

MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

Page No.

1. Transcript from the June 9, 2005 meeting	3
2. Announcements by the President - none	
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - none	
4. Announcements by the Chancellor - none	
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – none	
6. Special Orders	
a. Remarks by the Graduate Student Association President-Jonathan Karpel	
b. Remarks by the Associated Students of UC Davis President-Caliph Assagai	
c. Remarks by the Divisional Chair-Daniel L. Simmons	
i. Executive Council priorities for 2005-06	
ii. MySenate Demonstration	
d. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility	5
e. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel	
i. Appellate Committee	11
ii. Oversight Committee	13
f. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review	32
g. Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment	35
h. Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity	38
i. Annual Report of the Committee on Committees	41
j. Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction	48
k. Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards	52
l. Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction	61
m. Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee	67
n. Annual Report of the Executive Council	68
o. Annual Report of the Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers	72
p. Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare	73
q. Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee	75
r. Annual Report of the Graduate Council	76
s. Annual Report of the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges	93
t. Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee	98
u. Annual Report of the Library Committee	107
v. Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (will be distributed at meeting)	
w. Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service	108
x. Annual Report of the Committee on Research	110
y. Annual Report of the Committee on Student-Faculty Relationships	117

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, November 1, 2005

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

Page No.

z. Annual Report of the Committee on Transportation and Parking (will be distributed at meeting)	
aa. Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council	118
i. Annual Report of the Committee on General Education	121
ii. Annual Report of the Committee on Preparatory Education	125
iii. Annual Report of the Committee on Special Academic Programs	128
iv. Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review	130
bb. Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes (will be distributed at meeting)	
7. Reports of standing committees	
a. CERJ: Proposal to create DDBL 153 to create the faculty of the newly created College of Biological Sciences-CBS	133
8. Petitions of Students	
9. Unfinished Business	
10. University and Faculty Welfare	
11. New Business	
a. Graduate Student Funding Task Force: <i>Graduate Fees and Tuition: Academic Senate Resolution</i>	136

Susan Kauzlarich, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

TRANSCRIPT
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, June 9, 2005

2:10 – 4:00 p.m.

Memorial Union, MU II

1. Transcripts of the April 25 and May 4, 2005 meetings (*will be distributed at meeting*)
Action: Approved
2. Announcements by the President - None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents - None
4. Announcements by Chancellor Vanderhoef **-unavailable**
5. Announcements by Deans, Directors, or other Executive Officers - None
6. Special orders
 - A. Remarks by the Chair of the Academic Federation-Catherine Vandervoort
 - B. Remarks by the Chair of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate
7. Reports of standing committees
 - A. Report from Committee on Committees regarding the membership roster in 2005-06
Action: Approved unanimously
 - B. Report from Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards: Announcement of 2005 Distinguished Teaching and Graduate Mentor Award Recipients
 - C. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 44
Action: Approved unanimously
 - D. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaws 11-13
Action: Approved unanimously
 - E. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 17
Action: Approved unanimously
 - F. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 28
Action: Approved unanimously
 - G. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 29
Action: Returned to the Special Committee of the Executive Council on Shared Governance
 - H. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 33
Action: Approved unanimously
 - I. Proposed Amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 48
Action: Approved with 1 no vote
8. Petitions of students – None
9. Unfinished Business - None
10. University and faculty welfare - None
11. New business - None

Victoria Smith, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

RECEIVED
ACADEMIC SENATE/UC DAVIS
2005 SEP 13 AM 10 13

Total Meetings	Meeting Frequency	Average hours of committee Work each week
3 in person sessions	3 per year	4-5
Total Reviewed 3 (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed -0- deferred from the previous year	Total -0- deferred to the coming academic year

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Committee reviewed bylaw change Academic Senate 3.7.1 Membership of Executive Council. Recommended chair of CAFR be a permanent member of Executive Council.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

NONE

Issues considered by the committee:

1. Proposal from College of Ag & Env Sci to consolidate departments of Agronomy, Range Science, Enviro Horti, Polmology and Veg Crops (see report attached).
2. Review of UCD Policy and Procedure Section 210-35 Integrity in Research (see attached report).

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

NONE

Committee's narrative:

See attached reports

Review of UCD Policy 210-35 still in progress. New draft being compiled as review proceeds.



SCHOOL OF MEDICINE
DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAL MICROBIOLOGY AND IMMUNOLOGY

ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8645
TELEPHONE (530) 752-9402 FAX (530) 752-8692

January 28, 2005

To: Daniel L. Simmons
Chair of Davis Academic Senate
303 Voorhies Hall
UC Davis

From: J.H. Theis
Chair of Academic Freedom and Responsibility
UC Davis

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "JH Theis", is written over the "From:" line of the letter.

Re: Section 3.7.1 Executive council membership; page 29, Item 1, in the "Mending the Wall" document.

The committee recommends that the divisional by laws be amended to "establish the membership of the Executive Council" to include: "The chair, vice-chair, and secretary of the Division, the representatives, and first alternate representative of the system-wide assembly, the chairs of the faculties, of the schools and colleges, and the chairs of the following committees: Academic Personnel, Academic Planning, Budget Review; Admissions, Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council and Research." Left off this list is the chair of the committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. This is a standing committee of the Academic Senate in every respect that the others are and whose chairs were included. Furthermore, directly or indirectly, virtually everything that impacts teaching or research on this campus has the potential to impact APM 010. The very essence of an institution of higher learning depends upon the freedom of its faculty to teach and investigate topics that may be highly controversial in the society at large. Other committees are not oriented to consider the ramifications of the actions they take as regards APM 010. As an example, I sent a copy of CAFR response to the P & P, section 210-35; Policy on Integrity in Research, to the Committee on Research, Committee on Faculty Welfare, and the Committee on Privilege and Tenure in June of 2004. To date, I have had no comments from any of their committees on the intrusion on shared governance that policy commits, nor on how the policy may affect the duties and responsibilities of any of those committees.

There is an absolute need for a person, sensitive to the issue of Academic Freedom, to be a member of the Executive Council and the Chair of CAFR should be included on the list of committee chairs to serve on the Executive Council.

I am hereby requesting that the membership list for Executive Council be amended to include the Chair of the Committee of Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

The second concern the committee has with the reorganization involves the duties assigned to the vice chair regarding teaching and curriculum development. It is unclear if the term "recommend" involves faculty input or it really means the vice chair "unilaterally decides". In keeping with the provisions of APM 010 the committee suggests items 1-8 under vice chair-teaching and curriculum development on pg. 21 of Appendix B be amended to include the specific requirement that "consultation with the faculty must occur before such recommendations are made". The committee finds that item #4 is particularly problematic in that it omits any mention of faculty input and does not even entail the use of a curriculum committee. APM 010, Academic Freedom, clearly establishes the faculty as the deciding force in course content, curriculum structure and presentation. Item 4 is a violation of APM 010, both as regards authority and principle.

Recommendations by the chair CAFR based upon the comments of committee members.

- 1). Academic senate recommendation for or against consolidation of the 4 departments be withheld until the Executive Council has discussed the concerns expressed in items 1 and 2 above.
- 2). Duties of the vice chair regarding teaching and curriculum development be amended so as to require faculty consultation before recommendations are made.
- 3). Duties in item 4 be specifically placed in the hands of a faculty appointed curriculum committee and removed as one of the duties of the vice chair of the proposed new department.

Review of the UC Davis Policy and Procedure
Section 210-25 Integrity in Research and Responding to Allegations of Research
Misconduct

This policy was the result of demands made by the Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Research Integrity, which claimed that the former UC Davis Policy did not comply with federal regulations.

Vice Chancellor for Research, Barry M. Klein has submitted the revised policy without review by the Academic Senate UC Davis or any consultation with the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. He excuses himself from doing this in his November 21, 2003 letter to the Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors claiming that the Department of Health and Human Services had given UC Davis 30 days to submit a revised or New policy based on the Office of Research Integrity Model Policy or be declared ineligible for PHS funding.

The new Policy 210-25 has been in effect since November 12, 2003. The document consists of

- I). A 17 page section of definitions, Policy Scope, Federal Sponsor oversight and Institutional Review and Decision guidelines.
- II). An 11 page document titled: Attachment 1 conducting the Inquiry.
- III). A 13 page document titled: Attachment 2 Conducting the Investigation.
- IV). A 3 page document titled: Attachment 3 Reporting of Violations to Federal Agencies.

These four documents have been reviewed by 3 members of the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee, UC Davis. Contained herein is a summary of our findings and concerns about this new UCD Policy and Procedure Section 210-25.

There are several over riding general criticisms of the policy that will be noted first.

A). The Policy as submitted is a complete abrogation of the standing orders of the Regents covering shared governance in matters of faculty discipline and misconduct, standing order: 100.4© and 103.2, The faculty code of conduct particularly Part I Professional Rights of Faculty point 4e and 5. It is also in violation of the newly defined APM 010 on Academic Freedom.

B). The Policy as submitted provides excessive and over-riding discretion to the Research Integrity Officer who alone and without consultation with the appropriate committee(s) of the Academic Senate decides when allegations of misconduct warrant inquiries (Policy document Item II-P.)

C). The Policy as submitted provides no procedures for handling allegations of research misconduct that involve “inappropriate treatment of living subjects” non-compliance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) policies or directives” and “fiscal malfeasance regarding research.” The procedures for handling allegations of this type are at the discretion of the Research Integrity Officer. (III Policy A Scope).

D). The policy does not clearly define terms in the standard of proof regarding what evidence is necessary to show: “a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research” one of the two requirements for a finding, by the Research Integrity Officer of Research Misconduct. (III Policy C-3).

E). The policy does not provide for due process before notification of the federal sponsor of “reasonable indications of “criminal violations” which must be done within 24 hours of a “finding”, (which term is not defined).

F). The policy as submitted allows for the Research Integrity Officer to appoint the Inquiry and Investigation Committees and determine the appropriate expertise of such committee members without consultation with the appropriate committees of the Academic Senate (III Policy E-2-b).

G). The Policy as submitted requires that the Research Integrity Officer maintain confidentiality during the inquiry and investigation and the policy requires the accused to maintain confidentiality. The person reporting the misconduct called in the document the “reporter” may request anonymity and during the “Allegation assessment and Inquiry Phase UC Davis will make effort to honor the request.” Only if the Reporter’s testimony is required does the reporter run the risk of losing their anonymity (IV Procedures B-1-C).

H). The Chancellor, without consultation with the Academic Senate, may impose an interim suspension with or without pay on the person accused of misconduct in Research (IV Procedures, A) This is in violation of standing order of the Regents 100.4-C.

I). The accused employee will have to provide their own counsel, if they want one, at their own expense from the time the inquiry is opened (III Policy E-4a).

J). The policy as submitted acknowledges that the accused faculty member’s reputation may be damaged even if UC Davis decides no research misconduct took place and the federal sponsor concurs with that decision by the Deciding Officer (Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Davis, currently Barry M. Klein). However, the Policy only requires the Research Integrity Officer to “undertake “reasonable efforts” to restore the accused reputation, as required by federal regulations, sponsoring agencies and based on the University’s discretion in the absence of mandatory restoration.” (Section XI-B).

3. This Policy is a direct assault on the Principles of shared governance in the University of California.
4. The approval of the provision of this policy by the Vice Chancellor of Research constitutes an abrogation of his responsibility, as an officer of the University, to protect the autonomy of the University Faculty from federal interference in the policies and procedures of the University of California. He should be called before the Academic Senate and asked to explain his actions.
5. The leadership of the Academic Senate should advise all faculty immediately that applying for NIH, NSF, DOE, DHS, and FDA funded research grants or contracts has the potential of ending their academic careers if they are accused of misconduct in research regardless of whether they are found guilty of such charges.

This report is being sent by the Chair, CAFR to the Chairs:Committee on Privilege and Tenure, Faculty Welfare and Committee on Research.

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
APPELLATE SUBCOMMITTEE
July 1, 2004 – August 31, 2005**

The 2004-2005 Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC) received 34 cases during this past academic year (Table 1) in response to requests from the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel (Table 2) and individual Dean's offices (Table 3). CAPAC met 10 times, averaging 2 hours per meeting, to discuss these appeals. Eight appeals were received late in the summer and were deferred to the incoming CAPAC (2005-2006) for review.

CAPAC recommended granting 1 of 26 appeals reviewed; in one case, CAPAC recommended an action which granted the appellant some advancement other than what was originally proposed. Table 4 shows the trend for the final decisions on these appeals, in relation to CAPAC's recommendations.

Table 1: Origin of Appeals

College/School	# Appeals
College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences	9
College of Engineering	6
College of Letters and Science	7
School of Education	1
School of Law	2
School of Medicine	7
School of Veterinary Medicine	2
Grand Total	34*

*8 cases pending review by 2005-2006 CAPAC

Table 2: CAPAC Recommendations to the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel

(excluding the 3 pending cases)		GRANT APPEAL		DENY APPEAL
Action	# Cases	Grounds of Procedure	Grounds of Merit	Grounds of Merit
Appointment via Change in Title	1	0	0	1
Merit	4	0	0	4
Accelerated P-VI or AS	3	0	1	2
Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)	1	0	0	1
Promotion	8	0	0	8
Regular P-VI or Above Scale	2	0	0	2
TOTALS	19	0	1	18

Table 3: CAPAC Recommendations to the Individual Deans

(excluding the 5 pending cases)		GRANT APPEAL		DENY APPEAL
Action	# Cases	Grounds of Procedure	Grounds of Merit	Grounds of Merit
Appt via Change in Title	0	0	0	0
Merit	4	0	0	4
Accelerated P-VI or AS	0	0	0	0
Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)	3	0	0	3
Promotion	0	0	0	0
Regular P-VI or Above Scale	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	7	0	0	7

Table 4: CAPAC Recommendation vs Final Decision

(excluding the 8 pending cases)		CAPAC Recommendation		FINAL DECISION	
Actions	# Cases	GRANT	DENY	GRANT	DENY
Appt via Change in Title	1	0	1	0	1
Merit	8	0	8	3	5
Accelerated P-VI or AS	3	1	2	0	3
Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)	4	0	4	1	3
Promotion	8	0	8	2	6
Regular P-VI or Above Scale	2	0	2	0	2
TOTAL	26	1	25	6	20

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Schneider, Chair

Members: Linda Bisson, Bruce Gates, Eugene Steffey, Lenora Timm

ANNUAL REPORT
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL - OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
2004-05

The Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel on promotions, appointments, terminations, multiyear accelerations within rank that involve skipping a step, high-level merit actions, third year deferrals, five-year reviews, and appraisals. CAP also recommends membership of ad hoc committees, which are appointed by the Vice Provost. Further, CAP advises both the Academic Senate and the Vice Provost on academic personnel matters as they arise. CAP appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise the Deans on redelegated personnel actions. See Appendix I for a list of CAP's principal tasks.

Faculty Advancement Criteria

CAP evaluates candidate files according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM). CAP's mandate is to assure fair and equitable treatment of all faculty while ensuring that high standards of scholarship are maintained across the campus. Its goal is to apply fair, objective, and uniform standards of evaluation across the disciplines, recognizing the variability of measures of accomplishment and success from one discipline to another. Teaching, research or creative activity, service, and professional competence are evaluated.

CAP bases its judgments on documents provided in the formal personnel evaluation process, including documents contained in each candidate's dossier, evaluations by departmental faculty and the Chair, commentaries

from the Dean, and when appropriate, assessments from external evaluators. CAP may also get input from a three-person ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel following CAP's recommendations.

The evaluation criteria are set out in the APM (APM-210, <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpers/apm/sec2-pdf.html>). CAP's judgments are guided by the wording of the APM, according to which the "indispensable qualification" for advancement at all levels is "superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement." CAP typically recommends advancement of a faculty member after the normal period at rank and step on the basis of a record of balanced accomplishment in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service. Alternatively, CAP might make a favorable recommendation when it judges the performance to be well above expectations in one category although it was below expectations in another, as appropriate to rank and step. Time spent on an activity is not considered to be a substitute for accomplishment. CAP does not use time in service (except for deferrals) or health or personal issues in judging merit advancements.

CAP's evaluation of research reported in peer-reviewed publications (and in other venues) and of creative work presented in many forms and venues is based principally on the originality, creativity, and impact of the work as judged by peers. CAP's primary criteria for the evaluation of teaching are effectiveness and impact, as well as the candidate's command of his or her subject, scholarly growth, and presentation of material in ways that help students to think critically, independently, and creatively. Advising and mentoring activities, and student evaluations are given substantial weight in judging teaching performance. CAP is also influenced by the amount, variety,

and difficulty of teaching. In evaluating service, CAP assesses the impact and outcome of the activities.

The files that were forwarded to CAP were mostly well prepared, but some files provided little balanced analysis or evaluative or critical insight (e.g., failing to state the goals and/or significance of the candidate's activity); sometimes the information was incomplete. Evaluations of the impact of service activity were frequently missing. Descriptions of administrative functions seldom came to CAP with sufficient documentation of effectiveness or impact to be useful.

Pace of Activity

During the 2004-05 academic year (September through August), CAP met 39 times and considered 427 personnel actions. CAP also provided advice on numerous other issues related to academic personnel. The normal turnaround time for agenda items remained two weeks.

Ad Hoc Committees

Review by a campus ad hoc committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotion to the Associate Professor and full Professor level, and merits to Professor, Step VI, and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. A total of 190 cases fell into this category in 2004-05. CAP's membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus; nevertheless, CAP looks to campus ad hoc committees for highly specialized expertise. CAP proposed ad hoc committees in 40 cases, and thanks the faculty members who served on at least one ad hoc committee for giving so

generously of their time and for the high quality and the objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

Observers

To acquaint new faculty with the personnel process, it has been policy to appoint Assistant Professors (Steps III and IV) as observers to ad hoc committees on promotions to Associate Professor or Professor. During the 2004-05 academic year, 35 assistant professors were appointed by the Vice Provost to serve as non-voting observers on ad hoc committees.

Academic Personnel Actions, 2004-2005

Table 1 provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year. CAP considered 85 appointments, 103 promotions, 127 merit actions, 54 appraisals, and 58 other actions. Forty of these actions were referred to ad hoc committees (Table 2).

Appointments: CAP continued to streamline the personnel process without compromising the tenets of shared governance. Using a fast-track process, CAP reviewed 49 new appointments and made recommendations to the Vice Provost. This process helps the campus compete more effectively with comparable institutions in an increasingly competitive environment. In four cases, CAP recommended appointment at a step higher than that originally proposed in order to address any potential equity problems in advance. CAP believes this process is working well.

Promotions: With respect to promotions to Associate Professor, CAP recommended promotion in 44 of 56 cases (Table 3). In four of these cases,

CAP recommended a further acceleration of the candidate than was requested. In 47 cases, the faculty members were promoted by the administration. Two cases are pending (both supported by CAP).

CAP supported 34 of 47 promotion actions to full Professor (Table 4). In four of these cases CAP recommended a further acceleration than was requested at earlier levels of review. The administration promoted 39 faculty members to full Professor.

High Level Merit Increases: CAP considered 37 actions for advancement to Professor, Step VI and supported 31 of these cases for advancement (Table 5). The administration gave a merit increase to Step VI (or above) in 34 of these cases. There were a total of 14 requests for advancement to Above Scale (Table 6). CAP supported advancement in 12 cases. The administration granted advancement in these 12 cases. CAP recommended five of eleven proposed merit actions within Professor, Above Scale (Table 7). The administration granted eight merit increases.

Other Merit Actions: CAP also considered merit actions within rank at the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor ranks. For the rank of Professor or Lecturer SOE, CAP considered a total of 35 actions (Table 8). CAP supported 29, including advancement in addition to that requested by the faculty member in 4 cases. The administration granted merit increases in 33 cases, with one case pending (which CAP opposed). At the Assistant and Associate levels, CAP reviewed a total of 18 proposed merit actions (Table 9). CAP supported all 18 actions, and the administration concurred.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: In previous years, it has been policy that a faculty member who had spent 6 years at the Associate

rank would be considered for promotion and would not be eligible for a merit increase to Associate Professor, Step IV except under special circumstances. This policy was revised. Departments may now ask the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, for permission to submit a merit to Step IV in lieu of a promotion with strong justification. The request must clearly explain why recommending a merit to Step IV is appropriate even though the faculty member has already spent 6 or more years at the Associate rank. One justification for a merit to Step IV is that the faculty member is close to meeting the requirements for promotion – i.e., that submission of a promotion action will occur no later than 3 years hence. An example of when consideration for merit may be appropriate is when a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it would be considered “in press”.

Career Equity Reviews: To address potential inequities at both the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement, a new program called *Career Equity Review* was initiated and implemented during the 2003-04 academic year. Career equity reviews consider the entire career record of the individual to determine if current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. If the candidate’s performance is substantially the same as that of the majority of compared faculty members holding the same rank and step, the review will indicate that the candidate is being treated equitably. If, however, the candidate’s performance is essentially equal or superior to the performance of the majority of compared faculty holding a higher rank or step, a recommendation for an appropriate accelerated advancement or equity adjustment will be made. Requests for career equity review can be initiated by individual faculty members, department chairs, deans, the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel, Faculty Personnel Committees or by CAP. CAP

conducted 12 career equity reviews that were initiated by faculty (Table 10). Out of these, CAP recommended an equity adjustment in five cases. CAP also routinely performs a career equity review for every major advancement.

Five-Year Reviews: CAP made 10 five-year reviews, recommending one “advancement,” seven “performance satisfactory, no advancement,” and two “performance unsatisfactory, no advancement.”

Initial Continuing Appointments: CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 17 initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2004-05. CAP made favorable recommendations for an initial continuing appointment in 16 of these cases. The administration gave 16 initial continuing appointments, with one case pending (which CAP supported). Teaching excellence is a requirement for a continuing appointment.

