### AGENDA

**GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Thursday, October 18, 2012**  
**9:00 - 11:00 AM**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM**  
**ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING**

| Information | 1. Approval of Minutes of September 27, 2012 meeting | Pages 2-4 |
| Information/Discussion | 2. Announcements | |
| 9:05 – 9:10 | a. Chair of the Graduate Council | |
| 9:10 – 9:15 | b. CCGA Representative | |
| 9:15 – 9:20 | c. Graduate Student Council Representative | |
| 9:20 – 9:30 | d. Dean of the Graduate Division | |
| Action | 3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee Attendance Sheet | Page 5 |
| 9:30 – 9:40 | a. Approval of Courses – the following courses are to be approved: | |
|  | 1. CS 204 - Advanced Computer Networks – CHANGE | |
|  | 2. EDUC 258 (E-Z) – Higher Education - NEW | |
|  | 3. EDUC 258R – Higher Education - NEW | |
|  | 5. HIST 278 – Early Modern Empires in the Middle East: The Ottomans and the Safavids – NEW | |
|  | 6. MEIS 278 - Early Modern Empires in the Middle East: The Ottomans and the Safavids – NEW | |
|  | 7. POSC 214 – Political Economy of International Trade – NEW | |
|  | 8. POSC 264 – Seminar in International Political Economy – CHANGE | |
| 9:40 – 9:50 | b. Program Changes and Proposals | Pages 6-9 |
|  | 1. GSOE - M.Ed. Emphasis in TESOL | Pages 6-9 |
|  | 2. Computer Science catalog updates for 2013-14 | Pages 10-14 |
|  | 3. Change to the MED Education, Higher Education Administration & Policy Curriculum | Pages 15-17 |
|  | 4. Proposed One-Unit Course in Preparation of the Dissertation: GRD 301 | Pages 18-19 |
| 9:50 – 9:55 | c. Review and approval of Coversheet for Request for Approval to Modify Program Degree Requirements | Pages 20-22 |
| Action | 4. Systemwide Business | |
|  | b. Proposed Open Access Policy | Pages 29-65 |
|  | c. Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report | Pages 66-75 |
| Action | 5. Graduate Program Reviews | |
| 10:30 – 10:50 | a. Revised Faculty Biosketch (for graduate reviews) Form | Pages 76-77 |
|  | b. Entomology review – F&R review and approval | Pages 78-83 |
|  | c. Sociology internal review | |
| Information/Discussion | 6. New Business | Pages 84-90 |
| 10:50 – 11:00 | a. Centralization of CNAS Graduate Program Advisors | |
|  | b. Appendix 7 - UCR Procedures for Discontinuance of a Program | |
Present:
Connie Nugent, Chair
Lynda Bell, Vice Chair
Chris Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El Hafsi, Area of Management Science
David. A. Johnson, School of Medicine
Roland K. Kawakami, Physics and Astronomy
Rollanda O'Connor, Graduate School of Education
Richard A. Redak, Entomology
Daniel Schlenk, Environmental Sciences
James S. Tobias, English
Mike Vanderwood, Graduate School of Education
Jianzhong Wu, Chemical/Environmental Engineering
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)

Absent:
Richard Arnott [On leave Fall quarter], Economics
Rene T. A. Lysloff, Music
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Jingsong Zhang [On leave Fall quarter], Chemistry

Guests:
Linda Scott, Graduate Division

Approval of Minutes
The agenda items and the minutes from the June 7, 2012 meeting were approved as written.

Conflict of Interest Statement for 2012-13
The Graduate Council voted unanimously to readopt the Conflict of Interest Statement from last year for 2012-13.

Chair’s Announcements and Introductions
Chair Nugent discussed Graduate Council subcommittee assignments and confirmed that Prof. James Tobias agreed to Chair Review Subcommittee A.

The committee voted and approved the removal of Graduate Division Associate Deans from the Graduate Council Administrative Committee. Sarah will make this change in the Graduate Council handbook that will go out to committee members soon.
Announcements

Mike Vanderwood (CCGA Representative) – Prof. Vanderwood discussed the issue of UCLA’s proposal for their School of Business to be a self-supporting program. CCGA denied their request. This is a big issue as this is a critical program for the entire system. There needs to be a system-wide policy on self-supporting programs.

Graduate Dean Joe Childers – Graduate enrollment is up from last year, especially in CNAS. The quality of students is also up. The percentage of students who entered with an undergraduate GPA of 3.3 is approximately the same as last year’s percentage. However, the band of students with a GPA of 3.5 or higher was considerably broader than in previous years. Graduate Division received a record number of over 5,000 applications last year.

Self-supporting Programs: Dean Childers has been working with Matt Hull, Associate Vice Chancellor for Resource Planning and Budget, to develop a check-list of what needs to happen in order to create a self-supporting program. Both academic and financial issues need to be clear since self-supporting programs must go through a dual approval process that includes a business plan for funding.

CCGA issues: There have been some issues with CCGA, stemming in part from lack of a clear system-wide policy on self-supporting programs. In addition, correspondence on programs from the CCGA Chair has not necessarily included the appropriate recipients at UCR, which would include the Graduate Council CCGA representative, Graduate Council Chair, and Graduate Division.

The self-supporting Masters of Arts in Finance proposal from SoBA was sent back by the lead reviewer from CCGA to the initial proposer with suggestions to change the name of the degree to a Masters of Finance. However, UCR has not had this degree title, and this was not the name approved by the UCR Senate. According to correspondence with the CCGA Chair, CCGA is not interested in using the usual academic degrees for self-supporting programs. Approving the proposal as a Masters of Finance will cause some delay, in part because this is a new degree title that will need US government approval prior to recruitment of international students.

New Associate Dean: Graduate Division has a new Associate Dean, Kevin Esterling from Political Science who is replacing Ken Baerenklau. Kevin is in charge of enrolled students and student affairs. It is very likely that he will be coming to the Council in the future to present issues. Graduate Division is in the process of putting together a quarterly newsletter.

NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program: A couple of years ago Graduate Division got 18 of these fellowships campus wide. Last year they went down to 8 fellowships which are still more than in previous years when the average was about one per year.

Graduate Division has taken many steps to bring these fellowship numbers back up. They have brought in a consultant to work with students who worked successfully with CNAS students in the past. He is able to work one on one with at least 30 students. The Office of Research is sharing this cost with the Graduate Division. These fellowships are being promoted across campus; hosting seminars to teach students how to apply; examples of funded applications and
proposals are being placed on an iLearn site for reference; making faculty who have been reviewers of these fellowships available to assist as well as students who have received these fellowships in the past. Incentives for applications have been created that include $50 cash. There are a lot of students who tend to receive honorable mention which does not constitute funding but it is an honorific that they can put on their CV. Students who receive honorable mention will receive $1,000 from the Graduate Division. Graduate Division is hoping this incentive will eliminate poorly prepared proposals.

The scope of study for these fellowships is stem fields and some social and behavioral sciences (Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, Anthropology, and some History). Students must be in their first or second year to apply. The fellowship includes a $30,000 stipend and $12,500 toward their fees and Graduate Division picks up the rest. It is essentially $125,000. Graduate Division’s goal is to receive 18-35 fellowships per year.

Courses offered through Graduate Division: Graduate Division is a service division as well as an academic unit which gives them the ability to offer courses. There are some courses that would benefit the campus and graduate community as a whole if offered. These would be for unit credit. The Graduate Council would serve as the Executive Committee of the Graduate Division for these courses. Graduate Division will not be teaching these courses, they will be the mechanism for delivery of these courses.

Economics Review F&R Closeout
Graduate Council voted to accept the response submitted by Economics and close out the review.

Faculty Biosketch Form for Reviews
There have been some questions and clarifications requested by programs pertaining to sections of the faculty biosketch form. Clarifications and modifications to the form were discussed, and a revised form will be on our next agenda.

Program Change Form
Graduate Council discussed the Program Change Form that would better assist Graduate Division, the Senate Analyst, and staff that update the catalog and decided it should be seen and approved by the Courses and Programs Subcommittee before coming to the full Graduate Council for approval.

UCR Proposed Academic Calendar
Graduate Council voted to approve the proposed UCR Academic Calendar.

Access to Qualifying Exams and Appeals Procedure
A subcommittee consisting of James Tobias, Chair; David Johnson; and Roland Kawakami were charged with the task of drafting a campus policy on student access to qualifying exams and a procedure for appeals.

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 AM
# 2012-2013 COURSES & PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING ATTENDANCE

**DATE:** 10/11/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTOPHER CHASE-DUNN, CHAIR</td>
<td>SOCILOGY</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD ARNOTT</td>
<td>ECONOMICS</td>
<td>ON LEAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHSEN EL HAFSI</td>
<td>SOBA</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLAND KAWAKAMI</td>
<td>PHYSICS</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RENE LYSLOFF</td>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL SCHLENK</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERTEM TUNCEL</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE VANDERWOOD</td>
<td>GSOE</td>
<td>PRESENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GUESTS:**

CONNIE NUGENT, CHAIR OF GRADUATE COUNCIL (VOTED ON COURSES & PROGRAMS)
LINDA SCOTT, GRADUATE DIVISION
VICKI LONG, GRADUATE DIVISION
University of California  
Graduate School of Education  
Proposal for the Masters of Education With Emphasis Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)  

Overview  
The Graduate School of Education proposes to offer a Masters of Education (M.Ed.) Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). This M.Ed. emphasis is closely connected to the Education, Society, and Culture area in GSOE. It represents collaboration between the Graduate School of Education and University Extension and reflects a balance of research and theory from active researchers and relevant pedagogical application of knowledge from TESOL experts and practitioners in the field.  
The M.Ed. with an emphasis in TESOL consists of seven 4-unit 200-level courses (28 units) offered by GSOE plus four 2-unit 400-level Extension courses (8 units) that are required as part of a (15 unit minimum) TESOL certificate at UCR Extension. Total units required for the M.Ed. are 36. Completion of an approved Extension TESOL certificate is also required for the M.Ed. although only 8 units from the certificate program are applied to the M.Ed. degree requirements.  
This proposal was approved on August 1, 2012, by unanimous email vote of the GSOE Executive Committee.  
Program Rationale  
The GSOE has four objectives for the TESOL emphasis M.Ed. program. These objectives spring directly from the GSOE mission and the UCR Strategic Plan. These objectives are:  
1. Meeting the need for advanced training for specialist teachers  
As a professional occupation, education increasingly requires teachers with specialized skills. Among these specialized skills, teaching the English language to speakers of other languages has become an important world-wide enterprise. English has rapidly emerged as the dominant language for international commerce, diplomacy and policy making. The UCR Extension program has become a major source of this kind of training and has expertise at the technical and pedagogical level. The GSOE seeks to provide teachers who are trained in Extension to teach English to speakers of other languages with an opportunity to acquire a UCR Masters of Education degree which will help to enrich their understanding of the processes involved in teaching and learning English, and theories, research-based practices, and policies as they relate to language learning.  
2. Expanding graduate enrollment in GSOE  
In keeping with the UCR Strategic Plan’s goal of increasing graduate student enrollment, this M.Ed. program provides a natural pipeline and bridge between teacher professional interests in language instruction and their increasingly sophisticated academic understanding of graduate education and quality of educational institutions. Existing faculty strengths and course offerings in GSOE will allow GSOE to offer a cohesive curriculum in this M.Ed. emphasis without the need to create new courses or offer special sections of existing courses for students in this program.  
3. Expanding enrollment of international graduate students in GSOE
Currently the Graduate School of Education has few international graduate students and will greatly benefit from higher numbers of students who have international experiences and perspectives on teaching and learning English. UCR Extension’s TESOL program has routinely brought to Riverside 10-25 international students per year – encouraging these students, and those who have completed a qualifying TESOL program in recent years, to matriculate in a GSOE MEd program is a natural path to increasing international graduate student enrollments in GSOE.

4. **Strengthening graduate student pipelines from University Extension and benefitting from Extension expertise in TESOL and international education**

GSOE maintains a close working relationship with the education and international programs in University Extension. We have responsibility for assuring Extension’s academic program integrity in education courses while greatly benefiting from the ability of various Extension programs to bring high quality students into contact with GSOE and introducing them to possible programs leading to advanced degrees. Both Extension and GSOE are enhanced by our collaboration.

**Extension’s TESOL Certificate Program as a Pipeline to M.Ed. TESOL Emphasis**

For over 30 years UCR Extension has offered a widely recognized certificate program that provides pedagogical and lesson planning support to train Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). Extension has also offered its TESOL curriculum at a center in South Korea since 2008. The TESOL certificate is intended for English language teachers from other countries or prospective domestic teachers who are planning to teach abroad and looking for a recognized course of study. The TESOL Certificate Program provides the skills and knowledge necessary to successfully teach English anywhere in the world. The UCR TESOL certificate program and all of its courses and instructors have been approved by the UCR Academic Senate Committee on Extension. Highly qualified Extension instructors and academic leaders with strong backgrounds in TESOL and linguistics have current knowledge of trends and best practices and revise instruction accordingly.

TESOL Master’s degree programs are not uncommon in the U.S. and abroad, and are often paired with a TESOL training program. A substantial number of the (several hundred) UCR TESOL certificate students, particularly those coming from foreign countries, have gone on from UCR to pursue a Master’s Degree in TESOL or a related concentration. Three California universities count credits from the UCR certificate program toward their Master’s Degree programs. Without a TESOL Master’s Degree, these potential graduate students are lost to UCR. Currently most UCR certificate completers that stay in the area to pursue Masters Degrees enroll in TESOL Masters programs at Cal State San Bernardino or La Sierra University. There is evidence to support our belief that many of these students would prefer to get their graduate training on the UCR campus and receive a University of California degree. Existing faculty expertise in GSOE in language development, schooling and identity, culture, individual differences, sociolinguistics and literacy provides a strong complement to language development and acquisition and TESOL pedagogy that are the focus of Extension TESOL certificate.

In combining participation in the University Extension TESOL Certificate program with a TESOL emphasis M.Ed. degree, students develop the strong pedagogical and intellectual foundations needed to provide educational program leadership as well as professional quality instruction.

