulfill the third-quarter composition requirement by taking ENGL 001C (or with college approval, ENGL 001SC)\(^5\), or by taking a designated alternative course in another department or program. Departments and colleges will choose whether to propose such courses. Once proposed, such courses must be approved by the appropriate executive committee as well as by the Academic Senate Committee on Courses.

3. In addition to the option designated above, the third-quarter requirement may be fulfilled by concurrent enrollment in a) a two-unit writing course taught by the University Writing Program and b) a four-unit course with a half-intensive writing component taught by another department or program. The two-unit courses will be developed in consultation with each college faculty. Both the two-unit and four-unit concurrent courses must be approved as substitutes for ENGL 001C by the appropriate executive committee as well as by the Academic Senate Committee on Courses.

4. Designation and renewal of alternatives to ENGL 001C will be based on the kinds of writing assigned, the amount of writing, the feedback being provided, and other criteria listed in Appendix A. The University Writing Program will be responsible for establishing and publicizing these criteria.

5. College executive committees will have the option of setting eligibility standards (e.g. a “B” average in English 1A and 1B) for their own students’ access to alternatives to English 1C. The UWP will be responsible for implementing any eligibility rules, with the cooperation of advisors.

6. In order to implement these new writing-across-the-curriculum options, the following UCR Catalog and Divisional and College Regulations must be implemented.

---

\(^5\) The ‘S’ in English 001SC indicates “Science”. Thus English 001SC teaches English writing using science topics.
APPENDIX A

Checklist of Criteria for Certification and Renewal of Alternatives to English 1C

The Academic Senate will designate alternatives to English 1C on the basis of the following criteria:

_____ a) Writing is one major focus of the course. Writing is used as a method of inquiry as well as communication, for example by

- assigning written explanations of complex concepts, texts, or data sets;
- requiring writers to discover, assemble, and explain competing ideas or explanations;
- encouraging writers to weigh and evaluate competing ideas.

_____ b) The course assigns an amount of writing roughly comparable to the amount assigned, graded, and returned to students in composition courses, adjusting for the fact that written communication in various disciplines takes a number of forms, and that assignments and exercises preliminary to formal assignments might qualify as part of that total. If the course is designated to satisfy the requirement in combination with the two-unit UWP course, it should assign an amount of writing roughly comparable to half the amount in composition courses.

_____ c) The course provides feedback to students on their writing in each assignment;

_____ d) The course responds to students’ writing in terms of ideas, reasoning, development, and clarity in paragraphs and sentences as well as the assignment as a whole, in terms of

- commenting on the students’ subject matter by paying close attention to fact, reasoning, development, and clarity;
- commenting on representative passages in terms of grammatical correctness, the clarity of assertions and the logic of paragraphs, and the use of evidence;
- offering advice on these matters for the sake of revision or the writing of later assignments.

The volume of writing in Composition courses is based on word totals required by IGETC transfer agreements with the CSU and CC systems. The amount of writing in English 1C is 5000 words: 4-6 papers (none shorter than 750 words, and at least one paper of 1250 words or more), plus a final.
e) The course’s TAs participate in the required UWP training course, which focuses on writing instruction -- including attention to the process of writing as well as the intensive evaluation of student writing.\footnote{TA-training will take place in English 302 (meeting one hour per week) during the quarter the course is taught, or by alternative means approved by the UWP Director. TAs will remain under the charge of faculty in their home departments, and UWP training will take account of the 20-hour per week limit on TA activity. UWP instruction will focus on productive ways of responding to student writing (through, for example, conferences, drafting, comments, and evaluation that focus on methods of development and patterns of error) and effective ways of embedding writing instruction in discussion sections.}

f) Materials relevant to these criteria have been provided by the proposing department for UWP and COC review.

g) The department offering the course commits to monitoring and evaluating the course’s conformity to these requirements.
APPENDIX B

Methods of Implementation

1. Coordination of concurrent enrollment in two-unit and four-unit courses (pathway # 2)
With college executive committee and Senate approval, one or several two-unit courses will be available for this option in each participating college. Advisors, working with the UWP Director, will be in charge of ensuring that students following pathway #2 are enrolled concurrently in both the two-unit course and one of several approved half-intensive four-unit courses in that college. Enforcement of concurrent enrollment will be effected by electronic means (with the help of the Registrar’s Office) or by advising, e-mail notification, and announcements in class. Students will have an incentive to enroll in both courses since both are necessary to satisfy the requirement.