Faculty Personnel Committees: Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise the deans with personnel actions redelegated to the deans. In 2004-05, these actions included: Appointment of Assistant Professor, Step I, II, and III; most normal and accelerated merit actions that do not skip a step up to and including Professor, Step IX, with the exception of merit increases to Professor, Step VI; most normal merit actions for Lecturers and Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment; and Unit 18 actions (including appointments and reappointments of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers without Security of Employment). The FPCs reviewed 322 cases (Table 11). In addition, the Committees conducted 54 appraisals of junior faculty which were then forwarded to CAP for further evaluation.

CAP continues to believe that the interests of both the University and of individual Academic Senate colleagues require that confidentiality govern the

personnel process. At the same time, CAP believes that the process itself should be transparent to individual candidates for advancement and promotion. Such transparency is an integral part of peer review and helps ensure that these candidates understand the basis for decisions about their personnel actions. Accordingly, CAP reaffirms the importance of the principle (embodied in current policy) that each candidate for advancement or promotion automatically receive his or her own copy of the comments on his/her personnel action, whatever the outcome of the action. These comments include those made by CAP and the FPCs, along with the comments of Chairs/Directors, Deans, and ad hoc committees.

FPCs are appointed by CAP upon the recommendation of the Executive Committees of the colleges, schools, and divisions (Appendix II). CAP appreciates the dedicated efforts and hard work of the members of these Committees.

University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP): Anna Maria Busse Berger served as a member of the University Committee on Academic Personnel, which held several meetings throughout the academic year. The Office of the President, UCAP members, or other UC Academic Senate committees and officers bring issues to the attention of UCAP. A primary function of this systemwide committee is to facilitate the exchange of information among campuses. Accordingly, CAP was regularly informed of UCAP discussions and through its representative provided input into such discussions, when appropriate. UCAP addressed a broad range of issues, among which were discussions of the report of the Professorial Step System Task Force, discussion of electronic publication and scholarly communication, and amendments to the APM.

Other Policy Matters: During 2004-05, CAP commented on several campus or Universitywide policy matters. CAP made appointments to all of the School and College Faculty Personnel Committees based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees.

CAP reviewed *criteria of scholarship* for the Chicana/o Studies Program. CAP reviewed voting procedures for the following departments: American Studies, Anthropology, Applied Science, Civil & Environmental Engineering, Electrical & Computer Engineering, Environmental Design, Physiology & Membrane Biology, Physics, Political Science, and Statistics.

CAP reviewed various other items, including the following:

- Safety and health policy
- Air Quality Resource Center
- Proposed revisions to the APM regarding sick leave, medical separation and leaves of absence
- Proposal to discontinue the undergraduate program in Civil Engineering/ Materials Science and Engineering
- Proposed revisions to APM 210-1-3-d, 240, 245, Bylaw 34, Bylaw 336
- Proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 600B
- Internationalizing the curriculum
- Proposed Science & Technology major
- Endowed Chair policy
- Proposed transfer of Design Program to HArCS
- Several requests to assess particular voting procedures in departments

Acknowledgments

We thank our staff assistant, Solomon Bekele, for his efficient and professional service, and Diana Howard for her efforts on behalf of ad hoc committees. We also thank the members of the Faculty Personnel Committees for their hard work, and the faculty who served on ad hoc committees this academic year. Their efforts are vital to the success of the review process.

Respectfully submitted,

Anna Maria Busse Berger
Edward Callahan
C. Chris Calvert
Irwin Liu
Chip Martel

Thomas Morrison
Catherine Morrison Paul
Philip Yager
Michael Maher, Chair

**Table 1. Personnel Actions Referred to CAP
2004-05**

Appointments	Total	Accelerations	Ad Hoc
Assistant Professor*	7	0	0
Associate Professor*	21	0	0
Professor*	17	0	0
Target of Opportunity, Excellence (TOE)	2	0	0
Partner Opportunity (POP)	2	0	0
Via Change in Title	11	4	0
Endowed Chair	2	0	0
Joint	5	0	0
Initial Continuing Non-Senate	17	0	0
Dept. Chair (reappointment only)	1	0	0
Total Appointments	85	4	0
Promotions			
Associate Professor*	56	12	13
Professor*	47	18	6
Total Promotions	103	30	19
Merit Increases⁺			
Sr. Lecturer, SOE	3	0	0
Assistant Professor*	3	3	0
Associate Professor*	15	2	0
Professor*	94	35	20
Total Merit Increases	115	40	20
Miscellaneous Actions			
Retroactive Merits	12	12	0
Career Equity Reviews**	12	10	0
Appraisals	54	0	0
Termination	1	0	1
Third-Year Deferrals	8	0	0
Five-Year Reviews	10	0	0
TOE Screenings	5	0	0
POP Screenings	9	0	0
Other Actions	13	3	0
Total Miscellaneous Actions	124	25	1
Total Personnel Actions	427	99	40

* Includes Acting, Clinical, In Residence, and Adjunct titles. ** CAP initiates equity reviews for all major advancements. These career equity reviews were initiated by faculty. + Excluding retroactive merits

Table 2. Actions Sent to Ad Hoc Committees

Actions	Number
Termination	1
Promotion to Associate Professor	13
Promotion to Professor	6
Merit Increase to Professor VI	6
Merit Increase to Above Scale	14
Total	40

Table 3. Promotions to Associate Professor

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	42	40	2	42	0	7	1	37*	5
Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed	4	4	0	4	0	1	0	4**	0
Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved	5	5	0	3	2	0	1	1	4
Promotion denied	2	0	2	0	1+	0	2	0	2
Pending	2	2	0	2	0	1	0	2	0
Total	56	52	4	52	3	9	4	44	12

(*) one case is a career equity adjustment

(**) two are career equity adjustments

(+) one case had no Dean's letter

Table 4. Promotions to Professor

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	34	34	0	33	1	3	0	30	4
Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed	4	4	0	4	0	0	0	4+	0
Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Promotion denied	8	8	0	5	3	1	2	0	8
Total	47	47	0	43	4	4	2	34	13

(+) 1 case is a career equity adjustment

Table 5. Merit Increase to Professor, Step VI

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	31	30	1	31	0	2	2+	28*	3
Merit approved at a higher step than proposed	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	3*	0
Acceleration to Step VI denied, but normal merit approved	2	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2
Merit denied	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Total	37	36	1	35	2	3	3	31	6

(+) One ad hoc was split (3 ways)

(*) One case was career equity adjustment

Table 6. Merit Increase from Prof. IX to Prof., Above Scale

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		Ad Hoc		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	11	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
Merit approved at a higher step than proposed	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
Merit denied	2	0	2+	2	0	0	2	0	2
Total	14	12	2	14	0	12	2	12	2

(+) Includes one split vote taken here as a negative

Table 7. Merit Increases within Professor, Above Scale

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	8	8	0	8	0	5	3
Merit denied	3	3	0	2	1	0	3
Total	11	11	0	10	1	5	6

Table 8. Merit Actions Concerning:

- **Skipping a step (4)**
- **FPC Members (11)**
- **Department Chairs (7)**
- **Associate Deans, Vice Provosts, etc. (9)**
- **Upper level Lecturers, SOE (3)**
- **Request by Vice Provost (1)**

By target level: P2 (1), P3 (6)^a, P4 (9)^b, P5 (7)^a, P7 (5), P8 (2), P9 (2), LSOE III (1), LSOE V (2)

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	25	25	0	20	0 ⁺	25 ⁱ	0
Merit approved but at a lower step than proposed	4	3	1	3	1	0	4
Merit approved but at a higher step than proposed	4	4	0	3	0 [*]	4	0
Merit denied	1	1	0	1	0	0	1
Pending	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
Total	35	34	1	27	2	29	6

(+) five actions lacked Dean's letter

(*) one action lacked Dean's letter

(i) one case treated as career equity adjustment by CAP

(a) includes one acceleration

(b) includes three accelerations

Table 9. Merit Increases Within Assistant and Associate Professor Ranks, including 4 Accelerated Actions

Outcome		Dept.		Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	18	18	0	17	1	18	0
Total	18	18	0	17	1	18	0

Table 10. Career Equity Reviews

Outcome		Dept.			Dean		CAP	
		Yes	No	Split	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed action approved	7	6	0	1	5	2	5	2
Proposed action denied	5	2	1	2	4	1	0	5
Total	12	8	1	3	9	3	5	7

Table 11. Redelegated Merit Actions

	FPC Recommendation			Dean's Decision	
	Yes	No	Split	Yes	No
College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences	61	5	2	63	5
Division of Biological Sciences	12	5		13	4
School of Education	1	1		1	1
College of Engineering	38	7		41	3 ⁺
Graduate School of Management	1	0		1	0
Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies	35	1		36	0
Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences	16	0	1	17	0
Division of Social Sciences	32	2		32	2
School of Law	5	1		5	1
School of Medicine	49	6		48	7
School of Veterinary Medicine	36	4	1	37	4
Totals	286	32	5	294	27

(+) one case pending

APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL TASKS OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL – OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

1. Nominating faculty to serve on ad hoc committees which make recommendations for promotions, appointments, and upper level merit increases.
2. Reviewing the reports of ad hoc committees and independently evaluating the dossiers of the candidate under consideration.
3. Reviewing proposed accelerated merit increases, terminations, reconsiderations, third-year deferrals, five-year reviews, Chancellor Fellow and Endowed Chair appointments, and reappointments of department chairs.
4. Reviewing merit actions for department chairs, program chairs, associate deans, members of Faculty Personnel Committees (and their near relatives) and other individuals for whom such action has not been redelegated to deans.
5. Appointing faculty to serve on Faculty Personnel Committees.
6. Reviewing policy matters referred by the administration and by the chair or committee of the Academic Senate, as well as initiating new policies and changes in existing policies when appropriate.
7. Conducting an annual post-audit of the recommendations from the Faculty Personnel Committees.
8. Reviewing summaries of confidential files of individual faculty prepared at individual's request by the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel.
9. Approving departmental voting procedures.
10. Reviewing requests for Target of Excellence and Partner Opportunity Program positions.
11. Reviewing cases to ensure equity in the application of criteria for appointments, merits, and promotion actions.
12. Conducting career equity reviews and reviewing continuing appointments for Unit 18 Lecturers.

APPENDIX II

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEES 2004 - 2005

College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

Jan Dvorak (Agronomy & Range Science) - Chair
Adel Kader (Pomology)
Joy Mench (Animal Science)
Michael Barbour (Environmental Horticulture)
Richard Howitt (Agricultural & Resource Econ)
Kyaw Tha Paw U (LAWR)

College of Engineering

Bahram Ravani (Mechanical & Aero Engrg) - Chair
Jay Lund (Civil & Environ. Engrg)
Biswanath Mukherjee (Computer Science)
John Miles (Biological & Ag Engrg)
Ahmet Palazoglu (Chemical Engrg & Materials Science)

College of Letters and Science

Keith Widaman (Psychology) - Chair
Jacquelyn Gervay-Hague (Chemistry)
David Nutter (Music)
James Griesemer (Philosophy)
Evan Watkins (English)
George Roussas (Statistics)

Division of Biological Sciences

John Harada (Plant Biology) - Chair
Michael Sanderson (Evolution & Ecology)
Diana Myles (Molecular & Cellular Biology)
Carlito Lebrilla (Chemistry)
Andrew Ishida (NP&B)

Graduate School of Management

Peter Lindert (Economics) - Chair
Brad Barber (GSM)
Eitan Gerstner (GSM)

School of Law

Suad Joseph (Anthropology) - Chair
Edward Imwinkelried (Law School)
Joel Dobris (Law School)
Bruce Wolk (Law School)
Clarence Walker (History)

School of Medicine

John McGahan (Radiology) – Chair
Joseph Antognini (Anesthesiology)
Richard Maddock (Psychology)
Michael Holland (Biological Chemistry)
Ellen Gold (Epidemiology & Prev. Medicine)
Peter Franks (Family & Community Medicine)
Martha O'Donnell (Human Physiology)
Carroll Cross (Internal Medicine)
Anthony Stone (Urology)

School of Veterinary Medicine

Susan Stover (Anatomy, Physiol. & Cell Biology) – Chair
Mary Christopher (Pathology, Microbiology & Immun.)
Alan Buckpitt (Molecular Biosciences)
Peter Ihrke (Medicine & Epidemiology)

School of Education

Evelyn Silvia (Mathematics) – Chair
Jon Wagner (Education)
Barbara Merino (Education)

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

**Committee on Academic Planning &
 Budget Review**

Total Meetings: 20	Meeting frequency: Bi-weekly Fall and Winter quarters; Weekly Spring quarter	Average hours of committee work each week: On average, two hours per week for members and 4-5 hours per week for the Chair.
--------------------	--	---

Total TOE, POP, and Endowed Chair Proposals Reviewed: TOEs: 5 POPs: 9 Endowed Chairs: 10	Total of reviewed ----- deferred from the previous year: None.	Total ----- deferred to the coming academic year: None.
---	--	---

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Procedural change to TOE and POP proposals will be received electronically as opposed to through intercampus mail. These proposals are reviewed by two members of the committee who's recommendations are circulated among the committee and are accepted on the "Consent Calendar" unless there is an objection. Annual visits with the Vice Chancellor of University Relations should be ongoing at least twice per year to provide updates on the status of our goals and expenses relating to the Advancement Finance Plan.

Issues considered by the committee: Besides the 5 Target of Opportunity for Excellence (TOE) proposals, 9 Partner Opportunity Proposals (POP), and the 10 Endowed Chairs, we discussed at length proposals by Dan Simmons and the *Mending the Wall* report regarding the revisions to CAPBR's charge which included in depth discussions with ORMP and the Provost on CAPBR and the Academic Senate's role in the fte allocation planning process as well as revisions to the fte allocation formula itself. We also reviewed and discussed Graduate Council proposals for a new M.S. degree program in Neuroscience, a new

Graduate Group and M.A.S. program in Clinical Research, a new Graduate Group and Ph.D. program in Animal Biology, and a new Ph.D. joint program with CSU Fresno in Criminal Justice Sciences; the CA&ES Consolidation proposal for the Departments of Agronomy & Range Sciences, Environmental Horticulture, Pomology, and Vegetable Crops into the Department of Plant Sciences; GSM's East Bay MBA proposal; name change for the Department of Ophthalmology to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences; the Advancement Finance Plan (Guests Vice Chancellor Celeste Rose, Vice Chancellor John Meyer, and AVC Kelly Ratliff); Guidelines and procedures governing the establishment of a new campus/division; Three strategic investments in Graduate Education update from VC Barry Klein; Design Program transfer from CA&ES to L&S HARCS; ORU Air Quality Research Center (AQRC); SOM proposal for a New Division of Environmental & Occupational Health; Strategic directions for the Libraries and scholarly information; SOM Academic Plan discussion regarding required submission of Academic Plans with TOE and POP proposals; ORU revised procedures for process and review; Endowed Chair policy review; Science & Technology Studies major proposal; *Mending the Wall* proposed bylaw revisions; Excess units fee policy draft; Academic Council restrictions on research funding sources; clarification of big and little "c" centers (VC Barry Klein, Guest); Graduate student funding and the NRTR (Non-resident tuition remission) policy (Dean Jeff Gibeling, Guest); the Discontinuance of Civil Engineering/Materials Science & Engineering combined major; the IT Security Policy; Family friendly policies; proposed Health & Safety policy; UCAP proposed APM 220-18 modification regarding advancement to Step VI; we suggested the Committee on Research be the lead on ORU reviews; report from the Time-to-Degree Task Force representative (Jerry Last); and the name change proposal from the Program in International Nutrition to the Program in International and Community Nutrition.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: After extensive discussion amongst committee members and with ICA Athletics Director Greg Warzecka, we decided that the annual of the Division IAA athletics program review be moved from the Spring of 2004-05 to the Fall of 2005-06 with that being a precedent for future years.

Committee's narrative:

The committee on Academic Planning & Budget Review (CAPBR) met with the following guests:

- Daniel Simmons, DD Academic Senate Chair
- Virginia Hinshaw, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Celeste Rose, Vice Chancellor-University Relations;
- John Meyer, Vice Chancellor-Resource Management and Planning;
- Kelly Ratliff, AVC-Resource Management and Planning;
- Barry Klein, Vice Chancellor-Research;
- Jeff Gibeling, Dean-Graduate Studies;
- Michael Delwiche, CA&ES Executive Committee Chair;
- Wolf Heyer, DBS Representative;
- Cary Trexler, Division of Education Executive Committee Chair;
- Matt Farrens, College of Engineering Executive Committee Chair;
- Prasad Naik, GSM Executive Committee Member; and
- Pablo Ortiz, L&S Executive Committee Chair

The committee met with the Provost and staff from OR&MP for our annual Fall retreat on October 18, 2004. The meeting was generally more successful than those in the immediate past.

The committee was deeply engaged this year with the Provost on the issue of the planning for the allocation of FTEs. While the Provost was responsive to the concerns expressed by the committee, we continued to have misgivings about some of the measures used to drive the basic formulas. We were also concerned that the call for proposals sent to the deans was sufficiently imprecise that the plans they submitted were heterogeneous in their length and level of detail.

Respectfully submitted,

Randolph Siverson, Chair
Shirley Chiang
Patricia Conrad
Peter Green, AF Rep
Susan Kauzlarich
Ian Kennedy
Jerold Last
Ann Orel
Robert Powell (F)
Richard Sexton
Clarence Walker (W)
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on
Admissions & Enrollment (A&E)

Total Meetings: 6 meetings, averaging 2 hrs. each	Meeting frequency: Twice per quarter	Average hours of committee work each week: 1 – 5 hours per week average
---	---	---

Total Proposals Reviewed: 2 (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	No proposals were deferred from the previous year	No proposals were deferred to the coming academic year
--	--	---

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Proposed revision to bylaw 50. Committee is awaiting decision by
Representative Assembly.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Revised the UC Davis freshman selection procedure guidelines.

Issues considered by the committee:

UC Davis Comprehensive Review policy and procedure
 Academic Enrichment Programs
 Admission by Exception
 New SAT
 Floors on SAT scores and GPA
 Honors Grade Bump
 Eligibility in the Local Context

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Restructuring of committee as proposed in revision to bylaw 50.

Committee's narrative:

This committee considers matters involving undergraduate admissions and enrollment at Davis. The chair also served as the Davis campus representative to the UC Systemwide Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS).

The topics considered by the Admissions and Enrollment Committee during the 2004-05 academic year are listed below:

1. Proposal for modification to UC Davis selection procedure guidelines. The Davis Campus uses a formula-driven selection procedure whereby points are awarded to freshman applicants in fifteen different categories. Some of these categories are quantitative and strictly academic in nature, such as the high-school GPA and standardized test scores. Other categories are more subjective, and relate to personal qualities and experiences that inform a prognosis of a student's likely success at the University. Points in these categories are awarded by human readers, based on the totality of the information presented in the application. The Committee proposed splitting the available points in some of these categories into two levels, thereby allowing for more nuanced assessments of applicants. The proposal also called for doubling the points possible in one category – leadership potential. This was based on a previous study requisitioned by the Committee, which indicated that a favorable rating in the leadership category has a high correlation with success at the University. The proposal was presented to the Representative Assembly in Fall 2004, where it was approved. The reader guidelines were rewritten to reflect the modified procedure, and were implemented in time for the Fall 2005 admission cycle (processing for which began in November 2004).
2. New SAT exam. The SAT exam changed significantly beginning with the March 2005 administration of the exam. Along with the new exam, the required test pattern required of UC applicants – which involves both the core SAT exam as well as SAT II subject tests – also changed. The Committee considered and decided on a means of accommodating the new test pattern in the Davis selection procedure. The testing subcommittee of BOARS, which is chaired by the Davis A&E Committee chair, is assessing how the new SAT aligns with UC's testing principles. A report on this matter is due to the Regents by 2008.
3. Davis Comprehensive Review procedure. The Davis CR selection procedure was discussed at various times throughout the year, with the intent of scoping future directions for study and possible evolution of the process.
4. Admission by Exception (A by E). In response to new guidelines governing A by E from BOARS, the Committee received a briefing from the Undergraduate Admissions Office on current practice, and extensively discussed that practice in relation to the new guidelines. Further action, including possible changes to current practice in this area, will be taken up in the 05-06 academic year.
5. Honors-level grade bump. For over 20 years, UC has awarded a one-point grade “bump” to honors-level high-school courses in the calculation of the GPA. Mounting evidence suggests that this practice may not be achieving the intended outcomes. The issue is under intensive examination in BOARS. The Committee discussed the issue at length and reported back to BOARS.
6. Eligibility in the Local Context. The Committee discussed the possibility of admitting all applicants who achieve Eligibility in the “Local Context” - defined

as students in the top 4% of their high school classes. The Committee was favorably disposed to this idea, particularly in light of the fact that upwards of 98% of current ELC applicants are admitted. Final action was deferred until the 05-06 school year, when the results of a new study relevant to this issue will be available.

7. Academic Enrichment Programs. The Committee considered the inclusion of the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) among those for which selection points are awarded in the “pre-collegiate program” category. The Committee examined this program and decided that it did meet the spirit and substance of the guidelines governing the award of admissions credit for participation in enrichment programs.
8. It came to the Committee's attention that the College of Engineering and the Division of Biological Sciences have for years engaged in the practice of setting floors for admission on the GPA and certain SAT scores. This practice falls outside of the systemwide guidelines for the Comprehensive Review process. The Committee undertook corrective action, including requisitioning a study of the effects of this practice. The practice has since ended.