**Admissions Criteria:**
1. Must have completed a UCR Extension TESOL certificate or be concurrently enrolled in a UCR TESOL certificate program. Students who have earned TESOL certificates from other recognized university programs may be reviewed for admission to this M.Ed.; however, only 400-level unit credits from the specified UCR Extension TESOL courses can be applied to M.Ed. degree requirements.
2. Letters of Recommendation
3. Strong academic record
4. Demonstrated English language proficiency

Most program plans will include the following GSOE courses (28 unit minimum):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC233</td>
<td>Differential Achievement &amp; the School Learning Environment</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC201B</td>
<td>Theories and Issues in Literacy</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC246M</td>
<td>Multi-cultural Special Education</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC281</td>
<td>History of Education Policy and Reform</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC266</td>
<td>Language Schooling &amp; Identity</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC257</td>
<td>Language Culture &amp; Education</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC283</td>
<td>Analyzing the Practice of Teaching</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With consent of advisor and course availability, the course below may be used as an alternative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC272</td>
<td>Sociolinguistics &amp; Educational Processes</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXTENSION TESOL COURSES (maximum 8 units can be applied to M.Ed. unit requirements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension Course</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frameworks and Methods for TESOL</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Development and Acquisition</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar A (Methodologies) or Grammar B (Structure/Meaning)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, M.Ed. students must complete the following Extension TESOL certificate requirements (7 units) that are not counted toward the M.Ed. degree unit requirement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods A</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods B</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentals of Teaching ESL</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL Portfolio</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytical Report
EDUC283, Analyzing the Practice of Teaching, is the capstone course for this M.Ed. Students complete a final written report that integrates the content of GSOE and University Extension TESOL courses with a relevant case study. A final version of the project will be submitted to the Graduate School of Education and evaluated by a faculty committee.
GSOE TESOL M.ED: Catalog Language

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)

This M.Ed. emphasis focuses on teaching the English language to speakers of other languages. It is a partnership between the Graduate School of Education and University Extension and reflects a balance of research, theory, and pedagogy from active researchers on the socio-cultural factors affecting language learning and TESOL specialists.

Admission Requirements:

**Admission** The following are requirements:
1. A baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution
2. Concurrent enrollment in or completion of the UCR TESOL Certificate program. Applicants who have earned TESOL certification from other recognized university programs may be reviewed for admission to this M.Ed. program.
3. Three Letters of Recommendation, at least two of which must be academic references.
4. Official transcripts

**Course Work** A total of 36-quarter units, including a minimum of 28 units of approved 200-level coursework in the Graduate School of Education, are required. Up to eight units of coursework from a UCR Extension TESOL certificate program, approved by the Graduate Advisor, may be applied to the M.Ed. The UCR TESOL certificate must be completed before the M.Ed. can be awarded. Courses for this program are offered throughout the academic year, including the summer.

**Analytical Report** Students will integrate the content of theory and teaching methods courses in a capstone course. An analytical report must be submitted to the Graduate School of Education and evaluated and approved by a faculty committee.
September 6, 2012

TO: Dr. Morris Maduro  
Chair, Graduate Council

FR: Dr. Laxmi Bhuyan               
Computer Science & Engineering

RE: Requested Catalog Updates for 2013-14

Dear Dr. Maduro:

The attached requested catalog changes were voted on and approved by the Computer Science faculty. The following is a justification for the changes.

We are adding a brief statement to clarify the meaning of having CS professors on the dissertation and oral committees; many students and faculty have been confused over whether or not this should include cooperating faculty. It has always been the position of the department that the minimum required three professors should not be, and we feel that this addition will clarify this and eliminate any further confusion. Should a student wish to use a cooperating faculty, they will be permitted to for the fourth oral committee member or by adding a fourth dissertation committee member.

Thank you.
BOURNS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
REPORT TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION
09/06/2012

PROPOSED CHANGE TO COMPUTER SCIENCE GRADUATE REQUIREMENTS

PRESENT:
Doctoral Degree

The department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements. It provides a research-oriented education in preparation for a career in research, industry or academia and exploring both the fundamental aspects of computer science and engineering as well as their applications.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Work The course requirements for the Ph.D. degree ensure that Ph.D. students are exposed to fundamental concepts and tools (core requirement), a deep up-to-date view of their research specialty area (depth requirement), and an advanced, up-to-date view the same topics outside their area (breadth requirement). Students are expected to complete all of these course requirements in the first two years of the program. These requirements consist of 44 quarter units of approved graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses, satisfying all four of the following course work categories. All of these courses must be taken for a letter grade, and no course can be counted towards more than one category. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course.

Units obtained in CS 270, CS 287, CS 290, CS 297, CS 298, CS 299, CS 301, and CS 302 cannot be counted in any course work category.

1. Core Requirement (12 units). Choose three courses from at least two of the three Core Areas described above, with no grade lower than B- and an overall core course GPA of at least 3.2.

PROPOSED:
Doctoral Degree

The department of Computer Science and Engineering offers the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science, after completion of the following degree requirements. It provides a research-oriented education in preparation for a career in research, industry or academia and exploring both the fundamental aspects of computer science and engineering as well as their applications.

Satisfactory completion of CS 287 (Colloquium in Computer Science) each quarter of enrollment for full-time in-residence graduate students.

Course Work The course requirements for the Ph.D. degree ensure that Ph.D. students are exposed to fundamental concepts and tools (core requirement), a deep up-to-date view of their research specialty area (depth requirement), and an advanced, up-to-date view the same topics outside their area (breadth requirement). Students are expected to complete all of these course requirements in the first two years of the program. These requirements consist of 44 quarter units of approved graduate or upper-division undergraduate courses, satisfying all four of the following course work categories. All of these courses must be taken for a letter grade, and no course can be counted towards more than one category. Students who have completed similar courses elsewhere may petition for a waiver of a required course or for substitution of an alternative course.

Units obtained in CS 270, CS 287, CS 290, CS 297, CS 298, CS 299, CS 301, and CS 302 cannot be counted in any course work category.

1. Core Requirement (12 units). Choose three courses from at least two of the three Core Areas described above, with no grade lower than B- and an overall core course GPA of at least 3.2.
2. **Depth Requirement (8 units).** Choose two courses listed above under the same Major Area (A to G). This requirement ensures that Ph.D. students, early on in their careers, acquire some depth of knowledge in a particular research area.

3. **Breadth Requirement (12 units).** Choose three courses from at least two different Major Areas (A to G) outside the student's depth area. No course that is listed in the student's depth area can be used to fulfill the breadth requirement, even if it is cross-listed in another area. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted towards the breadth requirement.

4. **Electives (12 units).** The remaining courses can be selected from additional CS graduate lecture courses, up to 8 units of graduate seminars in CS 260-269, and up to 8 units of approved undergraduate technical electives. Students, with the consent of the major professor, may petition for a non-CSE course to be counted as an elective.

**Milestones** The Department has established three milestones to mark progress towards the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science: advancement to candidacy, presentation of the dissertation proposal, and final oral examination. A Ph.D. student must also satisfy all applicable Graduate Division requirements for each milestone.

**Milestone I: Advancement to Candidacy.** A student advances to candidacy after he/she has completed all of the Ph.D. course requirements described above, and passed the combined written and oral qualifying examinations, as described below. These two exams are intended to verify three components of the student’s preparation for Ph.D. research: (1) breadth of comprehension sufficient to enable Computer Science research in areas beyond the topic(s) of the research exam and dissertation; (2) ability to perform critical study, analysis and writing in a focused area; and (3) demonstrated research experience or ability to do research.

**Milestones** The Department has established three milestones to mark progress towards the Ph.D. degree in Computer Science: advancement to candidacy, presentation of the dissertation proposal, and final oral examination. A Ph.D. student must also satisfy all applicable Graduate Division requirements for each milestone.

**Milestone I: Advancement to Candidacy.** A student advances to candidacy after he/she has completed all of the Ph.D. course requirements described above, and passed the combined written and oral qualifying examinations, as described below. These two exams are intended to verify three components of the student’s preparation for Ph.D. research: (1) breadth of comprehension sufficient to enable Computer Science research in areas beyond the topic(s) of the research exam and dissertation; (2) ability to perform critical study, analysis and writing in a focused area; and (3) demonstrated research experience or ability to do research.
The Written Qualifying Examination. The written qualifying examination consists of a written report summarizing the oral presentation to be given at the oral qualifying examination. This report must be written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Computer Science conference or journal publication, and must be submitted to the Qualifying Committee for approval at least one week prior to the oral qualifying examination.

Oral Qualifying Examination. The student is expected to demonstrate research aptitude by undertaking a research study on some topic (typically a problem from student’s chosen research specialty that may be a promising area in which to conduct the dissertation research), under the guidance of his or her faculty major professor. The research must be presented orally to a Qualifying Committee, which is appointed by the Graduate Division based on nominations from the department. The committee evaluates the merits of the work and the student’s aptitude for research. The work must represent significant progress towards original and publishable research. The student must complete this requirement in no more than two attempts. The normative time for taking the Oral Qualifying Exam is by the end of the second year.

Dissertation Committee. After advancing to candidacy, the student must form a Doctoral Examination Committee chaired by his or her major professor. The committee will consist of at least four senate faculty members with at least three members belonging to the CSE department.

The Written Qualifying Examination. The written qualifying examination consists of a written report summarizing the oral presentation to be given at the oral qualifying examination. This report must be written in proper technical English and in the style of a typical Computer Science conference or journal publication, and must be submitted to the Qualifying Committee for approval at least one week prior to the oral qualifying examination.

Oral Qualifying Examination. The student is expected to demonstrate research aptitude by undertaking a research study on some topic (typically a problem from student’s chosen research specialty that may be a promising area in which to conduct the dissertation research), under the guidance of his or her faculty major professor. The research must be presented orally to a Qualifying Committee, which is appointed by the Graduate Division based on nominations from the department. The committee will consist of at least three members belonging to the CSE department (their home department is CSE). The committee evaluates the merits of the work and the student’s aptitude for research. The work must represent significant progress towards original and publishable research. The student must complete this requirement in no more than two attempts. The normative time for taking the Oral Qualifying Exam is by the end of the second year.

Dissertation Committee. After advancing to candidacy, the student must form a Doctoral Examination Committee chaired by his or her major professor. The committee will consist of at least four senate faculty members with at least three members belonging to the CSE department (their home department is CSE).
**Milestone II: Dissertation Proposal Examination** After advancement to candidacy, the student prepares a dissertation proposal that describes the dissertation topic, summarizes the relevant background literature, and presents a comprehensive research plan for the doctoral dissertation. The Dissertation Proposal Examination evaluates appropriateness of the research topic and the feasibility of the research plan. It also establishes a realistic timeline for the completion of the Dissertation. The Dissertation Committee administers this exam. The normative time for the Dissertation Proposal Exam is by the end of the third year. The Dissertation Proposal exam must be taken at least six months prior to the Final Doctoral Examination.

**Milestone III: Final Doctoral Examination** The student is required to write a dissertation in accordance with the Graduate Division requirements and may be required to defend it in a public oral final doctoral examination to the Dissertation Committee. After a satisfactory performance on the final doctoral examination, the Dissertation Committee recommends granting the Ph.D. degree. The student’s research and the dissertation must both meet the highest standards of originality and scholarship.

The normative time for the completion of a Ph.D. in Computer Science is five years.

**JUSTIFICATION:**
We are adding a brief statement to clarify the meaning of having CS professors on the dissertation and oral committees; many students and faculty have been confused over whether or not this should include cooperating faculty. It has always been the position of the department that it should not, and we feel that this addition will clarify this and eliminate any further confusion.

**APPROVALS:**
Computer Science and Engineering Department: 09/06/2012
May 24, 2012

TO: Graduate Council
FROM: Margaret Nash, Graduate Advisor for Continuing Students, GSOE
RE: Proposed revision to M.Ed. in Education, Higher Education Administration and Policy Emphasis curriculum

The Graduate School of Education approved the change to the MED Education, Higher Education Administration and Policy curriculum.

- The change is modest, we are requiring EDUC 248T instead of EDUC 212.

Justification for change:
We have been offering this course under the EDUC 269 label for two years as this course addresses the research in Higher Education, specifically, rather than Education generally. This course is tailored to the needs of Master’s of Education students in the program area of Higher Education Administration and Policy. Faculty with a Higher Education background can teach this course with its particular focus and thus we are also able to staff this course and ensure its yearly offering. Finally, other top Higher Education programs in the U.S. have a comparable course (focus upon Higher Education).

We submit the change here for review and approval by the Graduate Council.
Proposed revision to the M.Ed. in Education, Higher Education Administration and Policy area group curriculum

1. Replace required course EDUC 212 with EDUC 248T
M.Ed. Emphasis in Higher Education  
University of California, Riverside  
Graduate School of Education

The study of higher education includes both scholarship and research on institutions, policy, systems, and demographic, historical, political, social, and economic contexts. The goal is to prepare practitioners with expertise in higher education so that they can be knowledgeable scholars and expert professionals. This M.Ed. gives emphasis to reflective practice that is grounded in research.