2. Grading procedure in the two-unit course
The grade in the two-unit course stands alone and does not influence the grade in the half-intensive, four-unit course. Students must earn a “C” or better in each course to satisfy the third-quarter writing requirement.

3. Training TAs
TAs in the alternative courses will continue to be the responsibility of the faculty-in-charge of the alternative course – faculty in their home departments. TA-training will continue to be the primary responsibility of the home departments. Participation in the WAC program will require additional training conducted by the University Writing Program, which will coordinate with the home department to ensure that overall TA loads do not exceed an average of twenty hours per week. This additional instruction will focus on productive ways of responding to student writing (for example, by means of conferences, drafting, comments, and forms of evaluation that focus on methods of development and patterns of effective communication) and effective ways of embedding writing instruction in discussion sections.

4. Working with faculty who are proposing and teaching WAC courses
In its work with faculty proposing and teaching WAC courses, the University Writing Program’s initial priority is to work out a productive schedule of assignments, effective designs for those assignments, and arrangements for workshop and tutorial support. The long-range priority of consultation with WAC faculty is to strengthen instruction and learning with the help of more rigorous and frequent writing assignments in the disciplines; more intensive interaction among faculty, TAs, and undergraduates about writing; and more focus on deepening and facilitating written communication not as an adjunct pursuit but as an activity at the core of what we do.
5. **Need for variety of two-unit courses in CNAS or BCOE to reflect variety in the sciences**

If a College Executive Committee requests, the University Writing Program would pursue the development of several two-unit courses, in consultation with college faculty, to reflect broad disciplinary divisions in the College.

6. **Ensuring that students transferring to other UC’s are not disadvantaged**

Approximately 150 UCR students transfer to other UC’s each year, most of them to UCSD, UCLA, and UCI. Most would have no difficulty since most UC campuses do not require a third quarter of writing. Other UC campuses require a writing course in the upper division – a course that current UCR transfers to those campuses must take even after fulfilling UCR’s existing composition requirement. UCR’s new WAC legislation would not create a new inconvenience for most transfer students going to other UC’s. Only at Berkeley, where just 5% (7 students) go each year would the question of a UCR WAC course’s transferability be an issue. In that case, UCR could make a strong case that the WAC alternative to ENGL 1C should satisfy the requirement based on the criteria in Appendix A.

7. **Accepting other campuses’ WAC courses for transfer to UCR**

Associate deans and advisors, with reference to Appendix A and the UWP’s assistance, if needed, would be able to decide whether a WAC course taken on another campus would satisfy the third-quarter writing requirement at UCR. As with other transferability questions, a body of precedents would develop.

8. **Using a “W” designation for 1C alternative courses, and a “HW” (half-intensive) designation for half-intensive four-unit courses paired with a college’s two-unit course.**

These designations would aid in advising undergraduates. In the long run, they might be a good idea. However, 2009/2010 course offerings need a more streamlined process of approval that is not bound by the Courses Committee’s normal deadlines. We need to be able to get approval for next year’s courses as soon as possible, in some cases as early as this May and June. We are working with Courses Committee so that we are able to designate certain courses as 1C-alternatives in the coming months.

---

8 The ‘W’ nomenclature is the Courses Committee designation for 4-unit intensive courses or HW (half-intensive) writing courses.
To Be Adopted