The Committee looks forward to an exciting and busy year in 2005-06, during which a number of evolutionary improvements in Davis admissions policy and practice will be explored.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Rashid (Chair), Jennifer Chacon, Miroslava Chavez-Garcia, Karen Doyle, You-Lo Hsieh, James Schaaf, Evelyn Silvia, Ora Sraboyants, and Marci Buell (Senate Analyst)

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

**Committee on Affirmative
Action & Diversity**

Total Meetings: 7	Meeting frequency: Monthly	Average hours of committee work each week: 1.5
-------------------	----------------------------	--

Total __ Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.) Not Applicable	Total of reviewed __deferred from the previous year Not Applicable	Total __deferred to the coming academic year Not applicable
---	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Mending the Wall – Federation Executive Committee is writing a response that will probably go on the first page of the web site. May try marginalizing certain groups.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

None

Issues considered by the committee:

- 1) Structure the committee into subcommittees to focus on different things
- 2) APM 240 – (Appointment and Review of Deans) – committee strongly supports the changes
- 3) APM 245 – (Appointment and Review of Department Chairpersons) - committee supports all changes
- 4) APM 500 – (Academic Recruitment Guidelines) – committee made recommendations to the Vice Provost of Academic Personnel regarding academic recruitment and searches in spring 2002. Vice Provost Horwitz responded in fall 2002. Implementation of APM 500 to include wording incorporating APM210 changes is being discussed by 2004-2005 Chair Paw U, EAVC Rahim Reed, and VPAP Barbara Horwitz.
- 5) The following subcommittees were created: Best UC Practices, Noncompliance and Loss of Funding, and Training and Infrastructure.

- 6) Proposal to Internationalize the Curriculum was discussed. Committee members expressed the value of an international curriculum, but added that new requirements should not take away from diversity curriculum requirements, since this curriculum is aimed at the historical diversity and culture of the United States.
- 7) The Executive Council is considering a proposal for a Science & Technology major. The Chair wants to ensure that the major includes curriculum that deals with multi-cultural issues of learning science and technology, as well as different interactions that cultures have with science and technology.
- 8) Rahim Reed, Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Campus and Community Relations, provided the committee with an overview of (OCCR). Beginning winter 2005, the OCCR will begin a "train the trainers" program for senior advisors. The program will provide training in all aspects of the recruitment and selection process, including a commitment to affirmative action and EEO policies, and how to reconcile this commitment with University's responsibilities under Proposition 209. This will include orientation operations for search committees. As a federal contractor, the University must comply with Proposition 209, which prohibits the consideration of race, ethnicity or gender in recruiting or selecting faculty, staff or students.
- 9) The OCCR is currently working on a second part of the curriculum for training advisors, which will be aimed at what happens after the selection process is successful.
- 10) The committee reviewed examples of boilerplate wording to be used in all position announcements and job descriptions, and concluded that written in the right way it can be both positive and descriptive. This wording is related to recent changes to APM210, as noted in (4).
- 11) Per Rahim Reed's recommendation, the Chair of the Staff Assembly and the Chair of the Staff Assembly Diversity Awareness Committee attended a committee meeting.
- 12) The Administration is considered eliminating the Status of Women at Davis Administrative Advisory Committee (SWADAAC) due to the inability to obtain enough faculty volunteers to serve. After consulting several women leaders on campus, Chair Paw U proposed that SWADAAC be modified, not eliminated, reduce the size of the committee to no more than 12 members, and the Academic Senate Committee on Committees would recruit faculty members for SWADAAC with the clarification that the existence of SWADAAC would not replace the need for deliberation with the Academic Senate on issues. After consultation with this committee, Rahim Reed reconstituted SWAADAC in 2005-2006.
- 13) Best UC Practices Subcommittee reported that UCSD has the strongest policy with respect to search committee orientation. For example, the Academic Affirmative Action Officer meets with all search committee chairs.
- 14) Posting faculty demographics on website – numbers should be analyzed first. Senate personnel, 2004-2005 Chair Paw U, and VPAP Horwitz are working on data analysis, and posting of some information on the web. Care is being taken to maintain confidentiality while still conveying relevant information to the faculty, and the community at large.

- 15) Suggested change in graduate admissions race box – ask students to write about their backgrounds. Berkeley provides a good model to follow.
- 16) The differences in the Family Friendly Policy provisions for Senate and Federation members were discussed. The provisions for Federation members are much more specific than those for Senate members.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
1) Implement APM 210 with orientation of CAP, College Personnel Committees, Search Committees, and all faculty as to interpretation and activation of the official changes. Include prominent wording in all faculty search announcements, notices, and advertisements reflecting commitment to diversity and importance of research and teaching related to diversity.
2) Post current and historical faculty demographics on a easily locatable website. (After analysis of data)
3) Develop a prominent diversity web site and links to related web sites.
4) Official inclusion of the AAD Chair on the Davis Division Senate Executive Council.

Committee's narrative:

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Committees

Total Meetings: 28	Meeting frequency: Weekly	Average hours of committee work each week: 4-5 hours per week
--------------------	---------------------------	---

<p>Total:</p> <p>33 Academic Senate Councils, Committees and subcommittees with a total of 212 committee members.</p> <p>In addition, we provided names for 19 administrative task force/committees.</p>	<p>Total deferred from the previous year:</p> <p>Not applicable</p>	<p>Total deferred to the coming academic year:</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
--	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None initiated by our committee, but our committee carefully reviewed and responded to changes proposed by the *Mending the Wall* report. We discussed these changes with Academic Senate Chair Simmons, and our views were represented at the Executive Council as well.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None to report.

Issues considered by the committee: Committee on Committees carried out its charge in such a way as to carefully insure equitable representation from across the campus, doing its best to achieve balance on each committee with respect to the colleges, schools and divisions, and to issues of faculty diversity.

Committee on Committees members also reviewed the Mending the Wall report

and considered the recommendations and their impact not only on the work of CoC, but with regard to proposed changes to other Academic Senate committees, and the impact of such changes on the Academic Senate as a whole. We also reviewed and considered the responses to the report and to particular by-laws by other Academic Senate committees.

We also addressed the need to generate correct volunteer lists, since these are vital to the work of the committee.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Committee's narrative

In accordance with Bylaws 11, 12. and 13 of the Davis Division, we report the appointment of the following officers of the Davis Division for the academic year 2004-05:

Chair: Daniel L. Simmons
Vice Chair: Theodore M. DeJong
Secretary Susan M. Kauzlarich

In accordance with Bylaw 29(C) of the Davis Division, we report for confirmation the following appointments to standing committees for the academic year 2005-06. In accordance with Bylaw 40(H), each individual who has been appointed to a standing committee has either volunteered for the post, or has consented to serve after having been contacted by a member of the Committee on Committees. In making these appointments we have taken into account all information available to the Senate office on forthcoming sabbatical and special leaves. In the event that changing circumstances make it impossible for an appointee to serve on a committee to which he/she has been appointed, the Academic Senate office should be informed immediately so that a substitute appointment can be made.

APPOINTMENTS TO STANDING COMMITTEES 2005-06

Academic Federation Excellence in Teaching Award: *Stanley Sue*

Academic Freedom and Responsibility: *Jerold Theis, Chair, Alan Brownstein, Catherine Kudlick, Albert Lin, and Michael Nantz; (UCAF Rep: Jerold Theis)*

Academic Personnel Oversight: *Phil Yager, Chair, Christopher Calvert, Ines Hernandez-Avila, Irwin Liu, Chip Martel, Catherine Paul, Chris Reynolds, and Steven Tharratt; (UCAP Rep: Catherine Paul)*

Academic Personnel Appellate: *Linda Bisson, Chair (F,W); Lenora Timm, Chair (S, S), Stuart Cohen, Bruce Gates, Gail Goodman (F,W for L. Timm) and Eugene Steffey*

Admissions and Enrollment: *Mark Rashid, Chair, Terry Nathan, Jennifer Chacon, You-Lo Hsieh, and Evelyn Silvia (BOARS Rep: Jennifer Chacon)*

Affirmative Action: *Bruce Haynes, Chair, Carlito Lebrilla, Angela Onwauchi-Willig, Ching Yao Fong, Christopher Elmendorf, and Dennis Wilson; (UCAA&D Rep: Bruce Haynes)*

Campus Council for Information Technology: *Carolyn Bledsoe, Chair, Michael Toney (COR & L&S), Michael Hogarth (SOM), James Chalfant (CA&ES), Ann Orel (CAPBR), David Bunch (UGC), and Wes Wallender (Engineering); (ITTP Rep: Michael Hogarth)*

Courses of Instruction: *Arnold Sillman, Chair, Mark Grismer, Martha Macri, Linton Corruccini, Roger McDonald, and Ben Shaw.*

Distinguished Teaching Awards: *Michael Saler, Chair, Debra Long, Anita Oberbauer, James Shackelford, and Krishnan Nambiar*

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction: *Jay Helms, Chair, Kevin Hoover, and William Davis*

Emeriti: *Haig Zeronian, Chair (Emeritus), Harrison Dunning, Zunilda Gertel, Alan Jackman, Jack Reitan (Emeritus), Dean Simonton, and John Whitaker (Emeritus)*

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers: *Robert Rucker, Chair, Ed Imwinkelreid, Evelyn Lewis, Dino Tinti, and Diane Ullman*

Faculty Welfare: *James Chalfant, Chair, Andreas Albrecht, Brenda Bryant, Allison Coudert, John Krochta, Saul Schaefer, and Richard Gable (Emeritus); (UCFW Rep: James Chalfant)*

Grade Changes: *Greg Miller, Chair, Travis Bradley, James Prieger, Francine Steinberg, and Jeffrey Thomas*

Graduate Council: *Andrew Waterhouse, Chair, Carolyn Thomas de la Pena, Vice Chair, Evan Watkins, Nicole Baumgarth, Anne Britt, Joan Cadden, Matt Farrens, Tonya Kuhl, Walter Leal, Jay Mechling, Hans Mueller, Shrini Upadyaya, and Reen Wu; (CCGA Rep: Shrini Upadyaya)*

Graduate Student Privilege Adviser: *Jerry Hedrick*

International Studies and Exchanges: *Charles Leshner (L&S-Mathematical & Physical Sciences), Chair, Anne Britt (CA&ES/DBS), Beverly Bossler (L&S-Social Sciences), Patrick Carroll (L&S-Social Sciences), Fadi Fathallah (Engineering), Art Krener (L&S-Mathematical & Physical Sciences), and Charles Walker (L&S-Mathematical & Physical Sciences); (UCIE Rep: Charles Leshner)*

Joint Senate/Federation Personnel: *Bob Gilbertson and Ken Giles*

Administrative Series Personnel: *You-Lo Hsieh*

Library: *Winder McConnell, Chair and Norma Landau; (UCOL Rep: Winder McConnell)*

Planning and Budget Committee: *Ann Orel, Chair, Ross Bauer, Shirley Chiang, Patricia Conrad, Ian Kennedy, Jerry Last, Bruno Nachtergaele, Richard Sexton, and Jane-Ling Wang; (UCPB Rep: Patricia Conrad)*

Instructional Space Advisory Group (ISAG – subcommittee of Planning and Budget Committee): *Mary Christopher and Dino Tinti (Chair and other member appointed by CAPBR)*

Privilege and Tenure – Investigative: *Norman Matloff, Chair, Arturo Gandara, Daniel Link, Lyn Lofland, and Fern Tablin (UCPT Rep: Norman Matloff)*

Privilege and Tenure – Hearings: *Bill Hing, Chair, Colin Carter, Debbie Elliott-Fisk, Neil Flynn, Robert Hendren, Hanne Jensen, Thomas Joo, Denise Krol, Jim MacLachlan, Sally McKee, Lisa Pruitt, and David Shelton*

Public Service: *Kay Dewey, Chair, Paul Heckman, John Largier, Peter Moyle, and Steven Tharratt*

Research (COR) – Policy: *Marion Miller-Sears, Chair, James Carey, Nipavan Chiamvimonvat, Tom Holloway, James Murray, Cheuk-Yiu Ng, Jon Ramsey, Alice Tarantal, Stefano Varese, Anthony Wexler, and Keith Widaman; (UCOR Rep: James Murray)*

Research (COR) – Grants: *Marion Miller-Sears, Chair, Frances Dolan, Robert Irwin, Niels Jensen, Neil Larsen, Dianne Macleod, Kathryn Olmstead, Sharman O'Neil, Ning Pan, Xiaoling Shu, and Michael Toney*

Student-Faculty Relationships: *Jack Goldberg, Chair, Yuri Druzhnikov, Ronald Hedrick, and Keith Williams*

Transportation and Parking: *Judith Stern, Chair, Susan Handy, Charles Hunt, Quirino Paris, and Daniel Sperling*

Undergraduate Council (UGC): *Dan Potter, Chair, David Bunch, Vice Chair, Matt Bishop, Tom Famula, Mont Hubbard, Alessa Johns, Philip Kass, Jay Mechling (Special Academic Programs Committee Chair), Lorena Oropeza (Preparatory Education Committee Chair), Kathryn Radke/Jay Lund (General Education Committee co-chairs), Dawn Sumner (Undergraduate Instruction & Program Review Chair), and Keith Williams. (UCEP Rep: David Bunch)*

General Education (UGC Committee): *Kathryn Radke and Jay Lund, Co-Chairs, Elizabeth Constable, Gail Finney, William Lucas, and Roger McDonald*

Preparatory Education (UGC Committee): *Lorena Oropeza, Chair, John Bolander, Alison Mitchell, John Rossini, and G. Thomas Sallee. (UCOPE Rep: Lorena Oropeza)*

Special Academic Programs (UGC Committee): *Jay Mechling, Chair, Will Benware, Chia-Ning Chang, Ning Pan, and Mike Stieff*

Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review (UGC Committee): *Dawn Sumner, Chair, Bassam Younis, and Aaron Smith (Additional ex officio members appointed by their respective college Executive Committees)*

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes: *Silas Hung, Chair, Abdul Barakat, Zhe Chen, Christyann Darwent, Ting Guo, Sandy Harcourt, Anthony Jerant, Alessa Johns, Leslie Lyons, Rajiv Singh, Nancy True, Jean Vandergheynst, Louis Warren, Bryan Weare, David Wilson, and Rena Zieve*

To conduct our business, the Committee on Committees conferred with the following individuals throughout Fall 2004 and early Winter 2005:

- Daniel Simmons – Chair, Davis Division
- Virginia Hinshaw - Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Barbara Horwitz - Vice Provost, Academic Personnel
- Barry Klein - Vice Chancellor, Research
- Mark Rashid – Chair, Admissions and Enrollment
- Randy Siverson - Chair, Academic Planning and Budget Review
- Michael Maher - Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (Oversight)

- Philip Schneider – Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (Appellate)
- Norman Matloff - Chair, Privilege and Tenure Investigative
- Robert Hillman – Chair, Privilege and Tenure Hearings
- Matthew Farrens – Chair, Undergraduate Council
- Trish Berger – Chair, Graduate Council
- Steve Velinsky – Chair, Committee on Research (Policy and Grants)
- Judith Stern – Chair, Transportation and Parking

In addition to replacing members on a routine basis throughout the year, assembling the 2005-06 Academic Senate committees, and designating fifteen individuals to serve as representatives to the system wide counterparts of their divisional committees, the Committee on Committees fulfilled a broad array of requests. CoC nominated members of the Davis faculty to serve on the following administration committees and task forces (information in parentheses indicate the origin of the request):

- Green Transportation Planning Project (Larry Pitts, UCOP)
- HARCS Dean Recruitment Advisory Committee (Chancellor Vanderhoef)
- Vice Chancellor – Administration Recruitment Advisory Committee (Chancellor Vanderhoef)
- Faculty Discipline Panel (Vice Provost Horwitz, Academic Personnel)
- Athletic Administrative Advisory Committee (Vice Chancellor Sakaki, Student Affairs)
- Student Services & Fees Administrative Advisory Committee (Vice Chancellor Sakaki, Student Affairs)
- Vice Chancellor – Research Recruitment Advisory Committee (AVC Springer)
- Graduate Studies Dean Recruitment Advisory Committee (AVC Springer)
- UC Davis Prize for Teaching & Scholarly Achievement Selection Committee (Chancellor Vanderhoef)
- Sustainability Advisory Committee (AVC Blackwelder, Administration)
- Title IX Sexual Harassment Work Group (Vice Provost Horwitz)
- Time-to-Degree Task Force (Acting Vice Provost Wood)
- Winslow/Gilhooly Award Committee (Vice Chancellor Sakaki, Student Affairs)
- Margarita Robinson Award Committee (Vice Chancellor Sakaki, Student Affairs)
- Chancellor Review Committee (UC Academic Council Chair Blumenthal);
- John Muir Institute of the Environment Director Search Committee (Vice Chancellor Klein, Research)
- Computational Resource Center Work Group (COVDC via Academic Senate Chair Simmons)
- Vice Provost – Information & Education Technology Recruitment Advisory Committee (Chancellor Vanderhoef)
- College of Biological Sciences Task Force to form the Faculty (Academic Senate Chair Simmons)

We also regularly received reports from our system wide Committee on Committees representative, Jerry Powell.

Respectfully submitted,

Ines Hernandez-Avilla, Chair

Robert Powell, Vice Chair

Marta Altisent

Cynthia Brantley

Alan Buckpitt

Robert Flocchini

David Hills

Mark Kurth

Jerry Powell

Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05

Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Courses of Instruction

Total Meetings: 7	Meeting frequency: Monthly (on average)	Average hours of committee work each week: 4
-------------------	--	--

Total: <u>311</u> Courses Reviewed	Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: <u>0</u>	Total deferred to the coming academic year: <u>0</u>
---------------------------------------	--	---

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

- 1) The committee discussed the proposed bylaw changes being put before the Representative Assembly. There is concern about the COCI Chair not being on the Executive Council. There is also concern about ex-officio's not being able to vote.
- 2) The committee discussed the proposed Senate Regulation 477 – there were no objections.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

- 1) The chair will independently act on cancelled and 199 courses so that the committee does not have to spend time reviewing them.

Issues considered by the committee

- 1) Committee decided that Expanded Course Descriptions should not be published online via the Course Approval System. Marci will email the Registrar's Office and ask them to change the link. It should be replaced with a notice stating that expanded course descriptions are available in departments.
- 2) The committee agreed that the Division of Biological Sciences can use Q in the subject codes of courses containing quantitative subject matter.
- 3) Committee discussed whether review for GE should be done at the College level. It was agreed that the College level committees should review for everything, including GE.
- 4) Mending the Wall: Report by the Shared Governance Committee was discussed. The committee agreed that they are in favor of the recommendations regarding COCI.

- 5) Simplification of the Expanded Course Description was discussed. All members in attendance agreed that the changes proposed by Jay Helms should be adopted.
- 6) New learning activities were proposed by Dick Walters. The committee reviewed the proposal, but found no benefit to adding to the list.
- 7) Chair Sillman met with Professor Jan Ilkiw to discuss the School of Veterinary Medicine's use of the Expanded Course Description field on the CAF. She agreed that they would utilize a different system for their needs due to ECD being removed.
- 8) The committee agreed that the extensive use of guest lecturers was acceptable as long as the Instructor of Record participates.
- 9) The committee discussed the routing of courses and agreed that only 1 level of review, prior to review at the Senate level, was necessary for graduate level courses. Accordingly, Course Approval Forms, for graduate level courses, that originate in departments and are then routed to school or college review committees may be sent on to the Graduate Council Courses Subcommittee without further review. Course Approval Forms that originate in graduate groups are already routed directly to the Graduate Council Courses Subcommittee.
- 10) In an effort to make the CAF more user friendly and simplify the course approval process, the Office of the Registrar and the Academic Senate Office worked together in cooperation with the Offices of the Chancellor and Provost to revise the interface. Several changes were made to the CAF (most notably to the appearance of Page 1 and Page 2).

The Summary of Changes Include:

- Help windows now appear when you move your mouse over main fields
- The addition of a spell checker in the Course Description field, as well as a user prompt if the 40 word maximum has been exceeded
- General Education field information is only displayed if GE certification is requested, and is automatically included on Page 2 if selected
- Cross Listing field information is only displayed if "yes" is selected
- Repeat Credit field information is only displayed if selected
- In Progress Grading field information is only displayed if "yes" is selected
- If an undergraduate course does not have a final exam, the required description of grading criteria has been reduced to a statement of justification
- The Additional Information for Students field has been deleted
- The user is prompted if a required field has not been completed
- Course Format and Requirements field has been replaced by justification of the unit credit
- Reading field is limited to just a few examples
- Topical Outline field content is expected to be brief

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

1) Chair Sillman requested Jay Helms to review existing On-Line or Hybrid policy and make sure that it will work with revised CAF.

2) Chair Sillman asked Roger McDonald to write a new policy regarding Web-based courses.

Committee's narrative:**Course Requests**

The primary duty of the Committee is to review and act upon requests to add new courses and change or cancel existing courses. The following table summarizes our actions from May 1, 2004 through August 31, 2005. However, the graduate course numbers are from July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005.

	New	Change	Cancel	Total
undergraduate	132	73	22	227
graduate	37	30	7	74
professional	3	5	2	10
Total	172	108	31	311

Associate Instructors

The Committee also is required to approve/reject requests from departments to use advanced graduate students to teach upper-division courses. The Chair normally does this without consulting with the Committee (except as needed) and by following explicit Committee policy on this matter. This year the Committee received and approved 132 Associate Instructors from 33 different departments.

Nonstudent Teaching Assistants

The Committee is required to approve/reject requests from departments to use teaching assistants who are not UCD students. Normally, this task is delegated to the chair. The Committee received and approved 20 requests from 3 departments.

Undergraduate Teaching Assistants

The Committee is required to approve/reject petitions for the use of undergraduates as teaching assistants (this is an exception to policy). The Committee received and approved 8 petitions from 6 departments.

Undergraduate Readers

Like undergraduate teaching assistants, undergraduate readers are to be used only in exceptional circumstances. The Committee, however, does not receive and review petitions for undergraduate readers.

Grading Variances

The Committee must approve requests to change course grading from Pass/No-Pass or Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory to letter grade or vice-versa. Normally this task is delegated to the Chair. Following the process described in the Committee web page, the Committee granted grading variances in 57 classes.