Master of Education (Higher Education Emphasis)

Current (strikeouts would be deleted)  Proposed (underscores are additions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework:</th>
<th>Coursework:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required Course</td>
<td>Required Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 212 — Research Methods</td>
<td>EDUC 248T — Understanding Research in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Courses</td>
<td>Higher Education Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students select 20 units from the list below:</td>
<td>Students select 20 units from the list below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248 F — Financing Higher Education</td>
<td>EDUC 248 F — Financing Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248I — Critical Issues in Higher Education</td>
<td>EDUC 248I — Critical Issues in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248J — Higher Education Policy</td>
<td>EDUC 248J — Higher Education Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248 M — The Community College</td>
<td>EDUC 248 M — The Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248 O — Organization and Administration in Higher Education</td>
<td>EDUC 248 O — Organization and Administration in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248 S — The College Student</td>
<td>EDUC 248 S — The College Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248 U — History of Higher Education in the United States</td>
<td>EDUC 248 U — History of Higher Education in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Courses</td>
<td>Additional Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum of 12 units, as approved by the advisor, may include courses from GSOE, such as those below, or related fields outside GSOE.</td>
<td>A minimum of 12 units, as approved by the advisor, may include courses from GSOE, such as those below, or related fields outside GSOE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248E — Demographics and Diversity in Higher Education</td>
<td>EDUC 248E — Demographics and Diversity in Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248 G — Higher Education Governance</td>
<td>EDUC 248 G — Higher Education Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248Q — Foundations of Student Services</td>
<td>EDUC 248Q — Foundations of Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 248R — College Student Development</td>
<td>EDUC 248R — College Student Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University Writing Program

May 10, 2012

TO: Joe Childers, Dean of the Graduate Division
FROM: John Briggs, Director of the University Writing Program
RE: Proposed One-Unit Course in Preparation of the Dissertation: GRD 301

Drawing from our conversation a few weeks ago and your invitation to make a course proposal, I am forwarding this proposal for a new one-unit graduate course, GRD 301, to be taught in the Graduate Division. Its focus would be on some common and specialized challenges facing graduate students as they plan and write their dissertations.

GRD 301. Dissertation Practicum (1)

Description: Addresses the practical challenges encountered by graduate students as they plan and write their dissertations: developing a functional topic; formulating a thesis; creating a proposal; organizing the research; understanding dissertation genres appropriate to particular disciplines; formulating appropriate formats and approaches; overcoming writers’ block; managing time; developing ideas for revising and editing. Each offering would focus on several of these issues.

Graded S/NC. Course is repeatable.

Prerequisite: Graduate standing

Justification: There is no campus course available to graduate students seeking extra assistance as they write their dissertations. A number of other research universities offer courses that target areas of concern such as those listed in the course description above. This one-unit course would be flexible in focus, and amenable to being offered in clustered sessions or over the course of an entire quarter for maximum efficiency and impact.

General Syllabus (with the focus of the course varying from offering to offering):

Readings:

Supplementary Texts:

James Mauch and Jack Birch: *Guide to the Successful Thesis and Dissertation*

Sonja Foss and William Waters: *A Traveler’s Guide to a Done Dissertation*

*Dissertation Abstracts* (selections)

Schedule:

Week 1  General qualities of dissertations and general standards of judgment
         Lovitts, 3-58

Week 2  Some disciplinary approaches to the development of a dissertation
         Lovitts, 97-120
         *Dissertation Abstracts* (selections)

Week 3  Converting general expectations to disciplinary-specific standards of judgment
         Lovitts, 97-120
         *Dissertation Abstracts* (selections)

Weeks 4-8  Disciplinary dissertations in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences
           Lovitts, 121-384
           *Dissertation Abstracts* (selections)

Weeks 9-10  Strategies for moving ahead
             Mauch and Birch: Selections according to individual needs
             Foss and Waters: Selections according to individual needs

Sample Assignments:  Draft proposals, chapter summaries, meta-commentaries on the project as a whole or some of its parts, revision of chapter drafts, methods of embedding and documenting evidence, and assignments and presentations related to the readings.
MODIFICATION OF GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS
UCR Graduate Council

The following guidelines are meant to assist you in preparing program changes to existing graduate programs.

1. A Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements Cover Sheet (see attached) must accompany all proposed changes. A cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, must be included. The cover letter should briefly describe the proposed changes as well as provide a justification for the changes. In addition, the cover letter should include the date of the faculty meeting when the proposed changes were approved. The Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements Cover Sheet, cover letter, and proposed changes should be sent to the Graduate Council Staff Analyst – Sarah Miller.

2. The proposed changes need to be submitted in "catalog copy" style (two columns). The exact current catalog copy wording should be listed on the left side of the page. The proposed new wording should be listed on the right side of the page. On the current side, you need to strikethrough any text that is to be deleted. On the proposed side of the page, you need to underline any text that is being added (please see example on the Cover Sheet for Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements).

3. If the proposed changes include a change/addition/deletion of any courses, the program should indicate whether the affected courses have already been submitted into CRAMS for review/approval.

4. Proposed changes should be submitted as early in the academic year as possible, but no later than April 1, if the desired changes are to be inserted in the General Catalog for the following year.

5. Once the Graduate Council has approved the changes, no further approval is needed. The program will be notified of the Graduate Council's approval, and report the approval in its annual report to the Division.
UCR: GRADUATE COUNCIL FLOW OF BUSINESS

The following document is based upon anticipated current practice in our office, not on official policy. We will continue to work with the Graduate Division on best practices for the flow of Graduate Council business, as well as roles and responsibilities.

1. A department sends a draft proposal for changes to their M.A./Ph.D. program to the Academic Senate

2. All proposals are forwarded to the Graduate Council analyst (in the Academic Senate) for placement on the Graduate Council’s record of pending business.

3. The draft proposal will undergo administrative review by the Academic Senate and the Graduate Division, who will work with the initiators to ensure the proposed change adheres to regulations and policies governing graduate education. The Graduate Council Analyst will distribute the proposed changes to Linda Scott in the Graduate Division who will distribute them to Associate Deans and the Admissions Director in the Graduate Division for review and comment.

4. The draft proposal may be returned to the department/program with suggested changes. If revisions are necessary, the Graduate Council analyst drafts a response to the department, requesting additional information, clarification, or noting any issues which will need to be addressed before the proposal can be added to one of the Graduate Council’s next agendas. The response is reviewed by the appropriate Graduate Council sub-committee member, who suggests revisions if necessary. Each proposal may undergo several iterations.

5. The final proposal is submitted to the Graduate Council analyst for placement on the next available Graduate Council agenda.

6. The UCR Graduate Council meets every month. One week prior to Graduate Council meetings, the Graduate Council Analyst prepares a tentative agenda for the Chair. Agendas are sent out the Friday prior to a meeting.

7. The Graduate Dean attends each Graduate Council meeting as an ex-officio (non-voting) member.

8. Graduate Council’s final action will be reported to the Department/Program with a memo from the Graduate Council Chair and copied on the Academic Senate Graduate Council homepage.
Coversheet for Request for Approval  
To Modify Graduate Program Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Department/Academic Unit/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Proposed Effective Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Contact:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Modification(s) (please check all that apply)

- [ ] Admission requirements
- [ ] Unit requirements
- [ ] Professional Development Plan
- [ ] Other (please describe):  
  - [ ] Course requirements
  - [ ] Examination requirements
  - [ ] Time-to-degree

1. Proposal must include a cover letter from the Dean, Associate Dean, Chair, Director or Program Advisor as appropriate, taking care to briefly describe the proposed modifications and justification for the request.

2. Attached proposal must include the proposed modifications as formatted in the example below. The existing requirements must be on the left column, and the proposed revisions on the right. Proposed additions must be underlined and deletions must be stricken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insert existing program requirements on this side of the table</td>
<td>Insert proposed requirements on this side of the table. Underline the additions and strike the deletions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification: The Justification should include examples such as impact on time to degree, expected impact on employment prospects, expected impact on recruitment. Please address whether current students will be permitted to switch to take advantage of the revisions. If so what will the approval process be?

Faculty Approval Date: Indicate the date of the faculty vote

Department Chair / Program Director: Please type name(s) as appropriate  
Signature: Please include signature(s) as appropriate  
Date: Date signed

Checklist of Required Attachments/Appendices (please check to verify inclusion):

- [ ] Dean/Associate Dean/Chair or Program Advisor Cover Letter  
- [ ] Proposal in proper table format – signed and dated as appropriate  
- [ ] Revised and Dated Program Summary  
- [ ] Revised Catalogue Copy  
- [ ] Revised Website Copy
September 18, 2012

To: Sarjeet Gill, Chair  
   Committee on Academic Personnel

   Connie Nugent, Chair  
   Graduate Council

   Lucille Chia, Chair  
   Committee on International Education

   Len Nunney, Chair  
   Committee on Research

From: Jose Wudka, Chair  
   Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed New Policy – APM 430, Visiting Scholars

Attached for your review is a proposed new APM Policy – APM 430 which allows for appointments of students and academics as Visiting Scholars.

Please discuss with your committee and submit your response by Friday, November 9, 2012.

Enclosure
COUNCIL OF VICE CHANCELLORS 
LABORATORY DIRECTOR ALIVISATOS 
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL 
ANR VICE PRESIDENT ALLEN-DIAZ

August 31, 2012

Dear Colleagues:

Re: Systemwide Review of Proposed New Policy APM - 430, Visiting Scholars

Enclosed for Systemwide Review is proposed new policy APM - 430, Visiting Scholars. The proposal is responsive to campus requests to create a new title to accommodate domestic and international visitors who are students enrolled in universities in the United States and abroad, and academics employed at other institutions who are visiting the University of California for short-term academic or cultural exchange experiences.

These visitors are ineligible for any other academic title. Educational criteria is flexible, and there is no salary requirement beyond the established campus minimum funding standards already in place to satisfy federal visa requirements relating to funding for exchange visitors. Self-funding, either by personal funds or third-party funding payable directly to the Visiting Scholar, is required. Visiting Scholars are ineligible for University compensation. University of California titles available for compensated appointments are within the postdoctoral scholar title series and the specialist title series.

This policy is intended to support the International Students and Scholars Offices (ISSO) as well as Visiting Scholars. The policy does not provide instruction related to visa classification. However, it assumes that the ISSO and Visiting Scholars will abide by current federal regulations as well as University and campus policy related to visa sponsorship.

Systemwide Review is a public review distributed to the Chancellors and Executive Vice Chancellors requesting that they inform the general University community, affected employees and unions about policy proposals. Systemwide Review also includes a mandatory, three-month full Senate review.

Employees should be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the draft new policy, available online at: http://www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel/apm/review.html. Attached is a model communication which may be used to inform non-exclusively represented employees affected by these proposals.
August 31, 2012
Page 2

This letter and enclosures anticipate that you will begin Systemwide Review of the proposed draft and submit comments no later than **November 30, 2012**. Please send comments on the proposed policy to ADV-VPCARLSON-SA@ucop.edu. Questions may be directed to Janet Lockwood at Janet.Lockwood@ucop.edu or (510) 987-9499.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel

Enclosures:  
*Draft new policy APM - 430*
*Model communication*

cc: President Yudof
Chancellors
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President Brostrom
Senior Vice President Vacca
Vice President Beckwith
Vice President Duckett
Vice Provosts – Academic Personnel
Academic Personnel Directors
Executive Director Fox
Executive Director Rodrigues
Executive Director Tanaka
Executive Director Winnacker
Deputy General Counsel Birnbaum
Senior Counsel Van Houten
Systemwide Policy Director Capell
Assistant Director Ernst
Manager Lockwood
Human Resources Policy Analyst Bello
Senior Administrative Analyst Rupert
Administrative Officer Abbott
430-4 Definition

A Visiting Scholar is a student enrolled in an institution outside of the University of California or an individual employed by or affiliated with an outside institution or agency who is visiting the University of California for the purpose of participating in UC-sponsored conferences and partnerships, or for a short-term educational, academic, or research project under the supervision of UC faculty.

430-10 Criteria for Appointment

Visiting Scholars will possess:

1) a baccalaureate degree; or
2) equivalent; or
3) recognized expertise in a field.

Undergraduate students may be sponsored as well at the discretion of the host campus.

430-18 Salary

a. Visiting Scholars are ineligible for compensation from the University of California.
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b. Visiting Scholars are self-supported or have adequate support funds from external sources and provide evidence of such funding to the campus office charged with the responsibility to oversee these appointments.

430-20 **Conditions of Appointment**

a. Visiting Scholars are appointed for short periods of time not to exceed one year (12 months), and more typically, for six (6) months or less. The appointment is self-terminating unless the appointee is otherwise notified.

b. Service as a Visiting Scholar constitutes neither formal employment nor enrollment as a student at the University of California.

c. Visiting Scholars may not be UC-registered students, currently working for UC as contractors, or have any other active appointment or employment with the University of California.

d. The University of California reserves the right to withdraw the privileges and terminate the appointment without prior notice.

e. Visiting Scholars may be eligible for reimbursement of business and travel expenses. A reimbursable expense is an expense incurred which is related to activities that contribute to any one of the University’s major functions of teaching, research, patient care, or public service.¹

¹ See Business and Finance Bulletin G-28 for guidelines related to reimbursement of business and travel expenses.
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430-24 **Authority to Appoint**

a. The Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost or the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost’s designee may approve an exception to extend an appointment beyond twelve months when conditions warrant.

b. Subject to the provisions of this policy statement, each campus should establish authority and procedures to appoint and reappoint Visiting Scholars.
September 20, 2012

To: Chairs of Standing Senate Committee  
Chairs of College Executive Committees

From: Jose Wudka, Chair  
Riverside Division

Re: Proposed Open Access Policy

Attached for your review is a proposal for a systemwide open access policy. The policy would expand open access to research publications by UC faculty by changing the default relationship between faculty authors and scholarly publishers to one in which authors grant the University a non-exclusive license to the work. There are opt out features, as well as digital copy stipulations.

This policy will impact all faculty, and I ask that you give it a thorough review.

Please submit your committee response by November 16, 2012.

Enclosure
Dear Division and Committee Chairs:

On behalf of Academic Council Chair Bob Anderson I am forwarding for full Senate review a proposed Open Access Policy developed by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). The policy would expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty by changing the default relationship between faculty authors and scholarly publishers to one in which authors grant the University a non-exclusive license to the work. The proposed policy would also require that authors deposit a digital copy of the final version of their published works with the California Digital Library. Authors would be allowed to opt out of the license grant at their own discretion. However, publishers that demand exclusive rights would need to ask authors to choose to opt-out. The proposed policy, UCOLASC’s transmittal letter, and a paper responding to specific faculty concerns are attached. Additional material will also be made available on the web over the coming months.

Because the proposed policy touches on core faculty concerns, Council encourages every division and committee to engage a broad constituency in discussing it. Representatives of UCOLASC are prepared to offer input into your discussions if this would be helpful, and my office will is ready to assist with the necessary arrangements if needed.