**Proposed Changes in General Catalog**

**Campus Breadth Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses taken in a student’s major discipline (including courses cross-listed with the major discipline) may not be applied toward satisfaction of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Ethnicity or the Natural Sciences and Mathematics requirements except for Biology majors in connection with the Biological Sciences requirement, English majors in connection with the English Composition requirement, History majors in connection with the World History requirement, Ethnic Studies majors in connection with the Ethnicity requirement, and Foreign Language majors in connection with language requirements. However, courses outside the major discipline, but required for the major, may be applied toward satisfaction of these requirements.</td>
<td>Courses taken in a student’s major discipline (including courses cross-listed with the major discipline) may not be applied toward satisfaction of the Humanities, Social Sciences, Ethnicity or the Natural Sciences and Mathematics requirements except for Biology majors in connection with the Biological Sciences requirement, English majors in connection with the English Composition requirement, History majors in connection with the World History requirement, Ethnic Studies majors in connection with the Ethnicity requirement, and Foreign Language majors in connection with language requirements. However, courses outside the major discipline, but required for the major, may be applied toward satisfaction of these requirements. If such courses have also been designated by the Academic Senate as English 1C alternatives, they can be used to satisfy both breadth and third-quarter writing requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHASS English Composition Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 58: English Composition</td>
<td>Page 58: English Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.”</td>
<td>Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English Composition by completing a one-year sequence of college level instruction in English Composition with no grade lower than “C.” Courses that the Academic Senate designates as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry-Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C is completed with satisfactory GPA. Alternatives to English 1C may be applied toward satisfaction of the third quarter of the requirement if students earn a “C” or higher.

Students should enroll in an English composition course each quarter they are registered at UCR until the sequence of preliminary Entry-Level Writing courses, if needed, and ENGL 001A, ENGL 001B, ENGL 001C (or an ENGL 001C alternative designated by the Academic Senate) is completed with satisfactory GPA.

Approved:
CHASS Executive Committee – June 3, 2009
Endorsed by the Executive Committee –
To Be Adopted

Regulations of the Riverside Division

R6.1  *English composition. Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English composition with no grade lower than C.* (Am 16 Nov 2004)

*English composition. Students must demonstrate adequate proficiency in English composition by completing a one-year sequence of college-level instruction in English composition with no grade lower than C.*  
*A standard way to meet this requirement is to pass English 1A, 1B, 1C with a grade of at least C in each quarter.*

Courses that the Academic Senate and/or individual Colleges designate as alternatives to English 1C may be applied toward satisfaction of the third quarter of the requirement if students complete ENGL 1A and 1B with a “C” or higher and earn a “C” or higher in the Senate-approved alternative to ENGL 001C. Individual colleges may set a higher GPA requirement in English 1A and/or 1B as a prerequisite to take alternatives to English 1C. The alternative(s) must be approved by the Academic Senate. (Am 16 Nov 2004)

R6.1.1  *Transfer students who have taken one semester of English composition at another college or university are required to take English 1B and English 1C.* (Am 24 May 84)

*Transfer students who have taken one semester of English composition at another college or university are required to take English 1B and English 1C,*  
*(with the option of taking an alternative to English 1C approved by the Academic Senate)* (Am 24 May 84)

Approved:  
CHASS Executive Committee – June 3, 2009  
Endorsed by the Executive Committee –
PROPOSED INCENTIVE OPTIONS FOR STUDENTS TO ENTICE THEM TO COMPLETE THE iEVAL

1. STUDENT ACCESS TO PARTIAL EVALUATION RESULTS: This method provides students who complete their online evaluations with access the following quarter to certain parts of the evaluation results of all courses and instructors, such as numerical averages to key questions. The ad hoc committee encourages this approach, with some concerns though as discussed below. The approach provides a direct positive incentive for students—by participating in evaluation, the student gains access to evaluation information. Some faculty even argue that students, having participated in the evaluation, should be allowed to see some of the results, independent of whether evaluations are done online or with paper. Providing access can counter the worrisome trend of students relying on uncontrolled low-quality data such as data on www.ratemyprofessor.com, pickaprof.com, and ad hoc forums on Facebook; in the absence of good data, students may use any data they can find. Student-run evaluation processes have appeared on some campuses (e.g., UC San Diego’s CAPES, http://www.cape.ucsd.edu/); while useful, faculty have little control over access policies. Some would say that online availability of evaluation data is inevitable, and it will appear in either uncontrolled, student controlled, or faculty controlled form. By consciously choosing the latter before one of the other two becomes entrenched, faculty can create a process that provides adequate safeguards. For example, access to written comments could be disallowed, or irrelevant comments (such as comments on a professor’s clothing) could be hidden. Access to evaluation data of new assistant professors could be disallowed for 1-2 years to provide new professors a chance to develop their teaching skills. Data for only the past few years, which are assumed to be the most relevant scores, could be the only data displayed. Policies could be created for instructors to opt-out of providing student access, to allow data to persist beyond a few years, to allow broader access to data (e.g., comments, more numerical values, etc.), and so on. Data could optionally be supplemented with other measures of teacher and course effectiveness, such as peer evaluation, student performance in subsequent courses, etc. An online access approach would likely evolve over the years to be increasingly effective. UCR C&C indicates that the cost of modifying existing systems to track student iEval completion of all his/her courses and to provide subsequent quarter access to key results is straightforward and would incur a one-time development cost of approximately $12,000. UCR’s counsel is of the opinion that access to instructor and course evaluation information is allowable, with the recommendation that faculty be informed before teaching a course that the course evaluation data may be shared with students. Concerns with allowing student access to evaluation data include possible typecasting of faculty by students (students may have an incoming bias against a professor based on past evaluations) or an over-emphasis on student evaluations causing changes in grading by instructors. Consciously-developed controls on the process as discussed above could help reduce these concerns.
2. INFORMING STUDENTS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATIONS: This method strives to make students more aware of the importance of evaluations, which has been shown to increase student response rates. Methods include encouraging/reminding instructors to explain the importance during class, in class, and/or in iLearn; including discussion in the syllabus; and describing the importance in reminders sent to students. A related method involves sending students reminders. Much of this activity already accompanies iEval; further education/reminding of instructors as to the necessity of them personally stressing the importance of evaluations (e.g., its role in advancement) may help.