ACADEMIC SENATE Committee Membership 2004-2005

At-large Members

Arnold Sillman, Chair
Dan Chang
Mark Grismer
Martha Macri
Roger McDonald
Dino Tinti

Ex-officio Members

Eyal Biyalogorsky
Lora Jo Bossio
Joan Cadden
Richard Green
Lynette Hart
L. Jay Helms
Mark Servis
Ben Shaw
Frank Wada
Karen Watson-Gegeo

Graduate Student Representative

Chris May

Academic Federation Representative

Jayne Walker

Staff Consultant

Randall Larson-Maynard

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

**Committee on
Distinguished Teaching Awards**

Total Meetings: 5 meetings, averaging 1 hr. each	Meeting frequency: 1-3 times per quarter	Average hours of committee work each week: Approximately 2 – 6 hours, with Winter and Spring Quarters being the peak times
--	---	---

Total of 38 Nominations and 10 Dossiers were Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	No nominations were deferred from the previous year.	No nominations were deferred to the coming academic year.
---	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Revised Davis Division Bylaw 60.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Online submission of nominations for both DTA & DGMA established.

Senate office collection of some nomination data (i.e., DESI reports).

Consolidated Award Poster.

Issues considered by the committee:

Consolidated Award Ceremony.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Review dossier guidelines.

Committee's narrative:

The primary responsibility of the Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee is to oversee the annual awards for distinguished teaching and mentoring.

Following normal procedure, we issued the call for Distinguished Teaching Award (DTA) nominations in Fall Quarter. Eighteen nominations were received in January, of which seven were selected for full consideration. In our May 9th meeting, after much deliberation by the committee, four of the finalists were chosen as the 2005 recipients.

The call for the Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award (DGMA) was issued in December. Twenty nominations were received in February, from which three finalists were selected. Three recipients were chosen at our May 9th meeting.

The recipients for both awards were announced at the June 9, 2005 Representative Assembly meeting.

Additionally, this year the committee proposed a revision to bylaw 60, which changed the award structure. The Representative Assembly approved this proposal and the revisions will go into effect in the 05-06 school year. The restructuring included an increase in total awards given, from 5 to 6 per year. Also included in the bylaw change is a renaming of the Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award to the Distinguished Teaching Award – for Graduate and Professional Teaching. The previous Distinguished Teaching Award will now be titled the Distinguished Teaching Award – for Undergraduate Teaching.

The Committee discussed the proposal for a consolidated award ceremony. The Committee was unanimously opposed to this idea unless certain elements of the traditional DTA Ceremony were maintained in any new consolidated scheme. These elements include: 1) The reading of the DTA Citation in its entirety; 2) A response by the DTA winner; 3) DTA winners be allowed to invite significant others and guests (including graduate and undergraduate students) to the ceremony; 4) Previous DTA winners be invited to the ceremony, and be permitted to bring significant others.

The citations for the 2005 DTA and DGMA recipients are attached.

Respectfully Submitted,
Michael Saler (Chair), Debra Long, Anita Oberbauer, James Shackelford,
Chad Sparber, Jennifer Stickel, Anson Tharayanil, Susan Tucker,
and Marci Buell (Senate Analyst)

*The 2005
Distinguished Teaching Award
and
Distinguished Graduate
Mentoring Award
Recipients*



Douglas S. Gross

2005 Distinguished Teaching Award



What could be more fitting than a Professor named “Gross” teaching Gross Anatomy to medical and undergraduate students? Actually Professor Doug Gross doesn’t just teach anatomy, he inspires students to “understand and remember difficult concepts” making “one of the most difficult courses on our campus a thrill to experience.” The secret to his success? Incorporate time, effort, passion, innovation, and teamwork. Part of Professor Gross’s inspiration draws from his own diverse career journey. After beginning his career as a faculty member in the Human Anatomy Department at UC Davis, Professor Gross resigned to pursue a medical degree. Following a stint in private practice, Professor Gross returned to the UC Davis faculty whereupon he took the lead role in revamping the Human Anatomy undergraduate course establishing continuity and incorporating his own clinical experience. In that course, he created a learning environment in which each student felt the lectures to be one-on-one and develop a relationship with him despite the course having high enrollment. A student nominator writes, “he teaches every lecture and lab with a passion and enthusiasm like it is his first time.” The lectures are characterized as “well illustrated” and “carefully organized” which, when coupled with Professor Gross’s use of various tactics that are entertaining, instructive, and most important, memorable, create a learning environment that is “magic” and “academia at its best.” Some of Professor Gross’s teaching strategies include surreptitiously popping a balloon to activate the students’ flight or fight response, his dressing up as a uterus to orient the students to the female reproductive system, and creating models to illustrate the heart, lung, or eye.

Beyond Professor Gross’s innovations, he also incorporates details from his annual visits to rural communities in West Africa where he provides much needed health care to children. Sharing these experiences frequently inspires students to pursue careers in health sciences and medicine. One nominator writes, “He embodied not only all the virtues one would hope to have as a teacher or a physician, but he also exemplified a great man who gave more than he took in all facets of his life.” For example, his evening lectures are often followed by dinner at the Silo where students can come and chat about anything. Thus, “his reach extends beyond the classroom” as one student writes. Other students describe Professor Gross as “the family man who gives of his time to the sick and diseased of the world”; that, combined with his exceptional teaching abilities, led a nominator to state: “the time spent learning from Dr. Gross is some of the most valuable educational experiences we have had as students anywhere.”

The DTA committee concurs with this assessment and is honored to bestow a 2005 Distinguished Teaching Award on Professor Doug Gross.

Naomi Janowitz

2005 Distinguished Teaching Award



In her own words, Professor Naomi Janowitz approaches teaching as a way to “impart to our students a basic enthusiasm for the *life of the mind*.” She is extraordinarily successful!

One student said of Professor Janowitz that, “above any other professor I have had or heard about, she challenges me beyond what I think possible and then helps me reach those expectations.” An alumna who attended the Alumni College program in the summer of 2004 said, after hearing Professor Janowitz’s talk on *Religion and Violence*, “they really rolled out the *crème de la crème*!” And, after the Chancellor’s dinner for new faculty at which Professor Janowitz spoke, Mrs. Vanderhoef said that, “if this was the sort of teaching that generally goes on in our classes, then our undergraduates are really getting their money’s worth out of this university.” The Committee for the Distinguished Teaching Award could not agree more with all of these observations about an exceptionally dedicated, innovative, and inspiring teacher.

Professor Janowitz views teaching as a “relationship” between teacher and student that demands as much from the one as the other. She makes an effort to learn each student’s name (up to 140 students a quarter) and requires students to come to office hours at least once, “hoping it will become a habit.” As a student commented, “she forced each of us to come to her office hours as part of our grade, and I will be forever grateful.” To this end, she keeps a large supply of books to lend out. Her goal is to challenge students to think outside their own backgrounds, cultures, and traditions and engage constructively with people with different ideas and ideals. One student marveled at her ability to engage students in serious discussion, protesting that an hour and a half of class time was *too short*! She has also used new teaching technologies in a very effective way. By posting her introductory lectures online, she frees up class time to discuss individual texts as well as critical and theoretical issues.

No one summarized Professor Janowitz’s contributions better than the Religious Studies student who wrote, after having two classes with her, “I witnessed a true teacher: a woman so dedicated to helping her students become more learned human beings that she made all our heads spin. She encourages students more than any other teacher I have met, and her refusal to accept anything but excellence really helped us all actually *learn*, as opposed to simply getting through a class.”

The Committee is delighted to recognize this brilliant and inspirational teacher with the 2005 Distinguished Teaching Award.

Susan M. Kauzlarich
2005 Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award



It is our extreme pleasure to honor Susan Kauzlarich with this year's Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award. This award is truly well deserved, for the reasons provided by one of Susan's former graduate students: "Professor Susan Kauzlarich is an exceptional mentor because she is focused on educating students with the full complement of scientific, communication and professional skills." As another student stated, she "always keeps students' benefit in mind."

We see the themes emphasized by these students arise repeatedly in the many enthusiastically supportive letters we received from Professor Kauzlarich's present and former students. From these testimonies it is evident that she does everything one expects from an outstanding mentor. She treats all of her students fairly, equally, and with respect; she promotes critical thinking in her students by directing them to find answers themselves; she teaches her students to write both manuscripts and grants through the time-consuming process of providing constructive criticisms on multiple versions of each students' draft; and she provides a supportive environment within which she assists them in developing strong scientific oral presentation skills. Professor Kauzlarich demonstrates true concern for her students and their futures, advising and supporting them in their decisions. Specifically, she creates research and teaching opportunities for each student that support that student's interests and goals, even if these interests lie outside her own. She provides professional advice, letting students know what they should be getting out of various experiences, what they can expect on the job market, and even, as two students so aptly put it "giving advice on...surviving in the academic community" and "prepar[ing us] to interact well with all of the many different personality types she knew we would come in contact with over the course of our career[s]." And she takes the time to provide this information not just to her own students, but to other students, both graduate and undergraduate, former students, students of former students, and even junior faculty. As one former student notes, "[Susan Kauzlarich] is also an active promoter of women and minorities in the sciences...[and] all of her students are active in the mentoring of minority and [economically disadvantaged] high school women." Indeed, Professor Kauzlarich has been instrumental in the Chemistry department's participation in "Take your daughter to work day" and in ACS' Project SEED for high school students. By involving her graduate students in these activities, She extends the idea of mentoring one step further by giving them first hand experience as mentors themselves.

The DTA Committee feels it is best to conclude with the words of another student: "I am pleased to write a letter supporting [Susan's] nomination... [as] it gives me a chance to show my gratitude for the effort she put forth for me." The DTA Committee concurs with this sentiment and is pleased to recognize Professor Kauzlarich with a 2005 Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award.

Amiya K. Mukherjee

2005 Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award



Amiya Mukherjee has created a legacy, described by some of his current students, as inspiring “a generation of students to become established scientists, managers, and professors at the top of their fields.”

Professor Mukherjee has long been known as one of the premier teachers on the Davis campus, having received a Distinguished Teaching Award in 1979 and the UC Davis Prize for Teaching and Scholarly Achievement in 1993. He has also been honored with many of the teaching and research prizes within his own field of materials science and engineering. Especially noteworthy is the 1992 Albert Easton White Distinguished Teacher Award of ASM International, the largest professional society in the field of materials.

It is altogether appropriate that the Davis campus recognizes Professor Mukherjee in this additional way. The Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award is about people, and Professor Mukherjee has deeply touched the lives of his many students. The committee received a nomination jointly signed by two of his current students, along with numerous letters from other current graduate (and undergraduate) students, and from former students now working in industry, government laboratories, and university faculties.

Professor Mukherjee’s laboratory has consistently been at the forefront of his field while consistently evolving the focus of its research to stay extremely current. Over the past nearly four decades, his laboratory has gone from making seminal contributions to the area of high-temperature deformation of materials to being a world leader in the processing technology known as superplastic forming to, within the last decade, doing cutting-edge research on nanotechnology. The diverse comments from his many current and former students follow a common theme. With a tremendous passion for his research, Professor Mukherjee guides his students in a relationship based on mutual respect. Never dogmatic, he demands the highest standards of research while providing an unlimited supply of support and encouragement. A current student points out that, “He is able to motivate his graduate students, post doctoral colleagues and staff with his wonderfully contagious enthusiasm for materials science and engineering.” A former student who is now teaching at the university level recalled how he helped prepare her for her current career saying, “He involved his students in all aspects of academia. As a returning student, he made sure early on that I was involved with proposal writing.” A senior consultant recalls his graduate education at UC Davis thirty years ago saying, “He encouraged but did not push, helped but let me discover and learn, and provided perspective but did not direct. He restored fun to my learning process and, as a result of that, I learned more.”

The Committee is pleased to recognize this compassionate and inspirational mentor with the 2005 Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award.

Kathryn S. Olmsted

2005 Distinguished Teaching Award



History Professor Kathryn Olmsted is currently writing an account of conspiracy theories in modern American political culture, but it is no secret among Davis students that she is one of the best teachers on campus. She has compiled a near-perfect teaching record at every level, and those who have attended her classes praise the clarity and creativity of her presentations. She is an intellectual dynamo, often combining in a single lecture traditional blackboard outlines, powerpoint illustrations to underscore major points, video clips, slides, and musical recordings. She also goes out of her way to secure notable guest speakers who have been intimately involved with the topics she covers, including a survivor of the Bataan Death March and a San Jose Mercury News reporter who helped expose the CIA-Contra cocaine trade. These are just a few of the ways in which Professor Olmsted brings American history to life for her students and clarifies the complex and controversial issues she presents.

In addition to her clearly organized and energetic lectures, students praise her devotion to their intellectual and personal welfare. One of her senior thesis students – and Professor Olmsted has had many who have been inspired by her to undertake this challenging, full-year commitment – was unstinting in his praise for her efforts on his behalf, noting that she was even willing to work with him by phone and email for a full quarter while he served as an intern in Washington. Another undergraduate student noted that she goes out of her way to personalize the learning experience in her large lecture classes, which often exceed 150 students: “Quite frequently, she will look up from her lecture notes to make sure she has not ignored a student with a question. She welcomes on-the-spot student participation. She once told a student in class who made an insightful comment about her lecture, ‘What is your name? I’ll be sure to cite your name if I ever pursue further study on it.’”

Professor Olmsted has received similar enthusiastic encomiums from graduate students and professional colleagues. And, in an indirect but important way, Professor Olmsted’s teaching skills have also influenced younger generations of students. She has been a central participant in UC-Davis’s History and Cultures Project, an outreach program for the State’s elementary and high school teachers of history. Educators have been stimulated and moved by her presentations. One expressed, “Fantastic lecture! As always, your information was pertinent and succinct. You do such a great job at taking complex issues and making them ‘real’ for classroom use.” Another responded, “Wow! Loved all the ideas; got the wheels going in my head – look forward to my unit on this topic Thank you for the resources.”

For such inspired efforts, Professor Olmsted’s many admirers conspired to nominate her for a Distinguished Teaching Award, and the DTA Committee is honored to present her with this year’s award.

Wendell H. Potter

2005 Distinguished Teaching Award



Through his extraordinary efforts, Professor Wendell Potter has changed the face of physics instruction on the UC Davis Campus. He has devoted his recent career to improving techniques for teaching introductory physics, and has implemented innovative reforms to replace the classic lecture format with greater opportunities for student discussion and problem-solving. Professor Potter's creative approach to physics instruction has attracted national attention, including major grants from the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Department of Education. The reforms that he has implemented have been proven to be successful as measured by empirical data and by the personal testimonies of his colleagues and students. His faculty colleagues comment that:

"The students in Physics 7 become intellectually engaged with the ideas rather than just memorizing their way through the course."

"Initially I was skeptical about the restructuring, but came away a true believer after the first experience."

His students have similar comments:

"Professor Potter has been an exceptional instructor filled with enthusiasm and a willingness to really help the students understand physics in [a] conceptual and practical manner."

"In my new interest in Physics, I am not alone. Many other students around me have been 'turned on' to Physics by Dr. Potter."

The success of Professor Potter's curricular reforms is also supported by outcome measures of student performance. Students in the new Physics course that he designed have measurably improved their performance, and have also scored higher on the MCAT test for admission to medical school. These data are clear evidence for the effectiveness of Professor Potter's innovative teaching techniques.

The DTA Committee is delighted to have both quantitative and qualitative evidence to support their decision to award Professor Wendell Potter a 2005 Distinguished Teaching Award.

TO: Representative Assembly
Davis Division
Academic Senate

**Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction
August 31, 2005**

In addition to supervising scheduled elections, this Committee:

1) Requested a Legislative Ruling from the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction regarding the proper roles of Senate and non-Senate departmental personnel in evaluations of non-Senate instructional personnel. CERJ contends that: (1) Regents' Standing Orders provide the Academic Senate with unique authority to evaluate teaching; and (2) that academic departments act as committees of the Senate when conducting personnel actions; thus, only Senate votes regarding teaching evaluation are to be reported in Departmental personnel letters. There is clear and abundant evidence that the Academic Senate Code prohibits voting by non-members of the Senate in Senate committee business, when decisions are being reported out of committees (SOR 105.2, ASB 35 and 45; Legislative Rulings 5.67 and 12.75; Divisional Bylaws 29, 135, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 150, and 151). The request for a Ruling went forward 24 September 2004; the outcome is pending.

2) Advised the Dean, Graduate Studies and Research, on two related questions: (1) Whether a graduate program could require a minimum grade of "B" as a prerequisite performance standard for students taking courses on a Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis, when students are unaware of the practice; and (2) to which Senate agency students complaining of that practice should direct complaints. On the first question, CERJ advised that graduate programs could establish performance standards in prerequisite courses, but that those standards could not be based on letter grades which do not appear on official transcripts where taking courses on an S/U basis was an established practice in that program. On the second question, CERJ advised that the Graduate Council was the appropriate Senate agency to hear student complaints rising from the practice of covert prerequisites.

3) Requested a Legislative Ruling from the Academic Senate Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction regarding implementation of Senate Regulation 904. SR 904 authorizes the Dean, Graduate Division to disqualify graduate students. CERJ contends that SR 904 contradicts Regents' Standing Order 105.2 (which provides authority to assess academic performance to the Senate) and Senate Bylaw 330 (which prohibits delegating Senate authority except by specific bylaw provisions), both of which have superior standing in the hierarchy of legislative authority. CERJ believes that Regulation 904 is invalid and unenforceable, and should be rescinded. The request for a Ruling went forward on 1 October 2004; the outcome is pending.

4) Advised Vice Provost F.E. Wood's office on proposed changes to PPM Sections 200-20, 200-25, and 200-50. It is CERJ's opinion that these changes are too complicated to

be practicable and that in some instances they violate Senate authority and the principle of shared governance.

5) Advised Professor Nash, Department of Chemistry, that both the charge to the Committee and the Review Committee's subsequent investigation in the 2004 Administrative Review of the Subject A program went deeply into areas of the program that are under the authority of the Academic Senate; therefore, the recommendations of the Review Committee have no standing.

6) Requested that the Undergraduate Council undertake development of a Regulation governing how the undergraduate reading and writing proficiency requirement (formerly "Subject A") will be met in the Division. Procedures governing the requirement presently are set out only in the General Catalog and lack Senate authority. The Committee on Preparatory Education of the Undergraduate Council has conducted a review of this requirement and has proposed appropriate legislation that will be considered in the fall term, 2005.

7) Requested that the Undergraduate Council resolve the contradiction embodied in DDR A552 and DDR A545 on the question of whether students who are not in good standing may take courses on a Passed/Not Passed basis while in that status. A Special Committee considered this question and resolved it in the amended DDR A552 that was passed by the Representative Assembly May 4, 2005. The amended A552 allows students who are not in good standing for quantitative reasons to take courses P/NP, but prohibits students not in good standing for qualitative reasons from doing so.

8) Advised the Chair, Undergraduate Council, that the Assembly had passed a Resolution (June 3, 2004) requiring the Executive Council to appoint a Special Committee with a specified membership to develop uniform reporting procedures and routine reports (as mandated by ASR 902) for undergraduate students on probation, or eligible for disqualification and/or dismissal for quantitative or qualitative reasons. The Chair, Davis Division delegated appointment and supervision of the Special Committee to the Chair, Undergraduate Council. The Special Committee has produced legislative amendments that have been adopted, and continues in operation.

9) Reviewed legislative amendments proposed by Graduate Council: (1) an amendment to DDB 80 (Graduate Council) to allow Council to delegate administrative implementation of Council's regulations and policies to the Dean, Graduate Studies; and (2) amendments to DDR 520 (Doctor of Philosophy) that would (a) allow graduate programs to require an exit seminar and (b) establishes a Plan C (oral examination) dissertation requirement. CERJ suggested minor editorial changes and the amendments were adopted 2/28/05.

10) Advised Division Chair D. L. Simmons on two proposed administrative changes in the Division: (1) a proposal from the School of Medicine to change the name of the Department of Ophthalmology to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Science; and (2) a proposal from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences to

consolidate four departments (Agronomy and Range Sciences, Environmental Horticulture, Pomology, and Vegetable Crops) into the Department of Plant Sciences. As the names of academic departments are under the authority of the University President and his/her delegates, rather than the Senate, CERJ found no Senate jurisdictional or legislative issues involved.

11) Advised the Chair, Committee on Grade Changes that SR 800 and DDR 554 establish that the Academic Senate has authority over all students enrolled in courses in which students receive academic, subject, and grade point credit, whether they are matriculated students or students enrolled as Extension students.

12) Advised Professor Rodman, Faculty Chair of the College of Letters and Science, that fifty members of the Division may require a mail ballot on the question of converting the Division of Biological Sciences to the College of Biological Sciences, and that this right cannot be ignored in the reconstitution process.

13) Advised Divisional Chair D. L. Simmons on the questions of whether the Divisional bylaws should be revised to limit the student petitions heard by the Representative Assembly to those concerning matters of “general interest,” or if the Assembly should remain available to appeals from students seeking relief from adverse decisions made by Senate standing committees? CERJ noted that: (1) that ASB 160 (A) provides that the Representative Assembly may consider student petitions as ordinary business at regular meetings, (2) that “general interest” would be difficult to legislate and enforce. CERJ pointed out that the procedure for bringing a petition before the Assembly would require a motion and a second from Assembly Representatives, and the Assembly could decide at that point whether the petition should be heard. The procedure should prevent the formation of a tidal wave of student petitions that would slow the conduct of ordinary business.

14) Reviewed a proposal to amend DDB 60 (Committee on Distinguished Teaching Award) presented by that Committee. The proposal would change the name of the Committee to “Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards” and include language that accommodates awards made for other forms of instructional excellence than undergraduate instruction. CERJ suggested some minor changes in wording; the amendments were adopted.