Please provide comments by January 11, 2013. In the meanwhile, please feel free to contact me or 2012-13 Council Chair Bob Powell at any time if you have questions or concerns about how to conduct this review.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Martha Kendall Winnacker, J.D.
Executive Director, Academic Senate

Encl. (4)
Monday, July 16, 2012

Robert Anderson, Chair
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

RE: Proposed Policy to Expand Open Access to Research Publications at the University of California

Dear Bob,

I hereby submit for review by the Academic Council a policy to expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty. UCOLASC requests that Academic Council adopt this policy and forward it to the President for implementation as a presidential policy.

The proposed policy is one strategy in an ongoing effort at UC to transform the scholarly publishing industry and improve the accessibility and visibility of our scholarly research. UCOLASC has worked continuously for the last 8 months to understand the issues, address diverse concerns and to prepare a policy we think will both benefit and protect the UC system and the faculty. The proposed policy will provide unprecedented access to research publications by the public and send a strong message to scholarly publishers that any changes to the scholarly publishing system must include full and permanent open access to our research publications.

The key function of this policy is to change the default relationship that faculty have with scholarly publishers. Currently, each faculty member must individually negotiate open access rights with each individual publisher for each publication. The proposed policy would invert that relationship. It would make open access the default right of faculty and instead force publishers to request exclusive rights (by asking authors to opt-out). By making this a collective policy, individual faculty benefit from their membership in the policy-making group. Moreover, under this policy faculty members both retain ownership of their copyright and have an unobstructed right to opt out of the license for any reason.

Over 140 universities worldwide have implemented policies such as the one we propose here, including most recently our own UCSF, who voted on May 21st to implement a nearly identical strategy. Faculty at peer institutions such as Harvard, Duke, Princeton, MIT, Kansas University and many others have passed policies promising to make their work available to the world via open access digital repositories. Many of these policies were based on lessons learned from UC’s own previous attempt to formulate an open access policy in 2007. As a result, there is now much experience on which assess the effects of this policy.
All current policies are similar in design to the one proposed here. Although they differ in minor details, they each do basically the same two things. First, they collectively grant to the university a non-exclusive license for each research publication so that the university might make a version of that work available via an open access repository. Second, they obligate faculty to assist in this effort by providing a copy of each article (or the URL of an open access version) to that repository—in our case the well-established eScholarship repository run by the California Digital Library. eScholarship is prepared to begin implementation immediately.

The current proposed policy has been crafted in conversation with many constituencies. It has been extensively discussed and has the support of the Library and COLASC committees of all ten campuses, The California Digital Library, the University Council of Librarians, several Graduate Student Associations, the Library Association of the University of California, as well as the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP). The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) both communicated concerns that were discussed and addressed at UCOLASC’s May 25th meeting. UCOLASC has replied by letter addressing these concerns in detail.

The issue of open access to scholarly publications is a thorny and complicated one involving many technical issues related to copyright law, the rapid transformation of new information technologies and the changing practices of publishers and libraries. It is clear to UCOLASC that the current system is both economically unsustainable for UC and its libraries and that it does not function in our interests. There are many different ideas circulating for how to make open access both possible and sustainable, and the scholarly publishing ecology changes rapidly. Many publishers have already committed to open access, but others (especially the largest and most profitable) have not: they remain committed to a subscription-based model that puts artificial and insupportable restrictions on scholarly research and excessive strain on library budgets.

The proposed open access policy is a single component in an effort to transform this system; it is not an overnight solution to the challenges of scholarly publishing; but in our considered opinion, neither is it a dangerous one. It is, however, a crucial and necessary first step in transforming our collective relationship to publishers, it sends a powerful message from the largest public university in the world, and it charts a path towards a sustainable, healthy scholarly publication system openly available to everyone.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher M. Kelty, Chair, UCOLASC

Encl:
The Final Draft Open Access Policy
Presentation “An Open Access Policy for the University of California”
Proposed UC Open Access Policy: Questions and Concerns
Final Draft of Proposed Open Access Policy for the University of California

The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the article available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.
An Open Access Policy for the University of California

Christopher M. Kelty, UCLA
Chair, University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
What is Open Access?

In 2002, the Budapest Open Access Initiative defined open access as:

"the world-wide electronic distribution of the peer-reviewed journal literature, completely free and unrestricted access to it by all scientists, scholars, teachers, students, and other curious minds."
Who Benefits from Open Access?

• Scholars in universities
  o increase visibility, usage, and impact of research
  o Retain rights to use and reuse research publications, including derivatives

• Industry, business, arts and scholarship beyond the university
  o Gain access to cutting edge research and new ideas
  o Fuels innovation, discovery, creativity and progress
  o Stimulates and guides public discourse and debate

• The people of California (and the world)
  o Get a return on their investment and taxes when research is freely available
  o Promotes knowledge and free expression as a public good

• Libraries, K-12, educators generally
  o Gain access to the latest research
  o Creates a basis for better learning and teaching everywhere

• Publishers
  o Reduced transactions costs in managing complex subscriptions
  o Doing the right thing with scholarly research
Who has access now?

• **Scholars in universities**
  - Increase visibility, usage, and impact of research
  - Retain rights to use and reuse research publications, including derivatives

• **Industry, business, arts and scholarship beyond the university**
  - Gain access to cutting edge research and new ideas
  - Fuels innovation, discovery, creativity and progress.
  - Stimulates and guides public discourse and debate

• **The people of California (and the world)**
  - Get a return on their investment and taxes when research is freely available
  - Promotes knowledge and free expression as a public good

• **Libraries, K-12, educators generally**
  - Gain access to the latest research
  - Creates a basis for better learning and teaching everywhere

• **Publishers**
  - Reduced transactions costs in managing complex subscriptions
  - Doing the right thing with scholarly research
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

• The Scholarly publishing industry is concentrating, and subscription costs are out of control. Meanwhile, the largest for-profit publishers have profit margins between 30-40%.
• Library revenues have been dropping for decades, and faculty are losing access to content as subscriptions are canceled.
• Faculty provide all of the content and most of the labor: authorship, peer review, editorship, advisory board service, copyediting, even typesetting in some cases.
• Publishers seek greater control over content and its uses. They exert pressure on university libraries through complex negotiations.
• Digital content remains expensive to produce, but is getting cheaper to distribute.
• Open Access is not the solution to the crisis of scholarly publication, but is a necessary component of any future system.
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

• The Scholarly publishing industry is concentrating, and subscription costs are out of control. Meanwhile, the largest for-profit publishers have profit margins between 30-40%.

Percent Increase in Cost for the Average Health Sciences Journal versus the CPI

- Avg. HS title cost
- CPI

July 2012
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- The Scholarly publishing industry is concentrating, and subscription costs are out of control. The largest for-profit publishers have profit margins between **30-40%**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Profits</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Profit Margin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier</td>
<td>$1.14B</td>
<td>$3.12B</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>$106M</td>
<td>$253M</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springer</td>
<td>$467M</td>
<td>$1.4B</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informa</td>
<td>$74M</td>
<td>$230M</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

• Library revenues have been dropping for decades, and faculty are losing access to content as subscriptions are canceled.

**Library Expenditure as % of Total University Expenditure**
(Average of 40 US Institutions Reporting Since 1982)

Cancellations
9 database contracts cancelled since 2008.

600 journals (7.5%) cancelled in 2010-2011, including one entire contract.

More journal cancellations in 2013.
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- *Faculty* provide all of the **content** and most of the **labor**: authorship, peer review, editorship, advisory board service, copyediting, even typesetting in some cases.

Examples: UC authorship contribution to Elsevier journals
- UC authors: 2.2% of all Elsevier articles
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to Elsevier revenue: $31M
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to Elsevier profit: $9.8M

UC authors: 12% of all published articles in *Nature*
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to *Nature* revenue: $5M
- UC authors’ estimated contribution to *Nature* profit: $700K
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- Publishers seek greater **control** over content and its uses. They exert pressure on university libraries through complex negotiations.

### Systemwide Subscription Expenditures Negotiated in 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$38,743,006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>$6,261,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Campuses</td>
<td>$32,481,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA (e.g.)</td>
<td>4,804,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% of total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph

- **UCLA**: $4,804,960 (12%)
- **CDL**: $6,261,137 (16%)
- **Campuses**: $32,481,869 (84%)
What’s wrong with the current system of publishing?

- Digital content remains expensive to produce (the cost that scholars and universities bear) but is getting cheaper to distribute (the cost publishers have traditionally borne).

- *There is no free lunch:* publishing has costs, and someone has to bear them— but it shouldn’t be the public that has already paid for research.

- **Open Access is not the solution to the crisis of scholarly publication, but is a necessary component of any future system.**
How can we achieve Open Access?

• Federal Legislation
  o The NIH Public Access Act, passed in 2006, in effect since 2008. Most medical and health sciences campuses are as predominantly OA already.
  o In Congress now: The Federal Research Public Access Act (FRPAA) would expand OA requirements to all Federal Agencies.

• Open Access Journals
    • Many different funding models, and a range of quality—just as in traditional publication.

• Open Access options from existing publishers
  o Springer Open Pilot with UC and Max Planck— a success, but cancelled by Springer.
  o SCOAP3-consortium to pay for open access to high energy physics research.
  o Sage Open, Nature Communications, Cell Reports.

• Institutional Policies like the one we are proposing
  • 141 Institutions have already passed such policies.
Major US Institutions with OA Mandates

As of June 2012 there are 141 institutional mandates worldwide:

- **Harvard** – February 2008
- **Stanford University** – June 2008
- **MIT** – March 2009
- **Kansas University** – November 2009
- **Duke** – March 2010
- **Emory** – June 2011
- **Princeton** – September 2011
- **USCF** – May 21st, 2012

*UC made its first attempt at a System-wide OA Policy in 2006 (upon which many of the above were subsequently based)*
What can UC do to achieve open access?

• Negotiate with publishers to demand more open access and better business models to support the mission of maximum access for everyone.
  o UCOLASC regularly reviews, advises and joins in such negotiations with CDL’s negotiators.

• Encourage more publication in OA venues, where appropriate—Lead by Example
  o Senior scholars especially should take the risk of publishing outside of the non-OA journals.
  o Those with the most funding should be encouraged to publish in OA journals.

• Adopt an Open Access policy to **change the default relationship to publishers**
  o **Before the policy**: Individual scholars must plead with publishers to make a work OA in every case
  o **After the policy**: Publishers must plead with faculty to make the work closed access.
What do Open Access Policies do?

“An Open Access Publication is one that meets the following two conditions:

1. The author(s) and copyright holder(s) grant(s) to all users a free, irrevocable, worldwide, perpetual right of access to, and a license to copy, use, distribute, transmit and display the work publicly and to make and distribute derivative works, in any digital medium for any responsible purpose, subject to proper attribution of authorship, as well as the right to make small numbers of printed copies for their personal use.

2. A complete version of the work and all supplemental materials, including a copy of the permission as stated above, in a suitable standard electronic format is deposited immediately upon initial publication in at least one online repository that is supported by an academic institution, scholarly society, government agency, or other well-established organization that seeks to enable open access, unrestricted distribution, interoperability, and long-term archiving (PubMed Central is such a repository).”

From the 2003 Bethesda Statement on Open Access Publishing
The Proposed UC Open Access Policy

1. Preamble
2. License Grant
3. Scope
4. Waiver/Opt-out clause
5. Deposit Obligation
6. Review and Oversight
The Proposed UC Open Access Policy

1. Preamble
   “The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

2. License Grant
   Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same.”
The Proposed UC Open Access Policy

3. Scope

The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy.

4. Waiver/Opt-out clause

Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.
The Proposed UC Open Access Policy

5. Deposit Obligation

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the articles available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The deposit obligation will make the policy into one that facilitates actual as opposed to potential open access. Without this obligation, only a small portion of the published research would be made available. Although faculty can opt out of the license grant, the expectation is that faculty will nonetheless be obligated to deposit their work in the repository. There are many reasons for depositing work in this repository, whether or not it is made openly available.

- UC (via CDL) often negotiates OA rights independently, and can sometimes make a work OA after an embargo period.
- It provides an easily accessible, permanently archived copy for use and re-use in teaching, in providing copies to scholars, and in republishing or reusing elements of an article.
- It facilitates the creation of a dossier of publications in the promotion and tenure review process.
- It creates a meta-data record that facilitates findability and citation of work.

*Final version* generally means the version after peer review and copyediting. Some publishers allow deposit of the final typeset version, others do not.

The policy allows faculty to meet this obligation in many different ways. Some of the work of deposit can be automated by CDL, especially when faculty already use existing open access repositories.
The Proposed UC Open Access Policy

6. Review and Oversight

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.

The review and oversight of the policy is intended to be carried out jointly by the faculty and the university. In practice, this means the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) and the California Digital Library (CDL). CDL and UCOLASC have a long-standing and collegial relationship, and will represent the primary point of contact for this policy.
The Faculty of The University of California is committed to disseminating its research and scholarship as widely as possible. In particular, as part of a public university system, the Faculty is dedicated to making its scholarship available to the people of California. In keeping with this commitment to open dissemination and public access, the Faculty adopts the following policy:

Each Faculty member grants to the University of California a nonexclusive, irrevocable, worldwide license to exercise any and all rights under copyright relating to each of his or her scholarly articles, in any medium, and to authorize others to do the same. The policy applies to all scholarly articles authored or co-authored while the person is a member of the Faculty except for any articles published before the adoption of this policy and any articles for which the Faculty member entered into an incompatible licensing or assignment agreement before the adoption of this policy. This policy does not transfer copyright ownership, which remains with Faculty authors under existing University of California policy. Application of the license will be waived for a particular article or access delayed for a specified period of time upon express direction by a Faculty member to the University of California.

To assist the University in disseminating and archiving the articles, each Faculty member will provide an electronic copy of his or her final version of the article to the University of California by the date of its publication. The University of California will make the articles available in an open access repository. When appropriate, a Faculty member may instead notify the University of California if the article will be freely available in another repository or as an open-access publication.