3. SIMPLIFYING THE EVALUATION FORM: Studies show that short and simple online evaluation forms get better response rates (e.g., Error! Reference source not found.). This is especially true when students are completing forms for 4-5 courses during one sitting at a computer; survey fatigue may lead to giving up, or to filling in answers arbitrarily or with little thought. The committee recommends the evaluation form be reduced to less than 10 questions, while also still including the comments section.

4. PROVIDING GRADE-RELATED INCENTIVES: Many schools obtain high response rates via one of two grade-related incentives. A popular incentive is to provide a small amount of extra credit (e.g., 0.25 course points has been shown effective) in a course for submitting an online evaluation. The ad hoc committee does NOT recommend this approach (and obviously could not recommend it as a matter of campus policy). Another common incentive is to provide “early” access to final course grades, with students who have completed all their online evaluations receiving access to their semester grades several days or even a week earlier than other students. While this approach might be considered at UCR, it is somewhat problematic given that grades are increasingly posted on iLearn before being provided to the registrar, and thus instructors would need to hide those grades on iLearn. The approach could also be viewed by students as punitive. Nevertheless, the approach could raise participation. UCR’s C&C estimates a one-time setup cost of about $10,000.
Dear Colleagues:

I am writing to update you about several options under review for systemwide furloughs and/or salary reductions. Although this is a difficult subject to confront, like other employers this is something we must look at given the severity of the fiscal challenges we face and I want all faculty and staff to be aware of the options under consideration and the decision-making process we are following. I recognize this is difficult news to receive – it is difficult to deliver. But you are a member of the University community and an integral part of this institution and you deserve to know what is being considered, and why.

These are unprecedented times, and we are facing unprecedented challenges. The combination of actual and proposed cuts by the State to UC’s budget for the current and upcoming fiscal years results in a funding shortfall totaling nearly **$800 million**. The University has never faced a funding deficit of this magnitude and responding to it will require sacrifice from every member of the University community:

- Student fee increases already approved, which total **$211 million**, cover about one quarter of the shortfall.

- Systemwide pay reductions and/or furloughs would produce an estimated **$195 million** – another one-fourth of the solution.

- The remainder of the projected cuts will fall to the campuses, and likely will affect course availability, class size, student services, and other aspects of the educational program.

Enclosed is a summary of the furlough/salary reduction options being considered. No decisions have been made thus far – a specific option is expected to be submitted for approval to The Regents at their July meeting. In previous communications I
made clear that implementation of any furloughs and/or salary reductions must be
done in the most equitable manner possible, and requires broad consultation with
the UC community. This consultation process includes giving faculty and staff the
opportunity to comment on the proposed options, and you will receive information
about how to do that separately. Also, please be assured that we will keep you
informed as we move through this process.