15) Advised the School of Medicine that their recent change in the curriculum for fourth year students does not require additional Senate Review. The School of Medicine and Graduate Council have a memorandum of understanding in force.

16) Responded to a question raised by Professor Woodruff of the Graduate School of Management regarding what parties are authorized to view the results of teaching evaluations. CERJ advised that the question involves privacy issues that are covered by University policy and state and federal laws; thus, the question is more appropriately directed to University Counsel than to Senate committees.

17) Advised the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering on two matters: (1) The first concerned the definition of “a quorum.” As the Department has no bylaws in force, DDB 170 requires that *Robert’s Rules of Order* will govern the conduct of business. *Robert’s* defines a quorum as a majority of eligible voters. A previous *ad hoc* meeting of some departmental members did not meet that standard and decisions reached at that meeting are annulled. (2) The second issue concerned departmental voting methods. ASB 55 (Departmental Voting Rights) guarantees the right of any member to require a secret ballot, which means that procedures must guarantee the anonymity of all members who vote in any action. As *Robert’s* governs in this case, the double-blind voting method must be used for any mail ballot. To avoid controversy, CERJ urged the Department to use the Senate Office staff as tellers in subsequent votes on personnel actions.

18) Advised Professor Famula, Animal Science, who asked if a requirement for training in health and safety issues as a prerequisite for students in classes involving work with animals would conform to Senate legislation, and if Senate approval would be required to implement such a requirement. CERJ advised that: (1) any such prerequisite for a course offered for credit would require Senate approval; (2) there is no legislation that would prohibit such a prerequisite; and (3) the issue of permitted prerequisites falls squarely in the jurisdiction of the Divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction.

19) Reviewed proposed new bylaws and amendments to existing bylaws numbered 10, 11, 11.5, 12, 13, 16.5, 17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 48, and 73. CERJ suggested minor editorial changes to 17, 28, and 29.

20) Advised the Undergraduate Admissions Office that ASR 300 and 510 classify students as either graduate or undergraduate; thus, students are prohibited from simultaneous enrollment in graduate and undergraduate degree programs. Graduate students may, however, take some undergraduate courses while enrolled to pursue a graduate degree, and undergraduate students may enroll in graduate courses, subject to program restrictions.

21) Advised the Division Chair, D. L. Simmons, that the present election procedure for the Divisional Committee on Committees does not comply with Bylaw. DDB 39 requires the election of three members each year, each to serve a three year term; and that in the case of a vacancy an election must be held to select a member who will serve the remainder of the vacant term. Due to some confusion involved in replacing a resigning member in 2001, in 2003 four members mistakenly were elected for three year terms. That resulted in a situation in which COC elections will be locked permanently into four-three-two member annual elections and, therefore, will be out of compliance two years in every three. CERJ advised that in order to comply with bylaws, in 2006 three members should be elected to three year terms and a fourth member elected for a two year term. DDB 16 provides that the member elected for the shorter term shall be the candidate receiving the fourth largest number of votes.

22) Proposed an amendment to DDB 44 (Faculty Privilege and Personnel Advisers). DDB 44 was written with the intention of combining the work of two previous faculty advisory committees into one agency. Unfortunately, the paragraph dealing with faculty privilege advisors was omitted inadvertently; thus, faculty members offering advice on matters unrelated to personnel actions were acting without Senate authorization. Adding paragraph B.3 corrected the omission. The amendment was approved June 8th.

23) Reviewed the Bylaws of the Faculty of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and advised the Faculty that College Bylaws were seriously out of compliance with Regents' Standing Orders, Academic Senate Bylaws, Senate Legislative Rulings, and Bylaws of the Davis Division. CERJ pointed out that College Bylaws must be amended to comply.

24) Supplied advice to Professor Paris regarding the Special Committee on Undergraduate Probations, Disqualification, and Dismissal. CERJ advised that the Special Committee soon would expire and, therefore, could not be the Senate agency that received reports on these matters from appropriate College administrative officers. Senate Regulations require those reports to be sent to the Faculties of the several colleges.

25) Advised the Faculty Advisors to the proposed joint Bachelor of Science/Master of Arts in Geography program that: (1) Senate Regulations do not permit students to be enrolled in undergraduate and graduate degree programs simultaneously; (2) CERJ has no authority to waive any provision in Senate legislation; and (3) the only recourse would be to request a Variance from Regulations from the Academic Assembly.

26) Reviewed the Bylaws proposed to organize the Faculty of the College of Biological Sciences and suggested procedures for establishing that new Faculty in the Davis Division.

Addendum: Legislative Ruling

Divisional Bylaw 71.B.6 requires this Committee to notify the Divisional Faculty of any formal Legislative Ruling the Committee issues. On June 4, 2002 this Committee issued a Legislative Ruling related to Divisional Bylaw 43 that establishes the legislatively correct relationship between the deans of colleges/schools and Faculty Personnel Committees in those agencies. As CERJ neglected to report that ruling in 2002, we correct that oversight in this report:

6.02: In accord with the Standing Orders of the Regents (105.1) and Division Bylaw 43, as well as general considerations regarding the separation of authority that are part of the notion of shared governance that lies behind the independence of the Senate, nominations of Senate members to Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) must originate in the executive committees of one or more Faculties. As an ex officio member of the Executive Committee, the Dean may express views about potential nominees and vote on their nomination, where agency bylaws allow. These deliberations are a matter of

record, as are other deliberations of the Committee. The Dean may not, however, exercise any special right of vetting, vetoing, or pre-approving nominees. The slate of nominees must be transmitted directly from the Executive Committee (normally through its Chair or Secretary) to the Divisional Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). It must not be transmitted through the Dean's Office or under the authority or signature of the Dean or other administrative officer.

The Committee on Academic Personnel is entitled to seek relevant information about nominees before confirming their appointments. That may include consultation with the Dean, and may include confidential information that generally could not be shared with other Senate committees. Nevertheless, CAP must respect the rights and privileges of Senate members and may not cede to a dean or other administrator CAP's authority to confirm or disconfirm a nominee. CAP would violate fundamental fairness and due process if it failed to confirm a nominee on the assertion of some barrier to service expressed by the Dean on the basis of confidential information that he/she would not share with the Committee. Put simply: deans may not blackball nominees.

Regents' Standing Order 100.4.c requires the Chief Campus Officer to consult with the Senate on the personnel cases of Senate members. The Senate, however, determines which of its bodies speaks on its behalf. Likewise, the Chief Campus Officer may delegate his/her authority to lower administrators. DDB 42 and 43 define the authority that CAP and the FPCs have to speak for the Senate. For those personnel actions delegated to the decanal level, the FPCs are advisory to the Dean, in the sense that they transmit their reports to the Dean and may receive requests for specific action and information from the Dean. Their status as advisors to any level of the Administration does not give the Administration any authority over the organization and operation of the Senate committees.

Respectfully submitted,
L. J. Helms
K. D. Hoover
W. G. Davis, Chair

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05

Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Emeriti

Total Meetings: 0	Meeting frequency: Committee did not meet this year	Average hours of committee work each week N/A
-----------------------------	---	---

Total courses, proposals, cases, etc. reviewed: N/A	Total of courses, proposals, cases, etc. reviewed/deferred from the previous year: N/A	Total courses, proposals, cases, etc. deferred to the coming academic year: N/A
--	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: N/A
--

Listing of committee policies established or revised: N/A

Issues considered by the committee:

Essentially two items were considered by this committee during the 2003 - 2004 academic year. One was whether Emeriti would have to start paying for campus parking permits. The other was problems related to maintaining centralized records of Emeriti/ae, which is a prime responsibility for this committee.

Regarding the first item, the Administration allowed Retiree (RT) parking permits to continue to be issued free of charge for a further two years. Since the commitment is only for two years, this will need to be monitored in future years.

With respect to the second item, we now seem to be on top of the problem of maintaining an accurate list. The database contains close to 800 emeriti and the Vice Provost's office now is sending names over automatically.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

No new issues came before the committee during the year.

Respectively submitted,

Haig Zeronian, Chair,
Harrison Dunning, Warren Pickett, Jack Reitan, Dean Simonton, John Whitaker, Alan Jackman Ex Officio: Richard Gable, Margaret Durkin

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Executive Council

9	Monthly	1
Total Meetings	Meeting frequency	Average hours of committee work each week

57	1	1
Total business Items Reviewed	Total of reviewed student petitions deferred from the previous year	Total business items deferred to the coming academic year

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Bylaw proposals are reviewed and prepared for Representative Assembly input and are generally not created by the Council.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

As an advisory body to the chair discussion of a variety of divisional policies are vetted through the council.

Issues considered by the committee

All business items, bylaw/regulation additions or amendments,
 Student petitions, draft policy and procedure for the University,
 And campus are reviewed by the council.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Reduce the number of members to allow effective exchange of ideas.
 Eliminate the administrative updates to allow more time for business.
 Seek Council input on only controversial business items with the chair responding on behalf of the Division when there is consensus among those responding.

Committee's narrative:

In the 2004-05 Academic Year the Executive Council debated a number of issues important to the faculty and campus.

Revised Admissions Formula: The Admissions and Enrollment Committee chair provided an overview of proposed revisions to the admissions formula with the Council as well as the members of Representative Assembly.

Academic Senate Participation in the Annual Campus Budget Process: The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget, Divisional Chair and Divisional Vice-Chair worked throughout the year negotiating and then framing the process by with the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget would provide input and feedback during the proposal stage of the annual budget process. The Committee on Academic Planning and Budget routinely briefed the Council and in the winter and spring quarters developed a process for reviewing each college and school proposal for allocation of academic FTE. Enhancing interactions between school and college executive committees and the respective deans was an important element of this process.

Non-Senate Faculty Voting Rights: The Committee on Elections Rules and Jurisdiction ruled that non-Senate faculty do not have a right to vote on non-Senate personnel actions that relate to delivery of the curriculum. The committee ruled that authority was delegated by the Regents to Academic Senate members only. The issue remains unresolved.

Research Integrity Policy: The Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility remained concerned about the impediment to academic freedom imposed by the campus Research Integrity Policy 210-25. The Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and Research worked together to facilitate a review and rewrite of the policy. The Research Integrity Policy is in the process of being rewritten by a committee including the 04-05 Chairs of Academic Freedom and Responsibility (Professor Jerold Theis), Research (Professor Steve Velinsky), and Divisional Chair Dan Simmons participating. The proposed policy will receive campus and specifically Academic Senate committee review during the coming academic year.

Course Approval System: The Committee on Courses of Instruction with support from the Executive Council launched a review of necessary information to review a course. The first phase of Course Approval System improvement was completed and launched in the summer of 2006. The streamlined form and process is anticipated to improve the process of submitting and reviewing a course. The second phase is currently underway which is to map the entire process, attempt to identify redundant or unnecessary steps, and propose a rewrite of development of a new Course Approval System. The Academic Senate web site has a page devoted to informing members about the status of this important priority <http://www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/index.htm>.

Student Petitions Reviewed by Representative Assembly: For as long as there has been a Davis Division, the Representative Assembly Meeting Call has contained the item "Student Petitions." The first request for review of a Student Petition by the Representative Assembly was received in 2003. After a thorough review of the issue as well as legal and bylaw mandates, the Representative Assembly reviewed and voted in February 2004 to approve the student's petition for reinstatement as a graduate student.

Shared Governance Report: During academic year 2002-03, the Executive Council appointed the Executive Council Special Committee on Shared Governance charged with reviewing the state of shared governance at UC Davis. The special committee's report was issued during winter quarter 2004-05. The report generated a great deal of discussion concerning shared governance and the role of the administration and the Academic Senate in the management of UC Davis. Furthermore, the special committee recommended more than 20 bylaw and regulation additions or amendments to improve the function and efficiency of the Davis Division.

Special Committees

At the request of the chair, the Executive Council established special committees to address policies for the establishment, modification, or termination of academic units and degree programs (a draft revision to the PPM will circulate for formal review in the Fall of 2005), the process for review of proposals to establish organized research units, for intercollegiate athletics, and program review. The work of these special committees will continue into the 2005-2006 academic year.

For 2005-2006, the Executive Council has also authorized a council of school and college Faculty chairs as a special committee, and a special committee to address faculty personnel issues consisting of the chairs of the committees on Academic Personnel, Academic Personnel Appeals, Privilege and Tenure, Faculty Welfare, Affirmative Action, and Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Issues and Priorities for 2005-06

- Subject A: The Committee on Preparatory Education and Undergraduate Council have been reviewing Subject A and may propose improvements.
- Course Approval System: The Committee on Courses of Instruction will continue their efforts to improve the system's performance and effectiveness of the process.
- The Committee on International Studies and Exchanges is working on a proposal to add an international component to the general education requirement. The committee also is pursuing integration of international education into the curriculum.
- The Committee on Preparatory Education is working on an reform of the general education requirement.
- Planning and Budget is following up on the FTE allocation process.
- The chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, along with the Divisional Chair and the past chair of the Committee on Research continue to work on the integrity in research policy.
- Faculty Welfare is monitoring development of housing allocation policies for the proposed West Village.
- The Committee on Special Programs will review academic misconduct policies in the context of modern communication devices.

- The Graduate Council is leading efforts to address nonresident tuition with respect to graduate students. The Graduate Council will also explore developing an organized approach to graduate education.
- Several committees are addressing the formation of the College of Biological Sciences and the transition of programs to the College.
- The Special Committee on Faculty Personnel Issues, among others, will address problems generated by the increasing use of off-scale salaries in recruitment and retention cases.
- The Executive Council is instituting quarterly meetings with the Chancellor and Provost that include all Senate standing committee chairs in lieu of briefings at Executive Council meetings.

Annual Report
Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers
2004-2005

To: Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

The Committee of Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers was appointed under the authority of By-law 44, which was revised by action of the Representative Assembly at its annual fall meeting in 2002. The responsibilities of this committee are to advise members of the Faculty concerning personnel processes and procedures for appeal of personnel actions, and to provide them with independent assessments of whether a personnel action raises substantive issues for appeal. The Committee also advises faculty about other rights and privileges.

The Committee received requests for advice from seven members of the Faculty during the academic year 2004-2005. Two cases concerned appeals of negative tenure decisions and two others were appeals of the merit step awarded after a positive tenure decision. Additional cases include the appeal of an acceleration decision, a grievance awaiting consideration by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and wrongful termination. After providing relevant advice, we typically have no further contact with the faculty members in question.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard W. Day, Chair
Ines Hernandez-Avila
Leslie Kurtz
Martha West
Diane Ullman

October 5, 2005

**Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate**

Committee on Faculty Welfare

Total Meetings 1	Meeting frequency As Needed	Average hours of committee work each week: Variable
---------------------	--------------------------------	--

Total ----- Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed ----0----- deferred from the previous year	Total -----0----- deferred to the coming academic year
--	--	---

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None

Issues considered by the committee

The Faculty Welfare committee is charged with considering salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. Much of the committee's work is centered on the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare, and the divisional committee reviews and advises on matters before that committee. Issues during the past year included perennial concerns such as salaries and health-care costs, but the committee also is looking at issues surrounding long-term disability, parking, and other topics.

Locally, the committee met once last year, and conducted other business by email. Two members of the committee served on a committee concerning policies for the West Village development, and the entire committee provided feedback on those policies. The Faculty Welfare committee continues to advise on matters related to eligibility for the development, and on such policies as those concerning the accumulation

of equity or concerning separation of residents from the University.

The committee also provided input to a task force on year-round operation, and for various topics before the Executive Council. Typically, these topics are more directly the responsibility of other Senate committees, but affect faculty welfare. Examples include the cost of graduate education and most other new campus or university policies.

During the coming year, salaries, pension reform, parking costs, implementation of a new policy on faculty recall and phased retirement, and childcare seem likely to dominate the UCFW agenda and, therefore, the divisional committee's deliberations.

Finally, the members of the Faculty Welfare Committee want to encourage feedback and suggestions of topics of importance for the welfare of the faculty. Email to either the Senate Office at sbekele@ucdavis.edu or directly to the committee chair at jim@primal.ucdavis.edu.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None

Committee's narrative:

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Grade Changes

Total Meetings: 9	Meeting frequency: once a month during the academic year	Average hours of committee work each MONTH: 3 hours meeting and 6 -8 additional hours of reviewing
-------------------	--	--

Total ----- Reviewed 438 (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed ----- deferred from the previous year unknown	Total ----- deferred to the coming academic year unknown
--	--	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Issues considered by the committee

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

To have a member from medical school.

Committee's narrative:

The GCC committee reviewed 438 petitions from students and instructors during 2004-2005. In the summer of 2005, the committee also handled an issue raised by the registrar on errors caused by the electronic grade book.

TO: THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE
ACADEMIC SENATE

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL 2004-2005

The Graduate Council is a standing committee of the Divisional Academic Senate and is responsible for regulating and making recommendations on matters pertaining to graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues. The Graduate Council met on eleven occasions during the 2004-2005 academic year, once a month September through May and twice in June. The first eight meetings were two hours and the last three meetings were three hours long.

The Council is supported by a structure which includes the following subcommittees: (1) the Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee, (2) the Administrative Committee, (3) the Chair's Advisory Committee, (4) the Courses and Bylaws Committee, (5) the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), (6) the Program Review Committee (PRC), and (7) the Support and Welfare Committee. The Courses and Bylaws Committee was split into two subcommittees this year.

GRADUATE COUNCIL GOALS FOR 2005-2006 **Statement from incoming Chair Andrew Waterhouse**

The Council has much ordinary business to undertake in 2005-2006. Some of our activity involves improving processes for graduate program review, bylaws, and degree requirements. However, we have considered some larger goals for the future and these include:

- Consideration of a process to strategically plan graduate education at UCD
- What is the proper role of and means to review professional degrees at UCD
- Review of graduate education support including NRT, and the use of PELP and Filing Fee

Council is pleased to say that these issues have arisen in consultation with the Dean, and in some cases the Dean will initiate the formation of review bodies.

As noted in *Mending the Wall*, "...working relationships with the Administration are often cordial, smooth, and effective. This appears to be particularly true with respect to certain divisional committees Academic Personnel (and the Faculty Personnel Committees), **the Graduate Council...**" Part of this success is derived from a willingness to fully engage the other party, and granting the Graduate Studies Dean a vote in Council is an important recognition of this full partnership. Thus, Council wishes to express its disappointment that the Dean of Graduate Studies is no longer a voting member of Graduate Council. We would like to have the option of granting the Dean a vote.

GRADUATE COUNCIL ACTIONS: 2004-2005

A summary of the Council's actions for the year is provided below. In addition, annual reports for the subcommittees are provided. The item dates are typically those of Council's meetings.

A. UC systemwide items. Graduate Council reviewed and commented on:

- Family Friendly Policies, Systemwide Academic Personnel Manual, proposed revisions, 4/19/05
- Professors Advancing to Step VI, University Committee on Academic Personnel proposed modification to UC APM 220-18, 5/13/05
- Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions, Universitywide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) Addendum to report, 4/19/05
- University Management of Health, Safety and Environment, proposed UC policy 4/19/05
- UC Senate Regulation 600B. (Senate members earning higher degrees) proposed amendment, responded 4/8/05
- UC Senate Regulation 904 (authority to disqualify graduate students), requested an informal ruling from University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, 4/28/05
- Use of Multiple PIs on Federal Awards, from The Offices of Management and Budget (OMB) and Science and Technology Policy (OSTP). University Office of Research 8/24/05 request for comments. Council members were asked to respond directly to the request.