The Academic Senate and the University of California will be responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. The Academic Senate and the University of California will review the policy within three years, and present a report to the Faculty.

The Faculty calls upon the Academic Senate and the University of California to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient for the Faculty as possible.
Implementing the Policy

• Depositing in the eScholarship Repository
  o A simple two step process of uploading an article and confirming metadata
  o Some aspects of deposit can be automated by CDL.

• Using the Waiver generator and addendum
  o One-click access to standard forms.

• Improving campus education and support for faculty

• Assessing the Costs and Success of the Policy
Depositing an article

Depositing an article can be achieved in two ways:
1. eScholarship can “harvest” some publications from existing online sources and deposit them on behalf of faculty, or request a copy from faculty.
2. Faculty can deposit a copy of the publication themselves, or provide a URL of the existing OA version.

Faculty can choose to provide additional data about a publication, which can improve its discoverability.
Waiver and Addendum Generators

• **Waiver**
  - Generate a written and signed waiver of open access license
    - For use in any case where a faculty member does not want to make a work OA permanently or for a specified time (embargo)
    - Or where publishers demand confirmation of opt-out
    - Includes option to deposit a version of the article at the time of opt-out/embargo

• **Addendum**
  - Generate an addendum that alerts a publisher to the OA policy and pre-existing non-exclusive license.
    - Easily generated and attached to a publication agreement.
Example Addendum and Waiver

ADDITION TO PUBLICATION AGREEMENT

1. This Addendum modifies and supplements the attached or accompanying agreement (the "Publication Agreement") concerning the article titled,

Test Article Title
(Including any figures and supplementary materials, the "Work")

and published in,

Test Journal Title (Journal).

2. The parties to the Publication Agreement as modified and supplemented by this Addendum are:

a. Sam Test Author
   (Individually or, if more than one author, collectively, "Author"); and

b. Test Press (Publisher).

3. The parties agree that wherever there is any conflict between this Addendum and the Publication Agreement, the provisions of this Addendum will control and the Publication Agreement will be construed accordingly.

4. Notwithstanding any terms in the Publication Agreement to the contrary, Author and Publisher agree as follows:

   a. All of the terms and conditions of the Publication Agreement (including but not limited to all grants, agreements, representations and warranties) are subject to and qualified by a non-exclusive license previously granted by Author to the University of California ("UC"). Under that license, UC may make the Work available and may exercise all rights under copyright relating to the Work, and may authorize others, including the Author, to do the same, provided that the Work is not sold. In the exercise of that license, UC may use a facsimile of the final published version of the Work if Publisher permits use of that version; otherwise, UC may use the Author’s final manuscript version of the Work (including all figures and modifications from the peer review process). If UC makes the Work available in an online repository under that license, UC will use all reasonable efforts both to cite to Publisher’s definitive version of the Work if it has been published, and to link to Publisher’s version if it is available online.

   b. Where applicable, all of the terms and conditions of the Publication Agreement (including but not limited to all grants, agreements, representations and warranties) are subject to and qualified by any non-exclusive license previously granted, or previously required to be granted, by Author to a funding entity that financially supported the research reflected in the Work as part of an agreement between Author or Author’s employing institution and such funding entity, such as an agency of the United States government, and/or to Author’s employing institution.

5. Either publication of the Work or Publisher’s signature below will constitute Publisher’s acceptance of and agreement to this Addendum.

PUBLISHER: ___________________________________________ Date: ____________

26 June 2012

Dear Sam Test Author,

Pursuant to the Open Access Policy adopted by UCSF Faculty on 21 May 2012, this communication serves to notify you that your request for a waiver of the Open Access license for "Example Article Title" to be published in Example Journal Title has been granted.

However, please be aware that even though you are being granted a waiver of the application of the OA license to your article as specified above, if that article is subject to the NIH Public Access Policy because it is a peer-reviewed manuscript that arose, in whole or in part, from NIH-funded research and was accepted for publication on or after April 7, 2008, your obligations under the NIH policy cannot be waived. You must be sure to reserve rights sufficient to comply with the NIH policy when you enter into a publication agreement for the article.

Independent of the waiver, our OA Policy still requires that your article be deposited in a UC repository. This can be done regardless of the waiver status of the article or any agreement that you may have signed with a publisher.

Although you have received a waiver of the OA license, the publisher’s agreement may provide sufficient rights to allow copies of your article to be made publicly available in the UC repository. The publisher may ask that certain conditions be met, some of which the repository can easily accommodate (for example, an embargo period during which the article will not be made publicly available). Even if you conclude that your article cannot be made publicly available, depositing a copy of your article in the repository is useful for archival and indexing purposes. The bibliographic information will be made available for harvesting and indexing by search engines, such as Google Scholar, creating increased awareness of your article.

If you have any questions about the UCSF Policy for Open Access, the waiver of the OA license, or depositing your article in the UC repository, please feel free to contact either of us.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Schneider
Associate Professor
Chair, UCSF Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC)

Karen Butter
University Librarian
Assistant Vice Chancellor

University of California
San Francisco

Academic Senate
senate.ucsf.edu

July 2012
Improving Campus Education and Support

- Extensive support already exists, courtesy of the Library
  - Scholarly communications officers on each campus
  - Annual “Open Access Week” talks, conferences and festivities
  - Existing (small) funds for OA publication on some campuses
  - Extensive general knowledge about copyright, fair use, publisher practices and digital archiving
  - Campus-specific knowledge about different fields and disciplines

- But...
  - Need for more services does not come free.
  - More support for the library is imperative—it is the center of the entire scholarly communication edifice at UC.
Costs of the Policy

- The start-up costs of the policy are zero, because they have already been paid for. But several things will put pressure on ongoing costs at CDL and the campuses:
  - Dealing with constant publisher and faculty requests will put strain on existing resources.
  - Any improvements to the current repository in order to enhance its functions may be costly.
  - Assessing the success of the policy will require staff time and money, in proportion to the quality of the assessment desired.

- In the absence of additional funding, costs will likely be covered by cancelling existing subscriptions and shrinking collections. *The more open access the better for balancing accessibility with costs.*
The Future of Open Access

The proposed policy is one part of achieving sustainable open access in scholarly publishing. Other aspects of this transformation will continue:

- UCOLASC and CDL will continue to negotiate with publishers to change the funding model and experiment with forms of payment that include open access but do not adversely affect faculty.
- Researchers and funders will need to continue to explore the use of research money to pay for open access publication.
- Universities and libraries must continue to set aside funds for open access publishing for scholars in funding-poor disciplines.

The overall goal of a sustainable scholarly publishing model is to move more towards paying for services we value, rather than paying for access to content.

- Preservation, findability, promotion, design, and other services that improve quality and accessibility are well worth paying for. Skyrocketing subscription costs that limit access to only the richest institutions are not.
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Proposed UC Open Access Policy: Questions and Concerns
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This document lists the most commonly expressed questions and concerns about a proposed open access policy for the University of California. Concerns and questions were submitted by the Library and COLASC committees of all ten campuses, The California Digital Library, the University Council of Librarians, several Graduate Student Associations, the Library Association of the University of California, as well as the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) and the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) and the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), as well as many faculty members on each campus polled via town-halls, surveys and on-line discussions between Dec 2011 and July 2012.

Additional questions not addressed here can be found on the Reshaping Communication Website (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/)

Academic Freedom/Waiver of license
Issues of academic freedom are the most commonly expressed concerns about an open access policy. Many, if not all of these concerns, are answered by the fact that the proposed policy has an extremely generous opt-out clause. Scholars may opt out for whatever reason: if they disagree with the policy, or want to support subscription access, or co-author with others who disagree with it, or want to retain full control over their own copyright, or are asked to by a publisher, etc. Thus the policy balances the need for academic freedom with the need for greater access to research. The disadvantage, of course, is that it allows publishers to abuse the opt-out clause by routinely demanding opt-out waivers in order to publish. But from the perspective of achieving more open access, a policy with an opt-out clause is preferable to no policy at all.

Commercial use and Reuse
The proposed policy limits the use that UC may make of our scholarly articles to depositing them in an open access repository. Other uses (such as republication or resale by UC) are not authorized by the policy. However, the policy does not restrict the uses that end-users may make of these articles. In effect, it requires that articles by default be released under a Creative Commons Attribution license (CC-by), a form of license that requires attribution but does not restrict the use, commercial or otherwise, that may be made of these articles. Many faculty have insisted that open access versions of articles must be restricted to non-commercial uses only. The expressed intention in most cases is to protect our work from unscrupulous commercial re-use. In practice, the only legal way to attempt this (a so-called “non-commercial” restriction on the license used to redistribute the work) may also drastically restrict legitimate commercial reuses, such as republication of the work in another scholarly volume, re-use in a course reader, print republication in a foreign country, text mining, etc. It is also not clear that unscrupulous uses can be so prevented—fraud and plagiarism are not forestalled by copyright license restrictions. Furthermore, a more “open” license also introduces more, rather than less, competition into the scholarly publishing marketplace, something that is desperately needed in an industry that currently operates largely in secrecy and with little overt competition.
Deposit Requirement
Another concern occasionally raised about the policy is the requirement to provide a
copy of each article for deposit in eScholarship. This concern takes two forms. The first
concerns the extra amount of work it will require of faculty; the second concerns the lack
of ability to opt out of this requirement (the opt-out waiver applies only to the license
requirement). While it is undeniable that this requirement makes work for faculty in an
absolute sense, it is not clear whether that work is onerous. In fact, it may well have
extensive benefits for faculty. In practical terms, the amount of work required is
extremely small—far less work, for instance, than submitting an article to a manuscript
management system for a journal. Some of the deposit of articles may be automated;
eScholarship can find and deposit some articles on behalf of faculty, requiring only a
simple email response agreeing to the action, some articles (those that are already open
access) may require no action at all. For those that do require deposit, the process can be
streamlined to the point where it requires only a simple upload and verification of basic
data.
Deposit benefits faculty in the discoverability of their research—the more accessible, and
the better the metadata about an article, the more likely it will be found in a search or
linked to by other sources, improving the impact of the research. In addition, because
eScholarship is designed to function as an archive, it also provides faculty with a
permanent place to store and retrieve all articles, for any purpose—from promotion and
tenure, to requests for articles, to use as a backup personal archive.
The obligation to make our work available is paramount, and the proposed policy has
no simple opt-out clause as in the case of the license. Allowing opt-out from deposit
would have the unfortunate effect of giving publishers the power to demand even more
rights (including the right to archive the work) which many faculty members do not
want to give up. In the case where there are concerns about the use of previously
copyrighted materials (images, graphs, passages requiring permission, etc), those
concerns can be dealt with in the implementation of the deposit process itself.
Definitions: “scholarly article” and “final version”
Some have expressed concern about the definition of the terms “scholarly article” and
“final version.” In both cases, the language has been chosen for two reasons. First,
because it is strategically “vague” meaning that the definition of “scholarly articles” and
“final version” is not specified in the text of the policy itself, but in the implementation
and oversight of the policy. It will be easier to create a FAQ and an interface in the
deposit process that explains what kinds of materials are covered by the policy and
where the limitations might be, than it is to do the same in the policy language itself. The
more tightly worded a policy is, the more exceptions it creates, and so the option has
been to use this wording. The second reason is that this is the same language that nearly
all of the other existing scholarly policies use, and so in preference for compatibility with
other universities and publishers, the proposed policy retains these terms as well.
Faculty Oversight and Review
A final concern often expressed is that this policy will require clear faculty oversight and
review. The policy thus requires oversight by both the Academic Senate and the UC
Office of the President. In practice, oversight has been and will continue to be the
primary responsibility of UCOLASC and the California Digital Library, who historically
have worked very closely with each other and are in frequent consultation on issues
regarding scholarly communication. The policy sets a limit of three years within which
these two entities must report on the policy to the Faculty.
Other Issues
Many other concerns have been raised which are valid, but which would not in fact be at issue if this policy were passed. These include:

Copyright transfer to the University
- The policy does not transfer copyright to the university, only a very limited non-exclusive license.

Peer review concerns
- The proposed policy assumes no change in the current system of peer review.
- Further, open Access has no effect on how peer review is conducted. The quality of a journal and its peer review is independent of whether it is distributed freely or not, and under this policy, faculty are not required to publish in OA journals—they may and must continue to publish in the most appropriate venue.

Faculty (or students) should not be limited in where to publish
- Although we might want to encourage publication in OA venues, this policy makes no requirements on where to publish; there is no expectation or requirement to publish articles in open access venues, only that UC will have the right to make a version available in eScholarship.

Additional questions not addressed here can be found on the Reshaping Communication Website (http://osc.universityofcalifornia.edu/openaccesspolicy/)
October 2, 2012

To: Chairs of Standing Senate Committee
   Chairs of College Executive Committees

From: Jose Wudka, Chair
       Riverside Division

Re: Systemwide Review of “Rebenching” Report

As indicated in the attached memo, I am distributing to all Committee Chairs the Report and Recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee. The rebenching project is the next step in the systemwide overhaul of the internal UC budget process, which began with Funding Streams. The intent of the rebenching effort is to create equity in the formulas which allocate state funds to individual campuses.

Please submit your committee response by November 16, 2012.

Enclosure
July 12, 2012

SENATE DIVISION CHAIRS
SENATE COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Re: Systemwide review of “Rebenching” report

Dear Colleagues:

I have enclosed for systemwide review in Fall 2012 the report and recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee, which met from April 2011 to March 2012. The rebenching project is the second phase of the University’s overhaul of its internal budgeting processes, following Funding Streams, which addressed non-state revenues and which was implemented in 2011-12. The intent of rebenching is to increase transparency and equity in the formula for allocating state funds across the campuses.

Comments should be sent to SenateReview@ucop.edu by Monday, December 3, 2012. I encourage you to circulate this report and recommendations widely in order to engage the broadest possible range of faculty in discussion of the future shape of the University. I thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Anderson, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
   Executive Director Winnacker

Encl.
Dear Mark,

Enclosed please find the report and recommendations of the Rebenching Budget Committee. At your request, we convened this Committee in June 2011. The Committee was broadly representative of the University and its ten campuses, including six Chancellors, five members of the Academic Senate (including the Chair and Vice Chair of the Academic Council), two Executive Vice Chancellors, and four Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget. The committee deliberated over the better part of the year, holding its last meeting on March 7, 2012. The committee approved the framework and recommendations of the report at the last meeting and this report was reviewed extensively by a drafting committee representative of the full Committee.