Much has been done to deal with these very difficult budget challenges, and I
appreciate the sacrifices people have made already. UC already has cut the Office
of the President, frozen and reduced senior-level salaries, curtailed hiring and
faculty recruitment, certain bonus and incentive programs were cancelled or
defered, the staff merit pool for FY 2008-09 was eliminated, and significant
restrictions were placed on travel, equipment and other purchases. Campuses have
already begun eliminating positions, imposing severe restrictions on faculty hiring
and eliminating or modifying programs. And, the President, Executive and Senior
Vice Presidents, Chancellors, and Executive Vice Chancellors reduced their salaries.

Additional efforts are underway at the Office of the President to generate further
cost savings through restructuring UC debt, and possible savings through
information technology initiatives.

In closing I want to thank you, very much, for your hard work and loyalty to the
University, day-in and day-out. I appreciate deeply all that you do to support UC
and to uphold its service and promise to the people of California.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mark G. Yudof
President
Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan Options

Declaration of Financial Emergency: In May 2009, following the defeat of the ballot measures intended to provide budget relief to the State, the Governor proposed a revised budget for the balance of FY 2008-09 and for FY 2009-10 which imposes significant new State funding reductions for UC. For the current fiscal year, the Governor’s revised budget proposes a combination of one-time and permanent State funding reductions totaling $816.6 million, $640 million of which is offset by the allocation of federal economic stimulus monies (American Recovery and Reinvestment Act [ARRA]). The remaining shortfall in FY 2008-09 of $176.1 million is partially offset by the 7% student fee increase in that year, leaving a net reduction for FY 2008-09 of $77.4 million.

For FY 2009-10, the Governor’s budget proposes a State funding reduction of $619.3 million – representing a 19% decline in State funding from the FY 2007-08 levels. The previous adopted State budget for FY 2009-10 proposed a $115.5 million reduction for UC. While the recently approved 9.3% student fee increase for FY 2009-10 will generate, net of financial aid, $125.9 million in revenues to offset the $619.3 million reduction, the net State funding shortfall of $493.4 million for FY 2009-10 coupled with the $77.4 million shortfall in FY 2008-09 requires immediate system wide and campus actions.

As has been previously reported, the University already is taking multiple cost-cutting measures in response to the earlier approved reduction in State funding in FY 2009-10 totaling $115.5 million. The Office of the President has already been reduced by $67 million over FY 2007-08 levels. System wide salary freezes on Senior Management Group members have been imposed, certain bonus and incentive programs were cancelled or deferred, the staff merit pool for FY 2008-09 was eliminated, significant restrictions were placed on travel, equipment and other purchases. Campuses have already begun eliminating positions, imposing severe restrictions on faculty hiring and eliminating or modifying programs. And, the President, all of the Chancellors, the Executive Vice Chancellors as well as all Executive and Senior Vice Presidents in the Office of the President agreed to reduce their salaries by 5% for FY 2009-10.

The proposed additional reductions in State funding for the University totaling nearly a 20 percent decline, coupled with the need to act expeditiously to address these reductions, requires more dramatic actions. Following an extensive analysis of the options available to the University to absorb these reductions in the coming year, and following extensive discussions at a June 3, 2009 meeting with the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors, the President has determined that a system wide salary reduction/furlough plan is required inasmuch as over 70 percent of the University’s budget is related to salaries and benefits for faculty and staff. In order to ensure equity across the University, each of the Plans set forth below would apply to all faculty and staff, except student employees, including those funded
by contracts and grants, clinical income and other auxiliary activity, and general funds. It is recognized that implementation of each option described is subject to the University’s HEERA obligations.

While a salary reduction/furlough plan will assist in addressing the State funding shortfall, it is recognized that further actions will be required in order to address fully the entire reduction in the UC budget. These additional actions will include further cost savings at the Office of the President, savings through restructuring UC debt, possible savings through information technology initiatives, and significant budget actions on each of the campuses ranging from program closures, elimination and/or restriction of services to students and employees, layoffs, as well as eliminations of positions and deferred hiring.

While the Governor’s proposed budget awaits final action by the State Legislature, the President believes it prudent that UC act expeditiously to implement measures to address the proposed budget reductions. The latest tax collection figures released by the State Controller’s office project an $827 million shortfall for the fiscal year, putting the State on course to end the fiscal year with a $24.3 billion deficit. This further exacerbates an already bad cash situation, with revenues for the first 11 months of FY 2008/09 down $12.9 billion from the same period last year. This deteriorating cash outlook could substantially increase the State’s cash deficit to $25.3 billion by April of next year.