B. UCD campus items. Graduate Council reviewed and commented on:

- Air Quality Research Center ORU proposal, 3/29/05. Correspondence regarding revisions, 5/13/05
- CA&ES proposal to consolidate four departments into the Department of Plant Sciences, 9/22/04
- Civil Engineering/Materials Science and Engineering [Undergraduate] Program discontinuance, 3/28/05
- Davis Division Bylaws 28.D and 50, 5/13/05
- Davis Division Bylaws 34, 35, and 160.B., 3/28/05
- Davis Division Bylaw 35, 4/19/05
- Design Program, proposal to transfer from CA&ES to HArCS, 12/13/04
- Environmental and Occupational Health, proposed division in the School of Medicine, 1/31/05
- Internationalizing the Curriculum, 3/28/05
- *Mending the Wall: Report of the Special Committee on shared Governance and Senate Operations, December 13, 2004*, 1/31/05, commented 2/28/05
- Ophthalmology, School of Medicine – Request for department name change, 9/22/04
- Proposed Calendar for Summer Instruction – Year Round Operation, 9/22/04
- Small graduate programs, CAPBR memo, 12/13/04
- TOEFL, established a minimum scoring scale for the campus for the new internet-based test for academic year 2005-2006, 6/9/05

C. Current Items related to Graduate Studies and Graduate Council in 2004-2005. Graduate Council proposed, addressed, or received reports and updates on the following:

- 2005-2006 Budget Planning Parameters from Provost. Informational item received 3/16/05

- Academic Senate Regulation 520. (C) (4) Dissertation and Final Examination, proposed amendments: Addition of new Plan C and modification of Plan B, approved 11/22/04
- Academic Senate resolution regarding support of academic graduate students, handout distributed 12/13/04
- Comprehensive Campaign as related to graduate students, 12/13/04
- Davis Division Bylaw 80 Graduate Council, proposed amendment, D. authority to delegate administrative decisions to the Dean of Graduate Studies, 9/22/04
- Delegation of Authority to Dean of specific administrative actions, 6/30/05
- Disqualification and Appeal, Graduate Studies policy and procedures, dated June 8, 2005, Council endorsed 6/9/05
- Electronic review of graduate admissions packets, request to Campus Committee for Information and Technology (CCFIT), 6/30/05
- Graduate Council goals and topics for 2004-2005, 9/22/04, 10/21/04, 11/22/04, 12/13/04
- Graduate student survey of graduate program name changes, presented 2/28/05
- Graduate student support funding at UC Davis, 1/31/05
- Graduate Studies Dean candidate interviews with Council members scheduled for April 13, 15, and 20, 2005, announced 3/28/05
- Graduate Studies Development Officer, request to Provost, 3/28/05
- GSA 2005 Award for Excellence in Service to Graduate Students, announced 5/13/05
- Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Awards, awardees selected. Invitation to reception received 5/25/05
- Planned Educational Leave Policy (PELP), 3/28/05
- Student Petitions, Representative Assembly vote presented, 3/28/05
- Strategic planning for graduate education at UCD, discussed 6/9/05

D. Graduate Council Guidelines and Policies, approved or revised in 2004-2005

- Admission of Graduate Students Transferring from Other Institutions with their Major Professor Policy, approved 12/13/04
- Degree Requirements Guidelines, approved 6/30/05
- Doctoral Qualifying Examinations. Draft policy, 2/28/05. E-mailed to graduate program chairs for feedback, 3/23/05. Graduate program responses reviewed 5/13/05. Revised policy approved 6/9/05.
- Double Submission of a Thesis or Dissertation Policy, 5/13/05; policy approved 6/9/05
- Objectives for Graduate Education, statement approved 3/28/05
- Small Graduate Programs Review Policy, 12/13/04

E. Postdoctoral Scholar Items discussed:

- First Annual Award for Excellence in Postdoctoral Research, 1/31/05
- Postdoctoral Teaching Program, 10/21/04

F. New Graduate Program Proposals

- **Animal Biology Ph.D. and graduate group.** Council's final approval 10/21/04. Chancellor approved 11/12/04, CCGA approved 4/12/05, UCOP approved 5/6/05, effective 5/1/05.
- **Clinical Research Master of Advanced Study (MAS),** Council discussed 11/22/04. Council's final approval 1/31/05. Chancellor approved 2/22/05. Under CCGA review.
- **Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA), a Joint Ed.D. Program with CSU Sacramento and Sonoma State University.** UCOP approved 11/17/04. WASC approved 2/18/05. Students to be admitted fall 2005.
- **Environmental Policy and Management M.S.,** Graduate Council commented on initial proposal, 6/9/05.
- **Horticulture and Agronomy Ph.D.** to be offered by graduate group offering M.S. degree. Graduate Council's preliminary approval, 6/9/05. CA&ES letter of support, 9/30/05. Under review by Academic Senate Library Committee and Committee on Planning & Budget.
- **Joint Chemical Engineering Ph.D. Program with the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey,** Council commented on letter of intent 3/28/05.
- **Joint Doctorate (Ph.D.) in Criminal Justice Sciences with CSU Fresno.** Council's final approval 2/28/05. Chancellor approved 3/14/05. Under review by CCGA.
- **Neuroscience M.S.,** to be offered by the existing graduate group in Neuroscience, which offers the Ph.D. degree. Council's final approval 11/22/04. Chancellor approved 12/16/04. CCGA approved 6/7/05. UCOP approved 8/3/05, effective 8/1/05.

G. Designated Emphasis (DE) programs

New Affiliations with DE programs approved:

- Designated Emphasis in Feminist Theory and Research
Affiliation of Geography, 2/28/05
- Designated Emphasis in Reproductive Biology
Affiliation of Animal Biology, 6/30/05

Proposed DE programs: There were no proposals for new DEs this year.

H. Degree Requirement and Curriculum Changes for Graduate Programs, forwarded by the Educational Policy Committee and approved:

- Art History, 4/19/05
- Biological System Engineering, 1/31/05
- Biostatistics, 6/9/05

- Comparative Literature, 2/28/05; approved 3/28/05
- Comparative Pathology, 3/28/05
- Designated Emphasis in Social Theory and Comparative History, 2/28/05
- Epidemiology, 6/9/05
- French, 11/22/04
- German, 5/13/05; approved 6/9/05
- Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Physiology, 4/19/05
- Performance Studies, M.A. and Ph.D., 4/19/05; approved M.A. and Track 1 of Ph.D. 5/13/05
- Philosophy, 12/13/04
- Psychology, 2/28/05; approved 4/19/05
- Viticulture and Enology, 6/9/05

I. Program Bylaws, revised or new, approved:

- Animal Biology, 2/28/05
- Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA), Joint Ed.D. Program with CSU Sacramento and Sonoma State University, 9/22/04
- International Commercial Law, 3/28/05
- Sociology, 6/30/05

J. Name Changes of Graduate Programs approved

- Doctorate in Educational Leadership: Capital Region Alliance (DEL:CRA) to Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL), 2/28/05. Chancellor approved 3/14/05. Council notified CCGA 3/16/05.
- Dramatic Art M.A. and Ph.D. to Performance Studies, 11/22/04. Chancellor approved 12/3/04. Council notified CCGA 12/10/04. Dramatic Art MFA did not request change.
- Nutrition to Nutritional Biology, 4/19/05. Chancellor approved 5/3/05. Council notified CCGA 5/4/05.
- Soil Science to Soils and Biogeochemistry, 10/21/04. Chancellor approved 11/12/04. Council notified CCGA 11/17/04.

K. Other Graduate Program Actions

- Animal Biology M.S. request to transfer administration from department to graduate group, approved 2/28/05
- Animal Science Master of Agriculture and Management (MAM) program; Program Review Closure Committee recommendation to suspend admissions, approved 10/21/04
- Communication M.A., proposal to re-open admissions with name change from Rhetoric and Communication, approved 2/28/05
- Concurrent Master's/MBA Degree Program, MBA requirements and format for Master's degree programs to apply to participate, approved 6/9/05
- Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition, DE dissertation requirements, discussed 4/19/05 and 5/13/05, denied exception to policy 6/9/05

- Medical Informatics, request to re-open admissions, change curriculum, and change name, denied 6/30/05
- Textile Arts and Costume Design – Program Review Closure Committee recommendation to suspend admissions, approved 10/21/04. (See PRC subcommittee report.) Program request to rescind suspension, denied 12/13/04.
- Nutrition, Program Review Closure Committee request for program chair follow-up response to program review, approved 10/21/04. (See PRC subcommittee report.)

L. Graduate Program Review

One of the major responsibilities of the Graduate Council is the review of graduate programs on a regularly scheduled basis. Please see the Program Review Committee report. The following actions related to program reviews were taken by Council during 2004-2005.

Program Reviews initiated for 2005-2006. Programs selected by PRC, approved 9/22/04

- Biomedical Engineering
- Chemical Engineering
- Cultural Studies
- Ecology
- Entomology
- Epidemiology
- International Commercial Law
- Viticulture and Enology

Program Review Reports approved

Programs and administrators will respond to Council's recommendations.

- Agricultural & Environmental Chemistry, 6/30/05
- Comparative Literature, 6/30/05
- Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition, 4/19/05
- Dramatic Art MFA and Performance Studies M.A. and Ph.D., 5/13/05
- Forensic Science, 6/30/05
- French, 5/13/05
- History, 6/30/05
- Joint Doctoral Program in Ecology with San Diego State University, 6/30/05
- Mathematics Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), 6/9/05
- Philosophy, 5/13/05
- Statistics, 6/30/05

Program reviews closed (four on 9/22/04, six on 10/21/04, two on 6/9/05, and eight on 6/30/05)

Agricultural and Resource Economics, Animal Science and MAM, Art, Community Development, Comparative Pathology, DE in International Nutrition, Exercise Science, Food Science, Genetics, German, Horticulture and Agronomy, Mathematics Master of

Arts in Teaching (MAT), Microbiology, Music, Native American Studies, Plant Protection and Pest Management, Political Science, Population Biology, Sociology, and Textiles

Status Reports Reviewed (See K. Other Graduate Program Actions.)

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (APD) COMMITTEE

The Academic Planning & Development (APD) Committee's charge includes advising Graduate Council on matters related to the:

1. Future needs and directions in graduate education,
2. General issues related to graduate education,
3. Reports and recommendations to the Representative Assembly on matters pertaining to graduate work,
4. Reports to the Council on needs and procedures for coordination of various departments, graduate programs and schools for conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor's degree including fund raising and enrollments, and
5. Postdoctoral Scholar issues.

In addition, to balance subcommittee workloads, this year APD was charged with reviewing and evaluating proposals for new graduate programs and a new ORU and making recommendations to Graduate Council.

The APD Committee usually consists of 3-7 Academic Senate members, 1 Graduate Student, 1 Postdoctoral Scholar, 1 Academic Federation Representative, and the Graduate Dean or Dean's designee. In 2004-2005, the committee members were: André Knoesen (APD Chair, Electrical and Computer Engineering), Tom Bills (Art), Alan Conley (Population Health and Reproduction: Vet Med), Silas Hung (Animal Science), Wolfgang Polonik (Statistics), Axel Borg (Academic Federation, Shields Library), Angela LaRiviere (Graduate Student Representative, Community Development), Edward Caswell-Chen (Associate Dean for Programs, Graduate Studies), and Staff Lee Wilce (Graduate Program Analyst, Graduate Studies).

The committee met seven times in the period November 2004-June 2005. Before meetings agenda items and related materials were posted on a secure Web site. Subsequent to meetings, the committee's draft correspondence and reports were distributed electronically and agreed upon before submission.

The committee prepared the following proposed statements, policies and regulations:

- Admission of Graduate Students Transferring from Other Institutions with their Major Professor. APD drafted a proposed policy, December 6, 2004

- Dissertation and Final Examination, UC Davis Academic Senate Regulation 520. (C) (4). APD drafted proposed revisions, including a modification of Plan B and a new Plan C, November 15, 2004
- Objectives for Graduate Education. APD drafted a statement for Graduate Council, March 11, 2005
- Proposed Policy to Graduate Council Against Double Submission of a Thesis or Dissertation, April 26, 2005

The committee evaluated a:

- "Report from the Task Force on Internationalizing the Curriculum –2004." APD reviewed and drafted a response on behalf of Graduate Council, March 11, 2005.
- Request by the Chair to advise her whether Graduate Council should consider imposing conditions on "restriction on enrollment in graduate courses." APD advised against such an action on March 21, 2005.

The committee reviewed and made recommendations to Council on the proposals:

- to create the Air Quality Research Center Organized Research Unit, May 4, 2005
- to establish a joint Ph.D. program between Chemical Engineering and Materials Science at UC Davis and Chemical Engineering at Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara, Turkey, March 11, 2005
- to establish a Master of Science Degree in Environmental Policy and Management, May 13, 2005
- to establish a Concurrent Master's/ MBA Degree, May 12, 2005
- to establish a Ph.D. degree program in Horticulture and Agronomy, May 12, 2005
- to reopen admissions to the Master of Science Degree Program in Medical Informatics, June 13, 2005.

At a Graduate Council meeting this year it was reported that student support expenditures towards Master's degree students at UC Davis is the highest in the UC system. In response to this fact, in combination with the large proportional amount of time APD was required to expend on matters related to Master's degree programs this past year, we advise Graduate Council to emphasize stronger Ph.D. degree programs and take a critical view of Master's degrees at UC Davis that will divert already scarce resources.

The committee members thank Lee Wilce for her dedicated and skilled administrative support.

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

The Administrative Committee reviews student petitions, requests, and appeals concerning such issues as examinations, residency and degree requirements.

Committee members in 2004-2005: Trish Berger, Chair of Graduate Council and Committee; Andrew Waterhouse, Vice Chair of Graduate Council; Paul FitzGerald and Edward Caswell-Chen, Associate Deans for Graduate Programs; there was no Associate Dean for Students; Heather Wylie, Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor; and by invitation, Cathy

Jurado, Director of Graduate Admissions and Academic Services. Graduate Studies Staff: Lisa Trujillo

The Administrative Committee met 8 times during the 2004-2005 academic year and the following summer. The Committee dealt with 26 separate matters. The 23 student appeals included:

- 1 request to submit documentary video as part of Master's thesis
- 1 petition for admission to an Individual Ph.D. program,
- 4 appeals of denial of admissions,
- 3 appeals for exceptions to policy: 1 request to transfer 13 units instead of the 12 units allowed from UC Davis Extension, 1 request to transfer 13 units of credit received while enrolled as a second baccalaureate student, 1 request for a Designated Emphasis for a student in an unaffiliated Ph.D. program,
- 6 appeals of disqualification,
- 6 split decisions for Qualifying Examinations, and
- 2 appeals of Fail decisions on Qualifying Examinations.

The 3 other matters that were considered by the Administrative Committee were:

- Faculty membership in a specific graduate group after request from faculty member,
- Follow-up on GPA exceptions for 2005-2006 admissions to the combined Education credential-MA program for four applicants, and
- Blanket exception to UCD-CSUS Collaborative Teacher Credential Program admission criteria

CHAIR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

The Chair's Advisory Committee, a subcommittee established in 1999-2000, met monthly. The committee is comprised of the current and recent past Chairs of Graduate Council. Its charge is to advise Council on long-range planning and policy issues regarding graduate education on the UCD campus.

COURSES AND BYLAWS (C&B) COMMITTEE

The Courses and Bylaws Committee reviews requests for the addition and deletion of graduate level courses and changes to existing graduate courses. Approved course requests are forwarded to the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses of Instruction. The Chair of the Graduate Council's Courses and Bylaws Committee serves as a representative to the Academic Senate committee. In addition, this committee also reviews bylaws for new programs and revised bylaws for existing programs.

Committee members in 2004-2005: Academic Senate: Chairs: Courses - Andrew Waterhouse and Bylaws - Evan Watkins. Members: Joan Cadden, Edward Caswell-Chen, Richard Grotjahn, Prabir Burman, Carolyn de la Peña, ; Academic Federation Representative: Janet Baulch; Graduate Student Representative: Angela Lee Linderholm; Courses Staff: Marci Buell and Shelly Brozenick (Academic Senate) and Bylaws Staff: Kathy Garcia (Graduate Studies).

The 2004-2005 report is below:

The Courses and Bylaws Committee conducted most of its business via email and telephone.

Courses Subcommittee:

During the time period from July 1, 2004 to June 30, 2005, 147 courses were submitted. The committee approved 74 course requests and has 73 course requests still in the review process. Of the 74 approved course requests: 37 were new courses, 30 were course changes and 7 were cancelled courses.

Bylaws Subcommittee:

For the 2004-2005 academic year, the Committee had 14 sets of bylaws in various stages of review. Of the 14 sets: 4 sets of bylaws were approved and 10 sets are currently in the review process. The Committee also has 11 sets of bylaws that will be reviewed as part of the Program Review process.

Bylaws approved by Council:

- Animal Biology – approved 2/28/05
- Capital Area North Doctorate in Educational Leadership – approved 9/22/04
- International Commercial Law – approved 3/28/05
- Sociology – approved 6/30/05

Bylaws in the review phase:

- Anthropology
- Cell and Developmental Biology
- Clinical Research MAS
- Communication
- Genetics
- Immunology
- Joint Doctoral Program in Criminal Justice Sciences (proposed program)
- Neuroscience
- Nutrition
- Psychology

The following programs will have their bylaws reviewed as part of the Program Review process

- Applied Science
- Art History
- Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
- Chemistry
- Designated Emphasis in Biotechnology
- Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition
- Entomology

- Epidemiology
- Food Science
- Music
- Viticulture and Enology

Special thanks go from the committee to Kathy Garcia for her efforts to improve the Web site guidelines in a way that makes it easier for graduate programs to conform to Council policies, and for her many discussions with specific graduate program representatives to ensure compliance.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE (EPC)

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) typically reviews proposals for new graduate programs, designated emphases and new graduate degrees. However, in order to balance the workload, this year the Academic Planning and Development Committee was charged with reviewing proposals for new programs. EPC also reviews proposed changes to degree requirements for existing graduate programs. In addition, the EPC is asked for its recommendations regarding miscellaneous academic and programmatic issues and policies.

Committee members in 2004-2005: Committee Chair: Shrinivasa Upadhyaya; Graduate Studies Representatives: none; Academic Senate Members: Carolyn de la Peña (F), John Gunion, Lynette Hunter (W&S), David Rocke, Peter Yellowlees; Academic Federation Representative: Juan Arredondo; Graduate Student: Jennifer Weidhaas; and Graduate Studies Staff: Lee Wilce.

EPC Actions: During the academic year 2004-2005, the Educational Policy Committee met 9 times. It also conducted some of its reviews of materials electronically. EPC considered numerous proposals and actions, many of which required more than one meeting to resolve.

Degree Requirements Guidelines. EPC developed a set of guidelines, which were transmitted to Graduate Council for review and approval on 6/30/05.

Rhetoric and Communication M.A. proposal to re-open admissions and change name to “Communication,” approved and forwarded to Graduate Council

Program requests for degree requirement changes, approved and forwarded to Council:

- Art History
- Biological Systems Engineering
- Biostatistics
- Comparative Literature
- Comparative Pathology
- Designated Emphasis in Social Theory and Comparative History
- Epidemiology
- French
- German
- Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Physiology
- Performance Studies

- Philosophy
- Psychology
- Viticulture and Enology

There are no requests for program degree requirement changes that are still in process. Two programs withdrew their requests and will resubmit them next year.

Statement by Chair Shrinivasa Upadhyaya

The EPC saw its role as facilitating graduate programs (departmentally-based graduate programs, graduate groups, and designated emphasis programs) that seek to implement changes to their existing programs. Most of the changes recommended by the EPC were to improve the clarity of the proposals, to strengthen them, or to bring them into compliance with existing regulations or policies and standard wording. EPC developed a set of guidelines for submitting course requirement changes to assist the programs to develop the document. EPC also required that all proposals include a narrative description of their program and degree requirements. EPC wishes to thank Professor Jack Meeks who continued working with the proposers of several of the requests that were carried over from the previous year. EPC also wishes to thank Ms. Lee Wilce for assisting the committee in various matters related to graduate program requirements and meeting deliberations.

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Program Review Committee (PRC) has the primary function of conducting reviews of graduate programs on a regularly scheduled, periodic basis (Graduate programs include graduate groups, departmentally-based graduate programs and designated emphasis programs.) At the completion of a review the PRC recommends action to the Graduate Council.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the Committee met seven times. The Committee members include : Levent Kavvas, Chair; Julian Alston, Jack Hicks, John Labavitch, Jay Mechling, Robert Rucker, Academic Federation Representative: Xiao-Dong Li; Associate Dean for Graduate Programs: Edward Caswell-Chen, Graduate Student: Yvonne Lai, and Program Review Committee Analyst: Kathy Garcia.

Graduate Program Reviews – 2004-2005

The PRC began the year with 12 graduate programs to be reviewed. PRC completed 10 of the reviews and referred two reviews (Mathematics MAT Program and Textiles Arts & Costume Design) to the Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC). All of the reviews were initiated in the 2003-2004 academic year. The PRC referred 10 PRC reports to Graduate Council for consideration and approval. See PRCC report below regarding the two reports referred to this committee.

Graduate Program Reviews and PRC Liaison Assignments

- Agriculture and Environmental Chemistry – Susan Kauzlarich
- Comparative Literature – David Van Leer

- Designated Emphasis in Second Language Acquisition – Julian Alston
- Dramatic Art and Performance Studies – Jay Mechling
- Forensic Science – John Labavitch
- French – Kathleen Ward
- History – Jack Hicks
- Joint Doctoral Program in Ecology – Andy Walker
- Mathematics Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) – Levent Kavvas and the PRCC
- Philosophy – Robert Rucker
- Statistics – Susan Stover
- Textiles Arts and Costume Design – Levent Kavvas and the PRCC

During the 2004-2005 academic year the Program Review Committee Handbook and the Graduate Program Review Guidelines were also finalized after extensive rewriting and revisions of the previous texts, to facilitate the program review process.

The Committee recommended and Graduate Council approved the initiation of eight graduate program reviews for 2005-2006: Biomedical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Cultural Studies, Ecology, Entomology, Epidemiology, International Commercial Law, Viticulture and Enology

Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC)

The members of the PRCC for the 2004-2005 academic year were: Levent Kavvas, PRC Chair, Trish Berger, Edward Caswell-Chen, Paul FitzGerald, Alan Hastings, André Knoesen, John Labavitch, Kathleen Ward and Kathy Garcia, PRCC Analyst.

The Committee began the year with 22 graduate programs in the follow-up phase. Of the 22 reviews, two programs were asked to provide status reports which were forwarded to PRCC. The Mathematics MAT Program and the Textile Arts & Costume Design program submitted detailed progress reports on the steps taken to address the issues in their last PRC report. Based on their reports, the Graduate Council decided not to initiate a new review in the 2005 – 2006 academic year for these two programs. Their action was to close the review of the Mathematics MAT Program and recommended to the Dean of Graduate Studies to suspend admissions to the Textile Arts & Costume Design program.

During the year the Committee recommended to the Graduate Council the closure of 20 reviews, suspension of admissions for 1 program, and further action for 1 program. Council approved all of PRCC's recommendations. The following is a list of programs and actions recommended to Graduate Council.

Closure of reviews: Agricultural and Resource Economics, Animal Science and MAM, Art, Community Development, Comparative Pathology, DE in International Nutrition, Exercise Science, Food Science, Genetics, German, Horticulture and Agronomy, Mathematics Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT), Microbiology, Music, Native American Studies, Plant Protection and Pest Management, Political Science, Population Biology, Sociology, and Textiles.

Suspension of Admissions: Textiles Arts and Costume Design

Further Action by Graduate Council: Nutrition

With the closure of the 20 reviews the Committee has completed the process of closing out the backlog of graduate program reviews.

The PRC wishes to commend and express its appreciation to Kathy Garcia for her exemplary performance in the execution of the graduate program reviews: her organizational skills and careful attention to detail, her continuing efforts to have the reviews conducted and the reports written in a timely manner, and her contributions toward creating a standardized approach to gathering materials and preparing the programs' self-reviews and the reviewers' reports.