While not every member of the Committee agreed to every detail of the proposal, there was consensus on the need to move forward on the general principles behind the proposal. In particular, there was strong consensus that the University needs a more transparent and equitable process for allocating funds received from the State of California to its ten campuses. And there was strong consensus that such allocations need to be guided by core principles derived from the University’s mission. Specifically, that UC’s excellence is found in all of its parts and that state support per student should not depend on the campus a student attends. The Committee also felt strongly that rebenching should occur, if possible, out of new State funds rather than by further cutting existing State support at any campus.

Given the volatility and uncertainty surrounding the State budget, the Committee did recognize the need for year-to-year flexibility in implementing these changes. In particular, such flexibility would be needed in years of small or no budget increases. Other issues that would need to be addressed in implementation include:

- The development over the next year of a long-range enrollment plan that will provide the basis for the rebenching enrollment targets beginning in 2013-14. The campuses will be asked to begin such planning in early November, after the results of the November tax measure are known.
- The methodology for annual adjustments to the UC Merced and UC San Francisco budgets (proposals are referenced in the report).
Establishing a method for determining and annually adjusting the appropriate allocations to "off-the-top" programs including the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), the Scripps Institute, the Neuropsychiatric Institutes, Mental Health Teaching Support, the MIND Institute, SAPEP programs, and any State General Fund adjustments to student financial aid in order to even out the student work/loan commitment across campuses.

In our belief that, similar to Funding Streams, adoption of rebenching will create a framework that allows for the transparent resolution of many of these issues. Many of these issues concern funding that was allocated to the campuses for a specific program at the request of the state government and are related to how that funding has grown or been cut over the years since it was originally allocated.

The enclosed report includes two documents (Appendix A and B) that show the results of the rebenching model calculations. However, one of the implementation tasks is to verify these numbers with the campuses. Thus, the numbers and results in these appendices will change prior to implementation. They should not be considered final numbers. In addition, there are additional appendices that will be compiled and transmitted to you over the next few weeks.

We are transmitting the report for additional review and comment to a broad range of University constituents. We look forward to discussing the report and its implementation with you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Lawrence H. Pitts
Provost and Executive Vice President
Academic Affairs

Nathan Brostrom
Executive Vice President
Business Operations

Enclosures

CC: Chancellors
Rebenching Budget Committee Members
Executive Vice Chancellors
Vice Chancellors for Planning and Budget
Rebenching Budget Committee Staff
Reduced state support prompts reexamination of UC funding models. Beginning in 2008, the University of California Office of the President (UCOP) initiated a comprehensive review of how the University budgets and allocates its various fund sources. This became particularly urgent in the intervening years as the state dramatically reduced state support to the University and non-state fund sources became an ever-increasing share of the University’s total budget. This review and subsequent deliberations in the University led to a recommendation in 2011 to adopt Funding Streams, a new budget allocation model for current funds.

Funding Streams. Funding streams, implemented for the 2011-12 budget year, is based on the principle that campuses would retain all the revenues they generate and that central operations would be funded through a new assessment on expenditures from all fund sources. Funding streams was implemented for all revenues except State General Funds. Fundamentally, it did not change how State General Funds are currently distributed across campuses.1 The distribution of State General Funds among campuses is a result of a long history of State and University funding allocation decisions. Because campuses grew at different periods under different allocation models, the base allocation of State General Funds could no longer be explained by any one set of factors or principles.

The need for rebenching. Parallel to the funding streams discussions, there were a number of discussions about the need to address the distribution (or redistribution) of the State General Funds that comprised the campus base budgets. One such body, the UC Commission on the Future (COTF), recommended, subsequent to funding streams, that the University examine the rationale for distributing state General Funds and design a proposal for “an equitable and transparent readjustment of base funding formulas.” The need for such a change included concerns about the “considerable disparities” among campuses in per-student funding and “the complexity and opaqueness of the current model.” This “readjustment” or reallocation of core State General Funds came to be known as Rebenching.

Rebenching Budget Committee. Provost Pitts and Executive Vice President Brostrom appointed the Rebenching Budget Committee which held its first meeting in April 2011 and deliberated for the better part of year. At its meeting of March 7, 2012, the committee agreed to the recommendations for the rebenching of state General Funds.

1 There were adjustments to campus General Fund allocations associated with Funding Streams and state General Funds are included on the expenditure side in the calculation of the assessment.
Core principles. The recommendations below are based on the following core principles:

• Unrestricted State General Funds provided to University shall be allocated to the campuses for the purposes of UC’s core missions based on the number and type of students they educate.
• UC has a common standard of excellence across its 10 campuses. The state subsidy per student should not depend on the campus a student attends. Thus, the amount of state General Funds allocated per student should be the same for each type of student across all of the campuses.2
• Rather than reducing the state funding provided to any campus, if possible, rebenching should be implemented in a way that seeks to bring all campuses to up to current highest level of per-student funding. This requires additional state funding.
• Graduate education is such an integral part of UC’s mission and excellence that it needs to be recognized in any allocation model.

Committee recommendations. Those core principles as well as a number of others are inherent in the recommendations for rebenching adopted by the committee. The following are recommendations agreed to by the committee at its last meeting:

• Initially, UC Merced and UC San Francisco are not included in the rebenching model and adjustments to their State General Fund allocations will occur through different means. The intention is that, as it grows, UC Merced will transition to the funding allocation method recommended here for the other campuses. A determination will need to be made as to when UC Merced begins to be part of the normal rebenching formula. For UCSF, there is a proposal for a corridor for increases and decreases that was not reviewed by this committee. Under the proposed corridor, UCSF would get 100 percent of its share of augmentations for the first two percent increase in State General Funds and then 50 percent of its share for any further increases. UCSF would take 100 percent of its share of any cuts for the first one percent decrease in State General Funds and 25 percent of any decreases beyond the one percent cut.
• Rebenching will be implemented starting with allocations for the 2012-13 fiscal year.
• The transition to a fully-rebenched state General Fund allocation at each campus will occur over six years.
• At full implementation, all campuses are to receive per-student funding equal to the highest campus’ per-student average3 (by level – see next bullet)
• Per-student funding is to be distributed on a weighted basis in which undergraduate, postbaccalaureate, graduate professional, and graduate academic master’s students are weighted at 1, doctoral students at 2.5, and health sciences students at 5 (except health sciences undergraduate students are at 1 and health sciences academic doctoral students are at 2.5).

2 The Academic Senate stated it this way: “The state subsidy per student should not depend on the campus the student attends; this recommendation follows from our core value that UC is one university with one standard of excellence at its ten campuses. The cost of a UC-quality education is the same on every campus, and the campuses should be funded accordingly.”
3 The committee did discuss options for implementation that, in the absence of sufficient resources, would prioritize campuses furthest from the rebenching target and/or would rebench to the second highest campus.
• At the undergraduate level, only California resident students will enter into the formula for determining the allocation of state funding in the model. At the graduate level, all students are included.
• Only enrolled students up to a targeted number established in a systemwide enrollment planning process will be included. Students above targets will not be included in the weighting formula.
• For 2012-13, current budgeted enrollment targets\(^4\) will be the basis for rebenching. A new long-range enrollment plan will be developed over the next year and this plan will be the basis for rebenching enrollment targets in future years.
• There will be a penalty if a campus falls below its undergraduate California resident targets by more than a particular percentage over a particular time frame. For each student below the target, a campus will lose its per-student funding times a multiplier. The tolerance, time frame, and multiplier for assessing the penalty will be determined in implementation. For example, it has been proposed that the penalty be assessed if a campus falls below its target by more than one percent calculated using a three-year rolling average and that the multiplier be 1.5.
• Campuses with academic doctoral student proportions below 12 percent (ratio of Ph.D. to undergraduates) will be provided funding to increase the numbers of such students up to the 12 percent level.\(^5\)
• Campuses are assigned a set-aside of $15 million in State General Funds prior to application of the weighting formula to recognize fixed costs that every campus has to cover unrelated to the number of students served.
• State General Funds allocated for specific state purposes and restricted to those purposes are funded “off-the-top” – that is, these funds are allocated to campus or systemwide budgets prior to application of the weighting formula.\(^6\)
• As determined in Funding Streams, there is a student financial aid self-help contribution policy for resident undergraduate students common across all campuses. Currently, no State General Funds are used for leveling the student work/loan expectations among campuses pursuant to this policy. If state General Funds are used for this purpose in the future, those fund will also be treated as an “off-the-top” and not available for rebenching.

There were a number of issues that the committee left for resolution during implementation, including verification of the figures in the rebenching model.\(^7\) Two were mentioned above – the appropriate way to allocate state General Funds to UCSF going forward and the timing of the transition of UC Merced to the rebenching formula. Others include:

\(^4\) 2007-08 budgeted enrollments as adjusted in 2010-11. “Over-enrollment” (students enrolled beyond the budget targets) will not be included.
\(^5\) The rebenching model includes funding at 12 percent for those campus now below 12 percent; thus, those campuses will realize funding for additional doctoral students as rebenching is phased in over the six years. Funding will be withdrawn for any shortfalls in achieving these numbers at the end of an appropriate phase-in period.
\(^6\) "Off-the-tops" agreed to by the committee include Agricultural Experiment Station, the Neuropsychiatric Institutes (NPIs) including Mental Health Teaching Support, Scripps Institute, SAPEP, and MIND. Clinical Teaching Support is not included as an “off-the-top” and remains part of the base budget subject to the weighting formula.
\(^7\) There are some discrepancies in the dollar figures for General Fund and “off-the-top” programs that need to be resolved between UCOP and campus budget offices.
• Establishing a method for determining and annually adjusting the appropriate allocations to
“off-the-top” programs,
• Determining the appropriate set-aside for SAPEP funds, and
• Refining budgeted enrollment numbers by level.

While the University will need to work out the exact funding scenario through the allocations
process, the committee recommends a “waterfall” of funding sources, in which new state funding
would be the first source of rebenching funds, followed by savings generated from cuts to central
programs, and, in a worst-case scenario in which no new funds are available for rebenching and
cuts to campus budgets are necessary, distributing cuts in alignment with the goals of
rebenching. However, the group acknowledged the President’s authority to alter this
recommended solution in any given year in which circumstances warranted different action.

In the event of new funding from the State, funds would be distributed as follows:

• UC Merced – for enrollment funding according to its Memorandum of Understanding, which
currently ends after 2013-14.
• Agreed-upon cost-adjustments to the “off-the-top programs’’ excluded from the rebenching
base.
• To the campuses according to the rebenching targets based on the six-year implementation
schedule. Under one state growth scenario, this would account for approximately 20% of
any remaining new state funding after the above two categories are funded.
• Any remaining funds would be distributed according to the target General Fund percentages
in the rebenching model8 in order to increase the dollar amount of state support per weighted
student equally across the campuses. This would include UCSF’s distribution (proposal for
UCSF described above).

These are the recommendations of the Rebenching Task Force. The President has the authority to
take some, all, or none of these recommendations.

Calculations. Attachment A is the spreadsheet representing the latest version of the calculations
that show a six-year path to implement the above recommendations. The spreadsheet shows the
total amount of new funds that would be necessary to implement rebenching over six years9 and
how those dollars would flow to each campus under that scenario. Note that it excludes the
funding that would be needed for UC Merced and UC San Francisco and assumes no enrollment
growth beyond the additional graduate students discussed above. Attachment B is a graph
showing dollars per weighted student by campus, the system average, and the rebenching
target.10

---

8 Line S on the 5/4/12 version of the model (Attachment A)
9 Assuming no state General Fund cuts
10 The figures in the attachments will change as the various data elements are verified with the campuses and
as implementation decisions are made.
### Appendix A