Accordingly, it is proposed that one of the following suggested options for salary reductions and/or furloughs plans (or a modified version of any of these Plans) be submitted for approval by the Regents at their July 2009 meeting. A brief description of each of the options is being provided to facilitate consultation with faculty and staff prior to the submission of a final Plan to the Regents in July. The UC senior personnel who agreed to have their salaries reduced by 5% for FY 2009-10 will have their salaries reduced by a total of at least 8% under these plans.

**OPTION I: 8 Percent Salary Reduction Plan**

**Plan:** Salaries for all faculty and staff be reduced by 8%. Salaries for faculty and staff earning less than $46,000 per year be reduced by 4%.

**Duration:** August 1, 2009 through July 31, 2010 unless extended by subsequent Regental action. Extension will require submission and review of a plan in a manner similar to the plan currently under review.

**Projected UC General Fund Savings:** It is anticipated that this Option would generate $193.5 million in UC General fund savings.

**Considerations:**

- This Option would not result in an interruption of teaching, research, medical centers operations and essential services.
- This Option would easily be administered in the payroll system.
• This Option would impact employee retirement plan benefits unless addressed through Regental action similar to the provisions of the START program. Measures would need to be implemented to protect benefits and leave accrual levels for faculty and staff.

• Under this Option, faculty and staff would not benefit from a reduction in time worked.

• The Option does not present Fair Labor Standard Act concerns.

OPTION II: 21 Unpaid Days Plan

Plan: Through a combination of certain unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days totaling 21 days (14 days for academic year faculty and 19 days for fiscal year faculty), staff and faculty salaries would be reduced by 8%. For staff and faculty earning less than $46,000 per year, the Plan would include 11 unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days (7 days for academic year faculty and 10 days for fiscal year faculty). Accrued vacation and/or sick leave could not be applied to unpaid days.

Duration: August 1, 2009 through July 31, 2010 unless extended by subsequent Regental action. Extension will require submission and review of a plan in a manner similar to the plan currently under review.

Projected UC General Fund Savings: It is estimated that this Option would generate $195.4 million in UC General Fund savings.

Considerations:

• This Option would present significant operational challenges to the campuses and, in particular to the UC Medical Centers.

• This Option presents some challenges for implementation in the payroll systems.

• The Option would impact employee service credit for UCRP unless addressed through Regental action similar to the provisions of the START program. Measures would need to be implemented to protect benefits and leave accrual levels for faculty and staff.

• This Option, while reducing the earnings of faculty and staff by 8%, would provide some reduction in time worked.

• This Option presents Fair Labor Standard Act issues that would need to be addressed.

OPTION III. 12 Unpaid Days Plus A 3.4% Salary Reduction Plan

Plan: Through a combination of unpaid holidays and scheduled furlough days totaling 12 days (8 days for academic year faculty and 11 days for fiscal year faculty), and imposing a
3.4% salary reduction resulting in an overall reduction in salaries of 8%. Faculty and staff earning less than $46,000 per year would have their salaries reduced by 4 percent though a combination of 6 unpaid holiday and scheduled furlough days (4 days for academic year faculty and 5 days for fiscal year faculty) and a 1.7 percent salary reduction. Accrued vacation and/or sick leave could not be applied to unpaid days.

**Duration:** August 1, 2009 through July 31, 2010 unless extended by subsequent Regental action. Extension will require submission and review of a plan in a manner similar to the plan currently under review.

**Projected UC General Fund Savings:** It is anticipated that this Option would generate $194.1 million in UC General Fund savings.

**Considerations:**
- Under this Option, Campus and Medical Center operations would be affected although less than that anticipated under Option II.
- This Option presents some challenges for implementation in the payroll systems.
- This Option would impact employee UCRP service credit and retirement plan benefits unless addressed by Regental action similar to the provisions of the START program. Measures would need to be implemented to protect benefits and leave accrual levels for faculty and staff.
- Under this Option, faculty and staff earnings reduction is partially mitigated by time away from work.
- This Option presents Fair Labor Standard Act issues that would need to be addressed.