SUPPORT AND WELFARE (S&W) COMMITTEE

The Support and Welfare Committee reviews applications for a variety of fellowships, including those from private and public sources. These fellowships cover research expenses, travel to present papers at national and international scholarly meetings, as well as full academic year support in designated fields. It also considers a variety of welfare issues related to the academic lives of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars.

Committee members in 2004-2005: Core Committee: Graduate Council Representatives: Richard Scalettar, Committee Chair, and Judith Turgeon, Academic Senate: Rachael Goodhue, Benjamin Hart, Robin Hill, Terrence Nathan, Lucy Puls, Vicki Smith, Richard Tucker, Michael Zhang, Academic Federation: John Stenzel, Graduate Student: Caren Parrish, Postdoctoral Scholar: None, and Graduate Studies: Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen, Steven Albrecht, and Staff: Lisa Thomas and Lee Wilce. The core committee reviewed the travel awards.

Academic volunteers on behalf of graduate programs: Enoch Baldwin, Beverly Bossler, Lesley Butler, Gretchen Casazza, Tsu-Shuan Chang, Maxwell Chertok, Tom Coombs-Hahn, Robert Cummins, Roger Davis, Christiana Drake, Jelmer Eerkens, Nael El-Farra, Ian Faloona, Jaimey Fisher, Ching-Yao Fong, Rachael Goodhue, Richard Green, Richard Grosberg, Greg Herek, Lynette Hunter, David Hwang, M. Saiful Islam, Michael Kapovich, Dean Karnopp, Elisabeth Krimmer, Leah Krubitzer, Anna Kuhn, Charles Langley, Kwan-Liu Ma, Adrienne Martin, Nelson Max, Jade McCutcheon, Richard McElreath, Terrence Nathan, Orhan Orgun, Ning Pan, Rhacel Parrenas, Caren Parrish, Cecilia Penedo, Raul Piedrahita, Jerry Powell, Lucy Puls, Ruth Reck, José Eduardo Santos, Richard Scalettar, Sabyasachi Sen, Vicki Smith, John Stenzel, Gang Sun, Julie Sutcliffe-Goulden, Alfonso Tramontano, Alex Tsodikov, Richard Tucker, Judith Turgeon, Tony Tyson, Shrini Upadhyaya, Karen Watson-Gegeo, Kazuo Yamazaki, Michael Zhang, Xiangdong Zhu.

Process and new fellowship award policies

All applications for internal fellowships and travel awards were reviewed by at least two members of the committee. The formula weights used to determine awards were 1/7 each for the GRE, the GPA, and the graduate program's ranking and 2/7 for each of the committee reviewer's rankings.

There was some discussion of how to evaluate possible special cases in the Travel Awards process, e.g. students with low GPAs but who have published impressive papers or are in programs like Art for which GPA not a big admission criterion and predictor of success. It turned out that based on 2003-2004 statistics, a humanities student with a GPA below 3.848 would not be competitive; so this low GPA issue is a real one. We decided to have the reviewers look out especially for packets they considered exceptional despite a low GPA so we could consider them carefully.

We discussed the possibility of instituting a diversity criterion in the travel award process, but did not come to a conclusion.

The data in the summary below was provided by Steven Albrecht, Director of the Graduate Studies' Student Financial Support unit.

Summary of Internal Fellowship Awards reviewed by the Support and Welfare Committee during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Please note that awards are for the 2005-2006 academic year, except where noted.

Fellowship Name	Applications	Awards	Award Total
Butler, George S. & Marjorie	8	1	\$2,520.00
Elliott, Marjorie & Charles W.	160	2	\$45,000.00
Faulkner, Richard D. & Kate	10	1	\$18,950.00
Graduate Scholars Fellowship	70	14	\$478,904.00
Hauber, Harriet M.	1	0	\$0.00
Jones, Fletcher	119	1	\$26,959.50
Kraft, Herbert	37	2	\$30,000.00
Krantz, Bert & Nell	29	1	\$1,700.00
Lee, George	21	1	\$1,100.00
Mahan, Laura Perrott	3	1	\$1,991.25
McArthur, Frank	6	1	\$11,160.00
McDonald, James Monroe	10	1	\$1,230.75
McKeehan, Beatrice Oberly & S. Atwood	18	2	\$36,000.00
Richards, Lillie May	13	1	\$15,000.00
Schwall Dissertation, Floyd & Mary	11	7	\$35,000.00
Schwall Medical Research, Floyd & Mary	36	6	\$151,940.36
Stacey, Malcolm R.	2	1	\$43,653.50
Tryon, Herbert	6	1	\$3,083.40
UCD & Humanities Graduate Research	137	40	\$60,000.00
UCD Dissertation Year	80	7	\$191,983.50
Walker, Frank & Carolan	7	1	\$4,648.05
Wilson, Violet E.	2	0	\$0.00
Wood, Elizabeth P.	5	1	\$9,474.75
Wright, Jarena	5	1	\$11,000.00
Zolk, George & Dorothy	184	4	\$40,000.00
Total	980	98	\$1,221,299.06

Fellowships to support Campus Diversity	Applications	Awards	Award Total
Cota-Robles, Eugene	83	7	\$197,657.50
Dissertation Year	41	7	\$201,730.00
Graduate Research Mentorship	46	7	\$192,916.50
McNair	19	2	\$72,880.00
Total	189	23	\$665,184.00
Travel Awards:	Applications	Awards	Award Total
For professional meetings held January 1- June 30, 2005	88	39	\$25,000.00
For professional meetings held July 1- December 31, 2005	110	36	\$25,000.00
Grand Total All Awards	1367	196	\$1,936,483.06

Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award

The Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award recognizes excellence in teaching by graduate students on the Davis campus.

This award was a new task for the Support and Welfare Committee. In the past, the award was sponsored by the Teaching Resources Center and the former Academic Senate Committee on Teaching. At the beginning of 2004 the coordination of this award was transferred to the Graduate Council.

The members of the committee were: Professors Donal Walsh, Chair; Vicky Smith, John Stenzel, Lucy Puls, Edward Caswell-Chen; graduate student Kate Hopper, and graduate program analyst Kathy Garcia.

Seventy-four graduate students were nominated for the award; of those, 15 students received awards.

In closing, Graduate Council wishes to thank all of those who have given of their time in support of graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues during the past year. In particular, the contributions of the members of subcommittees and of the *ad hoc* review committees have been extremely valuable and are deeply appreciated by the Council.

Respectfully submitted,

Trish Berger, Chair
2004-2005 Graduate Council

Members: Trish Berger, Chair; Andrew Waterhouse, Vice Chair; Reen Wu, CCGA Representative; Joan Cadden; Peter Chesson; Alan Conley; Carolyn de la Peña; Jeffery Gibeling, Dean, *ex officio*; Levent Kavvas; André Knoesen; Richard Scalettar; Judith Turgeon; Shrinivasa Upadhyaya; and Evan Watkins. Academic Federation Representatives: Steven Blank and Donald Johns. Graduate Studies Representatives: Associate Dean Edward Caswell-Chen, Faculty Assistant to the Dean Sharman O'Neill, and Assistant Dean Ian Blake. Graduate Student Representatives: Jonathan Karpel, GSA Chair; Ann Kelleher, GSA Vice Chair; Ellen Pyatt (F&W); and Heather Wylie, Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor. Postdoctoral Scholar Representatives: PSA Chair Albert van Geelen and Alison Cole. Graduate Studies Directors: Steven Albrecht, Hector Cuevas, Cathy Jurado and Yuhang Shi. Graduate Studies Analysts: Kathy Garcia and Lee Wilce.

This report was prepared by the Graduate Council Assistant and the subcommittee chairs and staff. The report was reviewed and approved by the 2004-2005 Graduate Council during the period of September 30 – October 9, 2005. Revisions were forwarded to the Graduate Council Chair and Assistant and incorporated in the final report.

**Committee on International Studies
and Exchanges (CISE)**

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

5	Two meetings each in Fall and Winter Quarters; one meeting in the Spring Quarter	5
Total Meetings	Meeting frequency	Average hours of committee work each week

64	N/A	N/A
Total ----- Reviewed 64 petitions for GE credit (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed ----- deferred from the previous year	Total ----- deferred to the coming academic year

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None

Major issues considered by the committee:
Integration of foreign students and scholars within the university community;
Identifying problems and issues of students studying abroad;
Endorsement of initiatives in internationalizing the university curriculum;

Co-operation and coordination with campus-wide units responsible for international studies and exchange;
--

Clarification of criteria for reviewing petitions for GE credit

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Endorsement of creative restructuring of study abroad programs including short term programs abroad

Committee's narrative:

**2004-05 Annual Report
Committee on International Studies and Exchanges (CISE)**

TO: Representatives of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

The Committee on International Studies and Exchanges met five times in 2004-05, on 11/2/04, 12/8/04, 2/5/05, 3/4/05, and 5/20/05 during which its members discussed a broad range of issues pertaining to international studies and exchanges. To enhance the coordination among various campus-wide activities related to international exchanges and studies, the committee has worked and held discussions at our regular meetings with several other responsible units on campus. They included the Office of University Outreach and International Programs headed by Vice-Provost William Lacy, Internship and Career Center headed by Professor Albert Harrison, International Program Development at UC Davis Extensions directed by James Coffman, and the UCD Summer Abroad Program headed by Eric Schroeder. The committee has also agreed on a number of resolutions and made some suggestions for improvement and follow-up actions. Those will be outlined below.

Participation of UC Davis Students in Study Abroad Programs

Political and social instability in certain parts of the world along with the devaluation of the dollar in some regions such as Japan and the EU have cast a shadow on the enrollment of UC students studying abroad in 04-05. Applications to EAP Programs in the UC system are down approximately 3% this year, with year-long programs suffering the greatest impact. Remedies proposed include imaginative structuring and increase of new short-term programs abroad (one to

two quarters) and more discipline-specific offerings to serve a more content-focused student body.

Despite the abovementioned obstacles, the Davis campus continues to attract a growing, not decreasing, number of students who participate in a rich array of study abroad opportunities; there were a total of 425 students on various EAP programs for 2004-05, compared with 350 in 2003-04 and 342 in 2002-03. One exciting expansion of our existing programs can be witnessed in the growth of our Short-Term Programs Abroad (SPTA). With the support from the office of the Vice-Provost for University Outreach and International Programs, Associate Vice-Provost for International Programs Dennis Dutschke reported that the University plans to increase an average of two such short-term programs every year for the next five years. The current enrollment figures for UCD's Short-Term Abroad Program for 2004-05 stands at 101. There are already seven SPTA programs this year, and nine are projected for 2005-06.

Under the new leadership of Eric Schroeder, our Summer Sessions Abroad (SSA) has completed its transition from the UCD Office of Summer Sessions into the UCD Education Abroad Center. The program continues to expand. This summer, it has offered more than 30 courses on six continents with an enrollment of 450 students.

On another front, under the direction of Peter Schiffman, the Education Abroad Center has extended not only its staff members but also much needed office space to accommodate a growing number of students seeking study opportunities abroad.

In yet another area, CISE Chair Chia-ning Chang met with delegations from a number of Japanese and Korean universities during their respective visits to Davis in 04-05. He has also established a continuing dialogue with international education administrators from some of these universities in an attempt to identify specific problems American students often face while abroad as well as ways to encourage more of our students to study overseas. Some of the obstacles he has identified included inadequate accommodation facilities for foreign students, poorly-planned or segregated student populations in some university dormitories, and, perhaps most significantly, relatively few courses taught in English for English-speaking students who have limited or no proficiency in the native language of instruction. Foreign universities he has spoken with are well aware of these problems and are striving to address them.

Internationalizing the University Curriculum

The Faculty Senate Task Force on Internationalizing the Curriculum, formed in 2003-04, has finalized its findings and submitted its report to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate. Based on research and survey of faculty, students, administrators, and staff, the report proposes the following:

- Expand our existing educational abroad opportunities;
- More effectively integrate study abroad and international internships into the university's core academic programs;
- Develop an international component in courses and learning experiences;
- Establish an international component in the General Education program.

These proposals strongly resonate with the UC Davis Strategic Vision Plan with its emphasis on “international education as an integral part of the university’s mission of discovery, learning and engagement.” The proposals were discussed and endorsed by the CISE in our earlier deliberations this year. It should also be noted that the theme for this year’s Chancellor’s Fall Conference held in September 18-20 was “Internationalizing the Davis Campus.”

Review of General education (GE) Petitions Pertaining to Courses Taken Abroad

One of the duties of CISE according to the bylaws of the Davis Division Academic Senate is to designate approved Education Abroad Program courses for General Education credit. During 2004-05 and with the support of our administrative staff Joel Shriver, members of CISE have reviewed and processed a total of 64 petitions, sometimes in consultation with faculty in concerned departments and occasionally with institutions where UC students had attended. The Committee has also examined and compared the narrative on the criteria for GE credit as they appear in the University General Catalog with Academic Senate bylaws governing the granting of GE credit. The process for reviewing and approving/denying petitions were discussed and clarified. It is determined that the Academic Senate bylaws regarding GE credit represents the final authority for CISE’s evaluation of study abroad courses toward GE credit.

Integration of International Students and Scholars within the University

Although a recent survey of 113 universities by the Council of Graduate Schools has found that more than 90% of graduate schools in the US report that foreign applications have declined in part because of national security policies, the Davis campus still attracted some 1,400 international scholars and more than 1,700 international students from over eighty countries during the 04-05 year. The annual national Institute of international Education Open doors survey last year ranked UC Davis 21st in the US for universities hosting the most international scholars. CISE strongly believes that this very considerable and valuable human resource—coming from countries as diverse as China, South Korea, Japan, India, Germany, and Brazil, only to name a few—could be much better integrated within the University for mutually-beneficial ends beyond the visitors’ immediate affiliations with their research units or departments. Efforts to bring them closer to the university’s diverse academic enterprise would in all likelihood give such

scholars and students a greater sense of community and a stronger sense of belonging. In addition, faculty and students from UCD departments or schools outside the visitors' immediate academic affiliations would also benefit from the considerable knowledge, insights, and perspectives our foreign visitors bring with them.

Working with Wesley Young, Director of Services for International Students and Scholars (SISS), CISE has begun an initiative to explore ways to achieve such goals. Recognizing this untapped international resource, CISE will begin writing a questionnaire for our visiting scholars to identify where their interests lay outside of their immediate research areas. The result could provide a starting point for further integration with interested departments such as foreign languages, literatures, History, Political Science, International Relations, etc. At the end of the year, Young and Chia-ning Chang have developed a pilot program categorizing a number of visiting scholars by their country of origin. While this pilot project currently focuses on foreign language departments, it is anticipated to include many more interested departments and disciplines across the campus.

One final point to note is that, in discussions that took place at the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) held in Oakland in November 2004, our committee has been regarded as a model for other UC campuses to emulate. The committee wishes to thank the work of its former Chair Professor Jean-Xavier Guinard along with its continuing and new committee members for their hard work and vision which have brought about such system-wide attention and recognition.

Respectfully Submitted,

Members of the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges:

Beverly Bossler
Anne Britt
Patrick Carroll
Chia-ning Chang (Chair)
Fadi Fathallah
Joanna Groza
Charles Leshner (CISE Representative to the UCIE)
Jatal Mannapperuma
Florence Bouvet (Graduate Representative)
Kalpana Pathak (Undergraduate Representative)

Joel Shriver, Administrative Support Staff for CISE

2004-2005 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE JOINT ACADEMIC FEDERATION/SENATE PERSONNEL COMMITTEE (Period covering September 1, 2004 – August 31, 2005)

The Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC) met 30 times during this period to review packets. Of the 171 personnel actions reviewed, information on the corresponding final decision was available for all actions. The JPC also reviewed 16 departmental voting group and peer review plans. Table 1 in the Appendix provides a summary of all actions per title series and the corresponding committee recommendation.

The total number of actions (171) is only 1 more than the caseload from the previous year (170). Table 2 below summarizes the number of actions reviewed by the JPC and the corresponding recommendation.

TABLE 2	JPC Recommendations			
Actions	Yes	No	Other	TOTAL
Appointment	36	48	4	88
Appointment via Change in Title	10	4	0	14
Appeals	1	1	0	2
Conferral of Emeritus Status*	5	0	0	5
Accelerated Merits	1	1	0	2
Normal Merits	33	5	6	44
Accelerated Promotions	3	1	0	4
Promotions	9	2	1	12
TOTAL	96	62	11	171

*Including Conferral of Emeritus Status to 2 Clinical Professors

SUMMARY OF ISSUES

Regarding this past year, the following were the most critical issues for the JPC:

1. Proposed appointments were at an inappropriate level, typically too low: the JPC did not support 55% of appointments as proposed (56 of 102). In 34 of the 56 appointments, the JPC recommended a higher step than proposed.

2. The position descriptions, specifically for the Professional Research, Project Scientist and Specialist title series, continue to be problematic. Approximately a third of position descriptions submitted were inappropriate.
3. Appointment to serve in the JPC requires a significant time commitment (4-5 hours/week during a meeting week). Appropriate compensation for committee service continues to be a concern for the JPC.

APPOINTMENTS and APPOINTMENTS VIA CHANGE IN TITLE

(referred to as "appointments" collectively in this section)

As expected, the bulk of the actions reviewed were for the relatively new Project Scientist series (effective July 1, 2004) – with 58 proposed appointments plus 12 appointments via change in title. The combined appointments to this new series accounted for 69% of all appointments reviewed by the JPC.

The JPC supported 46 of 102 (45%) of all proposed appointments. The trend in appointments to the Project Scientist series accounts for this low percentage: of 70 proposed appointments to the Project Scientist series, only 30 were supported as proposed (43%). Table 3 below shows the percentage of proposed appointments on which the JPC and the final authority agreed on the appointment level.

TABLE 3: Breakdown of Recommendations on Appointments

		FINAL DECISION					Percent Agreement between JPC & Final Authority
Title Series/ JPC Recommendation		Agree w/ JPC	Higher	Lower	Agree with Original Proposal	Other	
Professional Research							
Yes	7	7	0	0	0	0	100%
NO: Higher	5	4	0	0	1	0	80%
NO: Lower	2	1	1	0	0	0	50%
Other	1	0	0	0	1	0	0%
Project Scientist							
Yes	30	25	5	0	0	0	83%
NO: Higher	22	16	2	0	4	0	73%
NO: Lower	15	13	0	2	0	0	87%
Other	3	3	0	0	1	0	100%
Specialist							
Yes	8	8	0	0	0	0	100%
NO: Higher	7	5	0	1	0	1	71%
NO: Lower	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%
Specialist in Cooperative Extension							
Yes	1	1	0	0	0	0	100%
NO: Higher	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
NO: Lower	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Avg Percent Agreement							82%

For proposed appointments not supported by the JPC, Table 3 breaks down these cases to three distinct possibilities:

1. NO: Higher – This means the JPC recommended a higher step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 71% of these cases.
2. NO: Lower – This means the JPC recommended a lower step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 83% of these cases.
3. Other: For the Professional Researcher case, the JPC deferred their recommendation and sent back the packet to the Dean's office; the packet was more appropriate for the Project Scientist series. The Dean's office, however, agreed with the original proposal and approved the appointment. For the three Project Scientist cases, the JPC reported a split vote, evenly between the proposed appointment and possibly a higher level. The final decisions on these three cases supported the appointments as proposed.

This academic year marked the first full year for the Project Scientist series. The JPC worked closely with the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel in establishing consistency in the appointment process for this title series. The JPC also met with the associate deans from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, along with the Vice Provost, to ensure that these three offices are in agreement as to the criteria for appointment to the title series. The JPC benefited tremendously from these meetings. Specifically for appointments in the Project Scientist title series, the JPC and the final authority agreed on 81% of the cases.

MERITS (including Accelerated Merits)

The JPC supported 34 of 46 (74%) proposed merits. Table 4 below shows the breakdown of the JPC's recommendations regarding these merits:

TABLE 4: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL MERITS

Title Series/ JPC Recommendation		FINAL DECISION			Percent Agreement between JPC & Final Authority
		Agree w/ JPC	Agree with Original Proposal	Other	
Agronomist					
Yes	1	1	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Joint Appointment					
Yes	3	3	0	0	100%
No	1	1	0	0	100%
Professional Researcher					
Yes	14	14	0	0	100%
No	4	3	1	0	75%
Other	5	3	1	1	60%
Specialist					

Yes	2	2	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Specialist in Cooperative Extension					
Yes	14	14	0	0	100%
No	1	0	1	0	0%
Other	1	0	1	0	0%
Avg Percent Agreement					89%

Of the 6 merits which the JPC did not support, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 4 cases; for the remaining two cases, the final authority approved the merits as proposed.

Regarding the 6 proposed merits where the JPC recommendation is specified as "Other":

- In 4 cases, the JPC reported a split vote; the final authority approved these merits as proposed.
- In 1 case, an ad hoc committee was appointed; this case has been deferred for final review by the 2005-2006 JPC
- In 1 case, the JPC reviewed a special request for a first merit after appointment (usually delegated to the Dean's office without committee review). The JPC recommended a change in title; the Dean's office agreed with the proposed merit.

PROMOTIONS (including Accelerated Promotions)

The JPC supported 12 of 16 (75%) proposed promotions; the final authority agreed with the JPC in 11 of these 12 promotions; for the 12th case, the accelerated promotion was denied but a normal promotion was approved. In 3 cases where the JPC voted against the promotion, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 2 cases and approved the 3rd case as proposed. Table 5 below summarizes the JPC's recommendations on these promotions:

TABLE 5: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL PROMOTIONS

Title Series/ JPC Recommendation		FINAL DECISION			Percent Agreement between JPC & Final Authority
		Agree w/ JPC	Agree with Original Proposal	Other	
Joint Appointment					
Yes	2	2	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Professional Researcher					
Yes	8	7	0	1	88%
No	3	2	1	0	67%

Other	1	0	1	0	0%
Specialist in Cooperative Extension					
Yes	2	2	0	0	100%
No	0	0	0	0	N/A
Avg Percent Agreement					81%

AD HOC COMMITTEE REVIEW

Ad hoc review was required in 47 of the 171 actions reviewed by the JPC. The JPC voted as a Committee of the Whole to waive ad hoc review in 45 of these 47 actions. Two ad hoc committees were appointed; one case was finalized, resulting in support of the proposed action (subsequently approved by the final authority). One case is still pending final review by the JPC.