Results will change when data is verified with campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A: Budget Adjustments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K: Include benefits in OTAs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B: State Funds</strong></td>
<td>$282,858,000</td>
<td>$312,560,000</td>
<td>$193,953,000</td>
<td>$398,800,000</td>
<td>$72,800,000</td>
<td>$154,405,000</td>
<td>$236,714,000</td>
<td>$186,936,000</td>
<td>$122,797,000</td>
<td>$116,751,000</td>
<td>$2,078,574,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C: General Campus Off-the-top</strong></td>
<td>$24,488,475</td>
<td>$46,927,717</td>
<td>$694,000</td>
<td>$1,068,000</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>$26,551,516</td>
<td>$15,961,600</td>
<td>$242,000</td>
<td>$675,000</td>
<td>$1,790,000</td>
<td>$122,733,368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D: Health Science non-CTS Off-the-top</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3,557,727</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$30,762,766</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$10,088,150</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$44,209,042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E: Clinical Teaching Support Off-the-top</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F: Fixed Cost Set-aside</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G: Subtotal (B+F)</strong></td>
<td>$243,449,525</td>
<td>$247,274,556</td>
<td>$178,259,000</td>
<td>$351,693,234</td>
<td>$57,075,000</td>
<td>$112,853,484</td>
<td>$202,022,140</td>
<td>$316,605,450</td>
<td>$107,122,000</td>
<td>$99,961,000</td>
<td>$1,761,591,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H: Health Science Budget</strong></td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I: Adjusted campus base budget (G+H)</strong></td>
<td>$243,449,525</td>
<td>$247,274,556</td>
<td>$178,259,000</td>
<td>$351,693,234</td>
<td>$57,075,000</td>
<td>$112,853,484</td>
<td>$202,022,140</td>
<td>$316,605,450</td>
<td>$107,122,000</td>
<td>$99,961,000</td>
<td>$1,761,591,590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **O: Graduation to UC average** | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% | 12.0% |
| **J: All State-supportable** | 31.97% | 29.39% | 27.44% | 35.62% | 4.76% | 17.87% | 27.43% | 3.78% | 21.480% | 16.060% | 215.283% | |

| **L: Dollars per Student (I/J)** | $7,759 | $8,414 | $6,495 | $9,867 | $11,978 | $6,312 | $7,364 | $42,708 | $4,987 | $6,224 | $8,183 | |
| **M: Difference from Mean (Campus L - System L)** | $(424) | $231 | $1,688 | $1,684 | $1,684 | $3,705 | $1,684 | $(819) | $34,253 | $(1,950) | |

| **N: Adjusted campus base budgets (I except MC & SF = 0)** | $243,449,525 | $247,274,556 | $178,259,000 | $351,693,234 | $- | $112,853,484 | $202,022,140 | $316,605,450 | $107,122,000 | $99,961,000 | $1,542,911,140 | |

| **Enrollment Options** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **P: Population to weight** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **Q: Weighting Scheme** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **R: Weighted Enrollment** | 42,346 | 40,144 | 35,832 | 54,883 | N/A | 20,895 | 36,741 | N/A | 25,055 | 19,168 | 275,266 | |

| **S: % of Systemwide Total (Campus R / System R)** | 15.4% | 14.7% | 13.0% | 19.9% | N/A | 7.6% | 13.3% | N/A | 9.1% | 7.0% | 100.0% | |

| **T: Campus funds on equal per student distr. (System N * Campus I)** | $237,163,495 | $236,126,746 | $200,844,246 | $307,628,239 | N/A | $112,139,067 | 205,939,339 | N/A | 140,437,390 | 107,439,788 | 1,542,911,140 | |

| **U: Change in State Funds: Dollars (F - I)** | $(6,062,901) | $(23,139,810) | $22,583,245 | $(44,341,005) | N/A | $4,266,423 | $9,196,999 | N/A | $33,155,190 | $7,478,788 | 0 | |

| **V: Change in State Funds: Percentage (UL)** | -2.5% | -8.5% | 12.3% | -12.6% | N/A | 3.8% | 1.9% | N/A | 31.1% | 7.5% | | |

| **W: Dollars per Weighted Student (T/JM)** | $5,605 | $5,605 | $5,605 | $5,605 | N/A | $5,605 | $5,605 | N/A | $5,605 | $5,605 | | |

| **X: New Funds Needed (W, or if W is negative, 0)** | $- | $- | $22,583,245 | $- | N/A | $4,266,423 | $9,196,999 | N/A | $33,155,190 | $7,478,788 | 71,562,845 | |

| **Bottom line of Hybrid model** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **Y: Resultant Dollars on Campus (the greater of N or T)** | $243,449,525 | $247,274,556 | $200,844,246 | $351,693,234 | N/A | $117,119,307 | 205,939,339 | N/A | 140,437,390 | 107,439,788 | 1,614,473,985 | |

| **Z: Resultant Dollars per Weighted Student (Y/R)** | $5,749 | $6,129 | $5,605 | $6,413 | N/A | $5,605 | $5,401 | $5,499 | N/A | $4,275 | 5,215 | |

| **Z1: Dollars per weighted student (unadjusted)** | $5,749 | $6,129 | $4,975 | $6,413 | N/A | $5,401 | $5,499 | N/A | $4,275 | 5,215 | | |

| **AA: Difference from Mean (Campus Z - System Z)** | $(116) | $264 | $(260) | $(260) | N/A | $(260) | $(260) | N/A | $(260) | (260) | | |

| **AB: Resultant Dollars per Weighted Student (rank of Z)** | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | N/A | 4 | 4 | N/A | 4 | 4 | | |

| **AC:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **1:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **AB:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| **Redistribution timeframe-years** | 6 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
Appendix B:
Rebenching Model Results: dollars per "weighted" student

These values are State General Funds per "weighted" student based on the formula in the rebenching model. The values are not related to the actual costs or expenditures for instruction since the model only accounts for a portion of one revenue source. It does not take into account other State General Funds, other revenue sources, actual expenditures, budget cuts, or over-enrollment.
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Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations
Graduate Program in Sociology

A. Introduction

The Graduate Program in Sociology was initiated in 1966/67 as a Master's program, followed a year later by the introduction of the PhD program. Currently, the Program does not admit students for a terminal Master's but confers this degree on students as they complete work towards their doctorate. In total, the Program has conferred 150 PhD degrees, with 46 of these awarded since the prior extramural review in Winter 2001. The overall attrition rate for students who leave without a PhD is 68.3%; this rate stands at 56.6% for the interval since the prior review. The mean time to completion of the degree for students who earned their doctorate during the period from Spring 2001 to Summer 2009 is 8 years.

The Program underwent an extramural review on February 1-2, 2010. The extramural review team consisted of Professors Karen S. Cook, Stanford University, Jeffrey Manza, New York University, and John Sutton, UCSB. The review team submitted its report on March 30, 2010. Graduate Division received the Program’s response to errors of fact, misperceptions and interpretations in the extramural report on April 23, 2010.

B. Summary of the Extramural Report

Overall quality of the graduate program

The extramural review team positively notes the national ranking of the Sociology Program and recognizes its strengths in several subdisciplines. The review team did find a number of areas in which the Program could be strengthened.

Leadership and Governance

The major concerns expressed by the review team stem from issues related to leadership and governance. The team finds the Department to lack leadership among its current faculty and that a strong leader will be needed to help the faculty progress towards a truly collegial and respectful environment. The team views as essential to the long term success of the department a new leader with a national reputation who can bring energy and vision to the department, who has the stature and will to bridge real or perceived divides, and who by nature can foster an environment conducive to promoting a shared view of Sociology’s future. The team urges there be an additional investment in new senior faculty such that the Department can maintain and build upon the quality that similar past investments have generated.
The team expressed numerous concerns about the manner in which the Department governs itself. Some of these concerns stem from issues directly related to a lack of mutual trust and respect among the faculty and the perception that decisions are made by a select few. Of particular concern is the team’s finding that decisions may be inappropriately influenced by the department manager. The team recommends that the Department develop the means to provide a level of transparency for important decision-making activities.

Graduate Students

The review team raises a number of issues with respect to the graduate students. First, the team finds that recent cohorts of students appear to be less affected by discord than are older cohorts, a positive development. Nonetheless the team also finds that the students, in general, appear to be unaware as to how decisions that affect their lives, particularly regarding their support, are made. The team suggests that the Graduate Student handbook address issues of graduate student governance. The team raises concerns that the program admits some weak students, that the attrition rate is too high, and that the support packages are not sufficiently attractive. The team recommends that the program maintain high admissions standards, in part by reducing the size of incoming classes to maintain these standards, and to be more proactive with respect to recruitment. Further, the team recommends that the causes of attrition be ferreted out. In addition, the team urges the Department to provide more multi-year support packages to its students. The team also finds the process by which graduate students are evaluated each year to be unwieldy, the four-level ranking scheme to be invidious and empirically unsupportable, and recommends revamping this evaluation process. The team finds the Program’s track record for placing its graduates into faculty positions to have been strong but does question whether this record may have fallen off in recent years.

Curriculum/Graduate Program

The most significant finding of the team with respect to the structure of the graduate program itself is that there are too many programmatic areas with insufficient faculty and courses offered to support them. The team recommends reducing the areas to Criminology /Socio-Legal; Social Psychology; Race/Class/Gender Inequalities; Political Economy of Global System Change; Theory. The team states that additional faculty hires would provide Social Psychology the means by which this distinguished group could remain viable. The team further recommends that the Criminology group conceive of itself more broadly such that links between crime and other social inequalities and institutions be part of the intellectual conversation. The team notes that whereas Theory is currently a major strength at UCR, this area has been disappearing as a distinct sub-field and has ceased to be a focus at top universities. The team believes that the field of Global Political Economy is an emerging area in which UCR could distinguish itself.
The team suggests changes/additions to the curriculum. The team finds that the graduate students do not get involved in independent research sufficiently early in graduate school and recommends that the program create a Research and Writing Seminar which would entail the students working systematically on a research project which in turn would fulfill a current "e-paper" requirement. The team questions the format and content of the statistics courses and recommends they be revamped into a two-quarter quantitative methods course with more sophisticated topics part of another course that only some students need take.

The team notes an absence of an intellectual culture within the department, noting in particular the lack of a regular seminar series and the resulting lack of exposure of students to research and scholarship conducted beyond the campus. The team recommends the program establish a seminar series for both in-house and outside speakers. Such a seminar series would enhance the intellectual atmosphere and provide a forum through which cross-fertilization of ideas could occur.

The review team states that faculty accessibility is an issue that needs to be addressed.

C. Departmental Response

The Preliminary Response of the Department of Sociology to the Extramural Report identifies numerous errors and misperceptions which include but are not limited to:

1. The Department is more collegial than the extramural report suggests.
2. The Department's policies and procedures are based on shared governance and on the APM which confers specific responsibilities upon the chair.
3. Many of the recommendations made by the review team are outside the purview of the Department including the appointment of the Graduate Advisor and TA workloads.
4. Issues related to student governance are directly addressed by the Sociology Graduate Student Association. The Graduate Student Handbook (Addendum) has been in place for 25 years.
5. The Department has no GSRs.
6. Graduate Division requires the Department to provide an annual evaluation of each graduate student.
7. The Department keeps minutes of its faculty meetings.
8. The Department disputes the statement that it admits weak students or that its placement record is diminishing. It also disputes the time to degree and attrition data and offers its own data.
9. The Department states that Sociology 250 fulfills the "Research and Writing Seminar" that the team recommends the Department create.
10. The Department states that Sociology 203B is designed appropriately to teach the necessary statistics to its students.
D. Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations

In considering the major points that the Department makes in response to errors and misperceptions in the extramural report, Graduate Council notes the following. The Department perceives itself as more collegial than the extramural report suggests, but Graduate Council finds evidence within the confidential faculty and student evaluations of the program to suggest that the Department still must make significant inroads in this arena. The Department provides data to suggest that the attrition rate and the time to degree are better than reported, but Graduate Council uses the data provided by Graduate Division which has a standard method for generation of these data for all graduate reviews. Graduate Council realizes, as the Department states, that many of the operations of departments and their graduate programs are dictated by the APM and that many decisions are outside a department's purview. Nonetheless, Graduate Council believes that establishment of transparent operating procedures, consistent with the APM, would permit an entire faculty to understand how decisions are made and, if procedures are followed, would reduce the likelihood that the faculty feels disenfranchised which, in turn, would help reestablish a sense of trust. The Department indicates that minutes are taken at each faculty meeting, and Graduate Council urges the Department to follow through by distributing the minutes to the faculty, allowing the minutes to be corrected, if need be, and then approved to ensure that the official record of decisions made by the faculty is accurate. The Department believes that the topics in statistics taught in Sociology 203B are academically warranted, but Graduate Council finds the extramural review team’s evaluation on this matter to indicate that UCR’s approach to teaching statistics to be outside the norm and not well reasoned. Similarly, the Department views Sociology 250 to address the writing and research methods needs of the students, but the extramural review team clearly finds that no current course fulfills this need.

Graduate Council is most concerned with the apparent lack of collegiality and mutual respect among the faculty in Sociology and the perception that a few senior faculty, perhaps aided by the MSO, make decisions for the Department. It is very difficult for graduate programs to be unaffected by surrounding discord, and the Graduate Program in Sociology will thrive in step with an improved atmosphere in the Department. Graduate Council will recommend to the CHASS Dean and the Graduate Dean that new individuals be appointed immediately to serve as Department Chair and Graduate Advisor. The Council will also recommend to the CHASS Dean that an external search be conducted for a senior faculty member to serve as Chair in the longer term. In addition, Graduate Council will recommend to the Graduate Dean that a committee of senior faculty from outside Sociology be appointed to oversee the implementation of transparent procedures for the Graduate Program.

Graduate Council makes the following recommendations to the Department:
1. Work to improve collegiality and trust among the faculty and recognize that new leadership will need to be seriously considered at all levels to deal with longstanding problems in the department.

2. Generate procedures for the Graduate Program that clearly articulate how the program is administered and how important decisions are made. Similarly, it is recommended that procedures be established for the Department as a whole such that the decision making process is transparent to the faculty. These procedures should include provisions for faculty meeting agendas and minutes, as well as how these documents are to be used by the faculty.

3. Avoid conferring onto the MSO the rights or responsibilities of the chair or of the faculty.

4. Reassess the subdisciplines and focus them to four or five that can be supported by the size of the faculty.

5. Maintain admissions standards for graduate students and offer multi-year support packages when possible.

6. Recognize that the attrition rate at 56.6% is high and take steps to understand its causes and then work to reduce it.

7. Recognize that the time to degree at 8 years is too long, given the 6 year normative time for the Program. Streamline the graduate program if warranted or push students to complete their requirements more quickly if not. Consider that lack of accessibility of some faculty may be delaying the progress of some graduate students.

8. Develop a seminar/colloquium series with speakers from both UCR and other universities to enhance the intellectual atmosphere of the Department and Graduate Program.

9. Introduce curricular changes to address the concerns raised by the review team with respect to a writing/research course and the content of the statistics courses.

10. Adopt a different approach to evaluating students each year. There are numerous methods for conducting these evaluations at UCR, and the current method used by Sociology appears to be problematic.

Graduate Council will conduct an internal review of the Sociology Graduate Program in 2012-2013 to assess the Program’s progress with respect to implementation of these recommendations.
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SCOPE

The College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences successfully operates two Service Centers that provide specialized academic advising to prospective graduate and undergraduate applicants, current majors and minors in CNAS, enrollment assistance, and transacts department course scheduling. These Centers were developed to serve separate populations:

The Biological Sciences Graduate Student Affairs Center (BSGSAC) was developed 14 years ago and services 14 graduate programs, approximately 75% of the CNAS graduate program population. The BSGSAC also provides department course scheduling for the Biological and Life Sciences departments and enrollment assistance of this undergraduate population. This involves working with Department Leadership (Chairs and Faculty Advisors) in quarterly course scheduling, data analysis, and general catalog oversight, utilizing applications such as CRAMS, CIRS and SIS+.

The CNAS Undergraduate Academic Advising Center (UAAC) was developed approximately 5 years ago and services all 17 undergraduate majors. The Center utilizes developmental holistic advising techniques in regard to: recruitment and orientation of new students; course and degree planning; interpreting and navigating university policy and procedure; referrals to appropriate on-campus or off-campus resources; working with students in crises; evaluating transcript articulations; and finally, certifying CNAS degree requirements have been met. These advisors also perform limited operations of enrollment assistance when needed.

This proposal explores the natural expansion of specialized academic advising services to the two existing Centers in three primary areas:

1. **GSAC**: Embrace the Departments of Earth Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Mathematics, Chemistry and Physics & Astronomy (hereafter known as the (5) departments), with the existing 14 graduate programs thereby creating the new Graduate Student Affairs Center (GSAC);
2. **UAAC**: Realign all enrollment assistance for the College into the UAAC;
3. **Department Course Scheduling**: Create a sub-unit to centralize all department course scheduling in the College.

It is proposed that the complete adoption of the specialized academic advising services into the two Service Centers will create efficiencies, economies, and increased customer service to our students, Faculty, and Departments. This report explores the three areas of specialized academic advising services and provides options for adoption.

RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The first area pertains to **graduate student affairs**. Presently, there is a Director and 4 Graduate Student Affairs Officers (SAO IIs). This Team works with prospective students (recruitment efforts), incoming students, and current students for 14 of 19 graduate programs within CNAS.

   Graduate recruitment involves answering inquiries both domestic and international, assisting students in application completion, and working with Graduate Division from submission through acceptance/denial. Incoming students require information about F1 visas, payroll, speak test requirements, TADP training, and department orientations. Some also need assistance with housing, acclimating to a new city, and an orientation to the campus.

   Current students primarily work with their assigned Faculty Advisors or Research PIs toward degree completion. SAO IIs are often the first point of contact for a variety of issues and provide support to the faculty and students in the areas of: enrollment in courses; submitting paperwork by established timelines; negotiating the university rules and regulations; and personal crises.

   Presently, the Center works with 14 programs with 358 continuing students and processes approximately 755
applications with ~4.5 FTE. UCR system applications being deployed this year are expected to have significant impact on managing the work load during the recruitment period. Hobson’s Connect is a major initiative underway that will streamline the inquiry and communication process with prospective applicants, and enhancements to GradSIS are ongoing. By folding in the 5 new departments with 372 continuing students and the processing of 767 additional applications, it is anticipated that additional FTE will be needed to accommodate the increased work. These new positions will match the existing Staff as SAO IIs (4353).

With the goal of adding 2.0 FTE to the GSAC, there are two options:

**Option 1:** Retain department course scheduling within the GSAC, and establish a reporting tier structure of two Assistant Directors-SAII-Supv. One Assistant Director would oversee 5 SAO IIs and all graduate student affairs; the other Assistant Director would oversee the new sub-unit of 3 __ Asst. IIIs and the tasks of department course scheduling, CRAMS, CIRS and catalog copy updates (see area #3 below).

**Option 2:** The current model of the BSGSAC would remain in the new GSAC (One Director SAO III-Supv), with all 6 SAO IIs reporting directly, although there would be a reassignment of existing departments among the Staff. One exceptional consideration is in regard to graduate student recruitment service the GSAC would provide the Department of Mathematics. This department has historically employed very specific recruitment and outreach efforts with strong financial support. Efforts in tabling at Conferences and Recruitment events can be consolidated for the 19 graduate programs, but perhaps the Department of Mathematics may need to contribute monetarily to have representation at Math-specific events.

2. The second area pertains to **undergraduate academic advising**. Currently, the UAAC actively advises all undergraduate majors and minors in the College by using developmental and holistic advising techniques in regard to: recruitment and orientation of new students; course and degree planning; interpreting and navigating university policy and procedure; referrals to appropriate on-campus or off-campus resources; working with students in crises; evaluating transcript articulations; and finally, certifying CNAS degree requirements have been met. These advisors also perform limited operations of enrollment assistance when needed.

In expanding this Center, the advisors would now also be fully responsible for **enrollment assistance** in the College. This would involve undergraduate students being admitted to courses with enrollment restrictions, obtaining call numbers, enrollment eligibility, and permissions codes (P-code). Across the campus, enrollment assistance is performed by advisors in all colleges except CNAS; students who need enrollment assistance often visit the UAAC. Once students visit with their academic advisor in the UAAC they must then be referred to the appropriate Enrollment Manager. These are staff who reside within academic departments throughout CNAS as well as in the BSGSAC. If forms or more information is needed, they must then return to their academic advisor in Pierce Hall for that advice.

Currently, there are 7 Staff outside of the UAAC performing enrollment assistance at about 5,399 transactions per year. The BGSAC staff perform enrollment assistance, with about 3,350 transactions/year. It is believed that by embracing a more holistic approach to servicing a student, i.e. if advising and enrollment assistance were provided by the same staff in the same location, the student experience would be less confusing and more efficient.

With the goal of adding 2.0 FTE to the UAAC, there are two options:

**Option 1:** The current model of the UAAC would remain and although there will be reassignment of advising load among the existing Staff, the unit structure will essentially remain unchanged. Currently, UAAC services the 4,918 CNAS undergraduate majors with 12 Advisors. It is expected that a minimum of 2.0 additional FTE will be needed to accommodate the increased work of incorporating enrollment assistance for all students that need to enroll in any CNAS course. These new positions will match the majority of existing Staff, as Professional Academic Advisor I (4352) positions.

**Option 2:** The function of Department Course Scheduling is established within UAAC. *Please see the full
description of work load in #3 (below). By attaching this area of responsibility to the UAAC and housing it with the UAAC, it keeps all undergrad services in generally the same physical location. The existing staff in BSGSAC (one ___ Asst. III) would relocate, and 2.0 FTE would be created which includes a Supervisor to accommodate the increased work load. The sub-unit would report to the UAAC Business Operations Manager.

3. The third area pertains to department course scheduling, including CRAMS, CIRS, and catalog updates. Currently, these tasks are primarily being accomplished in the BSGSAC for the 9 programs in the Life Sciences, by an ___ Asst. III (although a small percentage is covered by current SAOIIIs), and by numerous staff in the 5 new departments. By creating a sub-unit that handles all of these responsibilities, CNAS would create a 3-person Team of subject experts who maintain the course schedules (reducing scheduling conflicts for students) and position CNAS to better negotiate room availability with the Registrar and Academic Scheduling.

With the goal of adding 2.0 FTE to address department course scheduling, there are two options:

**Option 1:** The current model established in BSGSAC for the biological sciences would essentially remain unchanged but with the addition of 2.0 FTE and reassignment of one of the current unit SAOII to become the Supervisor over this new sub-unit. Currently, the BSGSAC handles approximately 3,582 transactions a quarter, with about 2,100 of these handled by the current ___ Asst. III. With the addition of (4) departments (Chemistry is 65% adopted in this model due to their department staffing structure), the approximate number of new transactions will increase by 4,459, (67% increase of the current ___ Asst. III). A reassignment of work load will enable the 3 person sub-unit to meet the complexities of the added departments, and the new 2.0 FTE positions will match the existing assigned Staff, as ___ Assistant III (4722) positions.

**Option 2:** The sub-unit is established within the UAAC. *See details in #2 option 2 (above).*

**PERSONNEL**

The current personnel in the Departments of Earth Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics & Astronomy include ___ Assistant II and III and Student Affairs Officer I:

[Table with personnel details]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Student Affairs UG</th>
<th>Student Affairs Grad</th>
<th>Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Total Student Affairs</th>
<th>Chair Support</th>
<th>Misc. Clerical Support</th>
<th>Total Clerical Support</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER I</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER I - SUPERV</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ ASSISTANT II</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER I</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COMPENSATION**

The combined salaries of the above personnel (5 departments):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current FTE:</th>
<th>Current Salary:</th>
<th>Current workload FTE:</th>
<th>Current workload Salary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00 AAII</td>
<td>81,044.52</td>
<td>1.90 AAII</td>
<td>76,992.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 AAIII</td>
<td>164,316.93</td>
<td>3.20 AAIII</td>
<td>140,217.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 SAO I</td>
<td>131,291.28</td>
<td>2.95 SAO I</td>
<td>129,103.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.75 $</td>
<td>376,652.73</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>$ 346,312.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projected salaries of the proposed new positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Lowest Cost</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>Highest Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 $</td>
<td>40,159.00</td>
<td>$ 80,318.00</td>
<td>$ 50,695.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Lowest Cost</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>Highest Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 $</td>
<td>40,159.00</td>
<td>$ 80,318.00</td>
<td>$ 50,695.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
<th>Lowest Cost</th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>Highest Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.0 $</td>
<td>33,268.00</td>
<td>$ 66,536.00</td>
<td>$ 42,001.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPACE**

Existing space for GSAC and UAAC amounts to 2,281 sq. ft. and 4,851 sq. ft. respectively. There are currently 6 staff in GSAC and 17 staff in UAAC:

**Option 1:** house both units and all personnel in Pierce Hall, regardless of which unit the sub-unit department course scheduling is attached;

**Option 2:** house the GSAC and sub-unit in the current location of Bachelor Hall, and maintain the UAAC in their current location, Pierce Hall. Additional space of approximately 400 sq. ft. is needed for GSAC to accommodate the addition of the sub-unit.

**Option 3:** house the GSAC in the current location of Bachelor Hall, and house the UAAC and the sub-unit in the current location of Pierce Hall. Additional space of approximately 400 sq. ft. is needed for UAAC to accommodate the addition of the sub-unit.

**S&E SUPPORT FUNDS**

The BGSAC currently has an operating budget (19900, BC47) of ~$28K. Due to the recruitment responsibilities, which entail travel, lodging and tabling fees, it has been demonstrated in FY12, that an increase is warranted. With the addition of the 5 departments and in anticipation of the inclusion of Math recruitment efforts, the recruitment budget should be revisited with consideration to a possible increase in resources.

The UAAC currently has an operating budget (19900, BC47) of ~$54K. With the addition of new academic advising staff, the operating budget should be revisited with consideration to a possible increase in resources.
For both units, there could be an initial allocation to acquire desks, chairs, computers and monitors.

**IN CONCLUSION**

Existing FTE in the 5 Departments, totals 8.75 with 8.05 FTE specifically assigned to roles of Student Affairs-Graduate, Student Affairs-Undergraduate, and enrollment assistance; 0.70 FTE is assigned to Clerical/Other Departmental functions.

It is projected that should the College proceed with a reorganization of the GSAC, UAAC, and Department Course Scheduling, the targeted salary savings could be as high as $119,140:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Code Desc</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Title Code Desc</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT II</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>76,992</td>
<td>ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>86,538.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSISTANT III</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>140,217</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADVISOR I</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>80,318.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER I</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>129,103</td>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER II</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>80,318.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>346,312</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227,172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent Salary 119,140
Salary Savings after Reorganization 34%
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences successfully operates two Student Affairs Service Centers:

1. The Biological Sciences Graduate Student Affairs Center (BSGSAC) services 14 of the 19 CNAS graduate degree programs, and provides enrollment assistance and course scheduling to the 6 Biological and Life Sciences Departments;
2. The Undergraduate Academic Advising Center (UAAC) services all 17 undergraduate majors.

This report explores the natural expansion of the BSGSAC to include all 19 graduate degree programs, realigns all enrollment assistance of the 17 undergraduate majors to the UAAC, and creates a sub-unit to provide course scheduling assistance to all 13 departments in CNAS.

The BSGSAC is comprised of:
- 5 SAOs who work with 358 continuing graduate students and who process approximately 755 graduate recruitment applications;
- One __ Asst. III who provides enrollment assistance to undergraduates, about 2,139 transactions/year. This Staff also inputs the quarterly course schedule into SIS+ of about 2,190 transactions/year.

The UAAC is comprised of:
- 12 PAAs who advise 4,918 undergraduate majors annually, and provide enrollment assistance of about 2,500 transactions/year.

The 5 graduate degree programs currently administered outside of the BSGSAC include: Departments of Earth Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Mathematics, Chemistry and Physics & Astronomy. This group comprises:
- 9 people for 8.75 FTE and an annual salary of $376,652.73
- 3.55 FTE work with 372 continuing graduate students and process approximately 767 graduate recruitment applications;
- 2.20 FTE provide enrollment assistance to undergraduates, about 5,399 transactions/year (does not include the lower division Chemistry scheduling). These Staff also input the quarterly course schedule into SIS+ of about 3,791 transactions/year.

The Committee recognizes and supports the deployment of Hobson’s Connect (select departments in pilot for 12-13), enhancements to GradSIS, and the ESS applications. These major initiatives will streamline the inquiry and communication process with prospective applicants and enable more effective enrollment management. Should this proposal be adopted by the College for immediate implementation, a request will be submitted to have all CNAS graduate programs pilot Hobson’s Connect 2012-13, as well as have ESS up and running for 2013-14.

It is this Committee’s recommendation that the College adopt the expansion of the Student Affairs Service Centers as follows:

1. The BSGSAC would become the GSAC with the addition of 2.0 FTE (SAO II) to serve the graduate student population. A new reporting tier structure of two Assistant Directors-SAO II-Supv. would be created with one Assistant Director to oversee 5 SAO IIs and all graduate student affairs, and the other Assistant Director to oversee the new sub-unit for department course scheduling, CRAMS, CIRS and catalog copy updates. The current __ Asst. III will be joined by 2.0 FTE __ Asst. IIs.

2. The UAAC would see an increase of 2.0 FTE PAAI, to incorporate enrollment assistance for all students that need to enroll in any CNAS course. This model ensures the “high-touch” personal attention for all Undergraduate students in CNAS, and promotes a more holistic approach to advising and enrolling.

The restructured Service Centers would add 6 people for 6.0 FTE for approximately $227,172 in perm salary.

The resulting savings of adopting the Committee’s recommendation could be $119,140.

The Committee recommends a Nov. 1, 2012 implementation for the GSAC and Jan. 1, 2013 for the UAAC.