CONFERRAL OF EMERITUS STATUS

The JPC received 5 requests for conferral of Emeritus status to 3 Specialists in Cooperative Extension and 2 Clinical Professors. The JPC supported all 5 requests; the final authority approved all five requests.

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

The development of appropriate position descriptions (PD) continues to be a concern, judging from the JPC's recommendations for revisions in 55 of 171 (32%) cases reviewed. Table 6 below shows the breakdown of recommended position description revisions per title:

Title Series	Revisions Recommended	% of Total Actions
Professional Researcher	20	40%
Project Scientist	17	24%
Specialists	13	72%
Specialists in CE	4	20%
Joint Appointments	1	17%

With the establishment of the Project Scientist series, the JPC has focused on restoring the Professional Research title series to its original definition: research expectation for that series is equivalent to that of the Professorial title. The JPC found that in 40% of the Professional Research actions reviewed, the position description did not include the requirement for the development of an independent research program. Consequently, these PDs also did not include expectations of research productivity as measured by publications in peer-reviewed journals as senior author and grant acquisition as P.I.'s.

Regarding the recommended revisions to 72% of the actions reviewed in the Specialist title series, the JPC found that these PD's do not include the appropriate expectation for research productivity as defined in UCD 330-10a. The expectation for research productivity was either too high (requirement for publications in peer-reviewed journals as senior author) or too low (no expectation stated at all). Moreover, these PDs also do not specify the position's area of specialization.

VOTING GROUP & PEER REVIEW PLANS

The JPC reviewed a total of 15 voting group and peer review plans including one that is specific to an individual Academic Federation member within the unit. Several of these plans have been through multiple revisions. The JPC's recommendations are summarized below:

Accepted	4
Accepted with Recommended Revisions	1
Rejected with Required Revisions	10

In sum, the JPC found that only 4 of 15 (27%) submitted plans were acceptable without the need for revision. This suggests that departments are still having difficulty with the composition of the voting and peer groups.

ISSUES/CONCERNS

Distinction among the Research titles

The JPC recommends further education of the campus with regards to understanding the distinctions among these research titles: Professional Research, Project Scientist and Specialist series. The JPC recognizes that the Project Scientist series is still relatively new and the campus, like the JPC, is still familiarizing itself with the criteria and expectations. The campus needs to understand the nuances among these titles, especially the requirements for independence and the expected evidence for research productivity. As summarized at the beginning of this report, it is clearly evident from the statistics presented that appointment levels proposed by departments are inappropriate in approximately half of the cases, and most often they are too low. It appears that the

departments do not have sufficient understanding of each title series; this is further demonstrated by the considerable number of position descriptions that are inappropriate and therefore require revision.

The JPC is concerned too that recommendations for transition to the Project Scientist series for Professional Researchers are perceived as negative. The JPC carefully considers these cases before making the recommendations; these transitions are recommended only when it is strongly evident that the Professional Researcher has not developed an independent research program and therefore risks not being able to advance in that title.

Committee Service

Service on the JPC entails a substantial investment of time and effort. In 2004-2005, the JPC met 30 times to review packets, and Committee members averaged 4-5 hours per week during a meeting week. This time commitment creates a problem with regard to the appointment of the AF members on soft money (Professional Researchers, Project Scientists and Specialists are typically funded by extramural grants). The funding source might not allow for this amount of personnel time to be devoted to non-research service activities. Thus, in these cases, appointments to the JPC may pose a workload hardship or even an audit risk. Furthermore, the time commitment limits the pool of AF members who are available or willing to serve on the JPC

The JPC proposes consideration of compensation to JPC members relative to what is currently provided for members of the Academic Senate Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP), especially given that these two committees have parallel functions. The JPC understands that respective workloads vary considerably. The JPC recommends compensation relative to its own workload (i.e., for 2004-2005, the JPC reviewed 171 personnel actions compared to 427 reviewed by CAP; the JPC's workload was roughly 40% of CAP's).

Voting and Peer Review Process

The JPC continues to encounter problems with the voting and peer review process. First, there are departments who either do not have an approved voting/peer group plan yet or the plan is currently under revision. Actions from these departments continue to be submitted for JPC review, despite the directive from the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel that actions from such departments will not be reviewed.

The JPC finds itself in a very difficult situation; sending back these actions critically affects the Academic Federation member. These departments need to be duly notified and instructed to develop the required voting/peer group plan. There also needs to be a more constructive consequence for non-compliant departments, other than disadvantaging the candidate.

The JPC has also reviewed actions from departments which do not follow their approved voting and peer review plans. Although the call includes instructions on how to report the departmental vote, the dossier review process does not include

confirmation that the department is following their approved voting plan. There does not appear to be any oversight of the implementation of these plans.

The JPC welcomes any opportunity to assist in the resolution of these issues and would participate in efforts to improve the academic personnel process for Academic Federation members.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Roeske, Chair

Members: Marita Cantwell, Steve Grattan, David Harris, Harry Kaya, Philip Power, Adib Rowhani

APPENDIX - TABLE 1: Committee Recommendations per Title and Action

Action Type	---in AES (Agronomist)			Joint Appointments*			Professional Researcher				Project Scientist				Specialist in Cooperative Extension				Specialist			TOTAL
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Total	
Appointment	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	1	14	21	34	3	58	0	0	0	0	8	8	16	88
Appointment via Change in Title	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	3	0	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	14
Appeals	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Conferral of Emeritus Status**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	5*
Accelerated Merits	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Normal Merits	1	0	1	2	0	2	14	4	5	23	0	0	0	0	14	1	1	16	2	0	2	44
Accelerated Promotions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Promotions	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	2	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	12
TOTAL	1	0	1	5	1	6	29	14	7	50	31	37	3	71	20	2	1	23	10	8	18	171
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Other	Total	Yes	No	Total	

* Joint Appointments: Jointly appointed in the Agronomist and Specialist in CE title series.

**The JPC also reviewed two proposals for conferral of Emeritus status to two Clinical Professors. The JPC supported both proposals.

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Library

Total Meetings: 3	Meeting frequency: Quarterly	Average hours of committee work each week: 1 hour
-------------------	------------------------------	---

Total ----- Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.) N/A	Total of reviewed ----- deferred from the previous year N/A	Total ----- deferred to the coming academic year N/A
--	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

- 1) Inclusion of Committee on Library in the list of committees having representation on the Executive Council as per Bylaw 73A

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

- 1) Representation on the Committee

Issues considered by the committee:

- 1) Resolution on Scholarly Communication
- 2) Efficient methods for authorization of visitors to use Library materials and services (and other campus services).
- 3) SLASIAC (Systemwide Strategic Directions for Libraries and Scholarly Information at the University of California) Report
- 4) There are two new graduate programs in the pipeline for which the committee will be asked to make recommendations on library funding.
- 5) UC Davis License Agreement does not allow for excessive downloading of journal articles – due to overuse by one student – a prominent journal revoked all UC Davis access.
- 6) 2005-2006 issues to consider – Library Budget and Electronic Copyright Privileges

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Committee's narrative: Chair Ray Waddington has retired from UC Davis and is therefore unable to provide commentary.

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Public Service

Total Meetings: 2	Meeting frequency: The full committee met once each in the Fall and Winter quarters. The subcommittee met during the summer to complete their review of the UCDE courses.	Average hours of committee work each week: There is not a weekly quota. There is very little time required to serve on this committee.
-------------------	---	--

Total Reviewed: See below (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total reviewed deferred from the previous year: None	Total deferred to the coming academic year: None
--	--	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None

Issues considered by the committee: Selection of Distinguished Scholarly Public Service recipients.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: We were asked whether or not we would be in favor of a combined Academic Senate awards ceremony and our committee voted unanimously it would. We are not certain of the outcome.

Committee's narrative:

The Committee, after reviewing nominations for the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award, selected four recipients for 2004-2005: Patricia Gandara, Professor of Education; Randi Hagerman, Professor of Medicine and Medical Director of the UCD M.I.N.D. Institute; Jeffrey Mount, Professor of Geology; and, John R. Whittaker, Professor Emeritus of Food Science and Technology. The awards were announced at the May 4, 2005 meeting of the Representative Assembly. A luncheon in honor of the recipients was held at the Chancellor's Residence on May 12, 2005.

The Committee reviewed two proposals for UCD Extension (UCDE) Certificate Programs. A certificate program in Accounting and Sports Event Management were approved. The committee was again this year impressed by the thoughtful design of the courses, by the excellence of the instructors, and the relevance of the courses to the UCDE mission.

The brochure, *Faculty in Public Service*, was updated with information on the most recent DSPSA awardees and was distributed widely to UCD administrators, e deans, directors, and chairpersons. The Senate public service website has been updated and is on line at www.mrak.ucdavis.edu/senate/award/default/html.

A subcommittee completed its annual review of UCDE academic courses in early July.

Respectfully submitted,

W. Jeffrey Weidner, Chair
Cory Craig
Kathryn Dewey
Bernd Hamann
Mark Francis
Joyce Gutstein, ex officio
Suad Joseph
William Lacy, ex officio
Dennis Pendleton, ex officio
Emily Plesser
Steven Tharratt
Karen Windbiel
Kathy Von Rummelhoff, Committee Analyst

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Research

Total Meetings Policy: 7 Grants: 2	Meeting frequency Policy: Approx. 3 meetings/quarter Grants: Approx. 1 meeting/quarter as needed	Average hours of committee work each week 1 hour
--	--	---

Total Grant Proposals Reviewed: Small Grants: 178 Large Grants: 40 Travel Grants: 313 Research Grant Proposals Accepted for Funding in 2005-06: Small Grants: 125 Large Grants: 13	Total of reviewed grant proposals deferred from the previous year: 0	Total grant proposals deferred to the coming academic year: 0
---	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

See note on committee structure in the attached operating guide. It is suggested that the bylaws be updated to reflect the membership as noted under the committee structure section.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Travel Grants: This year CoR will implement a 60 day policy to submit paperwork for reimbursement of travel grants. If the faculty member has not turned in their paperwork 60 days after the trip, the award will be cancelled. We now send out a reminder email to all departments letting them know that the end of the fiscal year is coming and we give them a deadline of when we will accept

paperwork for travel reimbursements.

New Initiative Grants: CoR implemented a policy that will require the faculty members that receive a new initiative grant to submit a status report to us so we will know if the project was successful.

Issues considered by the committee:

COR received and discussed the following reports and proposals from other Academic Senate or administrative committees and provided comments and responses for each of them:

1. Center for Health Services Research in Primary Care
2. Animal Research
3. Interdisciplinary Activities
4. AC Restrictions on Research Funding
5. Review process for CAL ISI's
6. Proposed Information Security Policy and Standards
7. Environmental Health and Safety Policy
8. Shared Governance Senate Bylaw revisions
9. APM 220-18
10. Proposed Amendment to DDBL 28.D and 50
11. Human Subjects Proposal
12. Academic Earmarking
13. ORU Name Change – Program in International Nutrition (PIN)
14. CA&ES Research Concerns
15. Air Quality Research Center (AQRC) Proposed ORU Report
16. Overall ORU process and ORU budgets
17. Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting – presentation and discussion was provided by Mike Allred and Lynne Chronister on the new Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting system that is being developed
18. Campus Policy on Research Misconduct.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Travel Grants: The committee will pay for only May and June travel grants that overlap fiscal years. There have been problems in the past with paperwork overlapping fiscal years. There are several trips that begin in the current fiscal year but end in the next fiscal year. We will allow the paperwork for these reimbursements to be sent in after fiscal close. One issue that came up during the year was whether Emeriti faculty should be eligible for CoR awards. The committee will continue discussing the issue in 2005-2006.

Large Grants (Insurance & New Initiative): The grant proposals that are submitted will hopefully be uploaded to the new MySenate system so the committee can review them online and be prepared to discuss them when they come to the meeting.

Committee's narrative:

The Committee on Research has worked hard to resolve difficulties in the Faculty Research Grant and Travel Grant programs over the last 2 years, and the current system is easy to administer and implement. Furthermore, there has been positive feedback on the system from faculty, staff and administration. The next several years should thus only involve fine-tuning of the current system although it is intended to evolve as Academic Senate and campus priorities change. Also, the Committee on Research has elevated its involvement and influence over the same period. This has occurred through more active committee members meeting regularly and through more involvement with the Office of Research. The appended operational guide is intended to serve as a means to ensure continuity in the COR's operation and to help understand the responsibilities of the chair and members.

Operational Guide for the Academic Senate Committee on Research

This document is intended to assist the Chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Research (CoR) in their responsibilities and the operations of the committee. Furthermore, the intent is to provide institutional memory on the various programs and methods developed over the recent history of the committee.

Committee Structure

Based on the various responsibilities of the CoR, starting in the 2003-04 academic year, a new committee structure was implemented. The CoR currently includes 2 subcommittees, the subcommittee on Research Policy and the subcommittee on Grants. The Grants subcommittee is charged with the operation of the CoR Faculty Research Grant Program and the CoR Faculty Travel Grant Program and this includes implementation of the programs, evaluation of the programs and development of revisions to the programs. The Policy subcommittee is charged with providing Academic Senate input on any and all research issues that effect the Academic Senate faculty.

The Grants subcommittee is comprised of 10 members in addition to the chair of the CoR who serves as chair of both subcommittees. The chair selects a co-chair for the Grants subcommittee who also serves as a member of the Policy subcommittee. As such, the Policy subcommittee includes the chair, 10 members as selected by the Committee on Committees, and the co-chair of the Grants subcommittee. Also, the UC-Davis representative to the system-wide committee on research policy (UCORP) serves as an ex-officio member of the Policy subcommittee. A representative of the Office of Research (typically the Vice-Chancellor for Research) is invited to participate at a portion of each Policy subcommittee meeting as well.

The appointment of members to the two subcommittees is the charge of the Committee on Committees. It is recommended that the Policy subcommittee be comprised of faculty from a broad cross-section of campus who have significant experience in managing research programs and who have a broad perspective. The Grants subcommittee needs to be comprised of faculty from various sectors of the campus to allow for adequate review of the faculty research proposals as described later in this document.

Time Commitment

The Policy subcommittee meets approximately once per month during the academic year. The typical method of operation is that individual members are assigned specific tasks, which most often relate to reviewing existing or new policy and generating a draft policy statement from the committee. The entire committee reviews, edits and approves the final statement, which, most often, is in the form of a letter from the committee chair to the Academic Senate chair. Additionally, the subcommittee chair often queries the members for input on issues that need to be resolved within strict time constraints and are anticipated to be non-controversial. If any individual member desires a meeting to discuss such issues, then one is called.

The Grants subcommittee's time commitment is significantly less. This subcommittee meets once during the Fall Quarter to review the timeline and overall program for the coming year, and to review and revise the Calls for Proposals and any

other material that will be disseminated. The Grants subcommittee then meets an adequate number of times after the Faculty Research Grant proposals are received to allow for the selection of those to fund.

The CoR Chair leads the noted meetings, regularly answers queries on a variety of issues, meets with Office of Research staff as issues arise, meets with other Academic Senate committees and committee chairs as issues arise, and serves on the UC-Davis Executive Council, which meets for 2 hours, monthly during the academic year. The CoR Chair is additionally invited to participate at the bi-annual meetings of the Office of Research External Advisory Board which occur over a 2 day period during Fall and Spring quarters, respectively.

Faculty Grant Programs and Subcommittee Implementation

Based on significant historical problems, the CoR Grants subcommittee made numerous changes in the 2003-04 academic year in order to meet budget constraints, to reduce administrative responsibility, to meet a strict time line, and to select the recipient grants in a fair manner. The revised program was well received by faculty, staff and administration and it has been used for 2004-05 academic year as well. The various elements of the program are described to follow.

Research Travel Grants: The Research Travel Grant program has the broadest impact on campus of all of CoR's programs and CoR has given this program its highest priority. Both subcommittees of COR unanimously support this program even if it means reducing other research grant programs. Faculty are eligible for one travel grant per year, and they are required to be presenting their original work at a professional meeting (for example, presenting a paper, poster or other creative work). While there are many additional reasons for travel that are highly valuable to the university and the faculty, the CoR must restrict its reasons for supporting travel due to its limited budget. Travel expenses are covered up to \$800 per trip and this program is administered through an on-line application system that makes the entire application and award process paperless. There is no restriction on foreign versus domestic travel. CoR has budgeted \$290,000 for this program for 2004-05 academic year.

Small Grants in Aid of Research for Teaching Intensive Disciplines:

In recognition of the support the teaching intensive branches of the university supply to the research intensive branches, COR has the Small Grant (\$2,000) program. The Small Grant application is online as with the travel grants. The form solicits the following information.

1. Name, rank and step, department.
2. Summary of proposed research activity (100 words or less).
3. Date of last merit advancement (or hire).

The monies awarded can be spent for any legitimate research purposes (other than faculty salary) as determined by university rules. Proposals are given a priority ranking which is based on the year of the last merit advance. Thus for the 2005 applications, those advanced in 2004 were ranked first and so on. Furthermore, the lowest ranks and steps receive the highest ranking within a merit year. Thus, the funds are rationed towards those making normal or accelerated progress in the merit system, and within that

group, towards those in the Assistant and Associate Professor ranks (since they have a shorter merit cycle and since the prioritization is based on rank and step). Also, the selection is independent of department, college, etc. for those faculty that are eligible.

CoR has decided that its funds should be distributed in approximately a 50/50 split between the “soft” sciences and the “hard” sciences. Since faculty eligible for the small grants are entirely in the soft sciences and they are additionally eligible for the other faculty research grant program discussed below, CoR has budgeted 40% of its Faculty Research Grant Program to the Small Grant (\$2,000) program. It is necessary to monitor the distribution in the future to ensure that whatever distribution is desired is met. For the program that will be funded in 2005-06 (i.e., grants selected in the 2004-05 academic year), the distribution is about 55% to the soft sciences.

Grants to Promote Extramural Support – Insurance and New Initiative Grants:

In most of the university, there is access to excellent sources of outside funds from State Government, the Federal Government, and private companies. The intent of this program is to support faculty in such a manner that they will produce highly competitive proposals and attain self-sufficiency. As such, the program, has two elements – Insurance Grant Program and New Initiative Grant Program. The amount of these awards are between \$10,000-\$50,000, and all Academic Senate faculty are eligible. Also teams of researchers can apply jointly. The recipients can use the funds for any acceptable research expenditures except faculty support.

The Insurance Grant program is aimed at faculty who have an extra-mural grant application under review, and who seek CoR money as insurance against not receiving the outside funding. They receive the award money only if the extra-mural application is unsuccessful. Essentially, this allows faculty to progress in their research work in the event a grant is not funded and to develop preliminary results that will allow for more competitive proposals in the future. Furthermore, such funds are essential for junior faculty at the start of their careers as it allows them to commit to the support of graduate students. By requiring extramural grant applications, this program is of value in encouraging self sufficiency of the faculty, will be greatly beneficial to the career development of junior faculty, and will allow for the growth of the program as extramural proposals are successful.

The New Initiative Grant Program is aimed at providing seed funds that will lead to major outside grant applications. CoR envisioned that such proposals would eventually allow for the development of unique teams of researchers or unique facilities.

Both programs require a five page application, with supporting documentation of extra-mural funding application for the Insurance category. However, the review process for each program is quite different.

For the Insurance category, each proposal is first reviewed to ensure that it meets the requirements of the program. Then, recognizing the shortcomings of the previous years’ review processes, CoR randomly ranks the acceptable proposals. In this random ranking extra weight is given to proposals from junior faculty and to grants that requested large amounts of extramural funds. Simply, the rankings are based on a random draw lottery in which junior faculty receive an extra ticket as do proposals which request more than 5 times the amount extramurally. As such, Assistant and Associate Professors receive 2 or

3 draws and Professors receive 1 or 2 draws. Such an approach is fair and easy to implement.

The New Initiative proposals are fully reviewed by members of the Subcommittee on Research Grants. The subcommittee review attempts to assess whether the proposal is a new major initiative for the campus, whether it brings large visibility to campus, if it has a high likelihood of success, and if this seed funding will allow the investigators to develop initial results and a proposal for major extramural funding with a high likelihood of success.

Following review of both categories in the Grants to Promote Extramural Support, the committee then carefully reviews the detailed budgets of the highest ranked proposals in an attempt to fund as many projects as possible within budget constraints. Both categories fund projects for a period of 15 months beginning on July 1 and ending September 30 of the following year.

Approval Process:

For various reasons, the 2002-2003 COR overcommitted a significant amount of funds for Faculty Research Grants for the current fiscal year. This deficit caused the administration to request an audit of the COR procedures and to make recommendations on the prevention of such cost overruns in the future. COR has modified its procedures to ensure that cost overruns cannot occur in the future and to ensure that unexpended funds are recovered. First, COR ensures that the budget for each Faculty Research Grant program is adhered to by submitting the complete list of recommended awards for each program to the Vice Chancellor for Research for approval. Second, COR has streamlined the programs and the process to minimize administrative responsibility and to meet a strict timeline. COR notifies all investigators that their department will have 60 days from the end of their project to reconcile the budget so that COR financial representatives will clear out the accounts and recover unexpended funds.

Timeline:

The call for proposals is issued in late February/early March with proposals due end of March/early April. The Small Grants in Aid of Research (\$2K) Program rankings are developed and provided to the subcommittee for their approval in mid-April. The complete list of recommended grants is provided to the Vice Chancellor for Research for approval and the faculty are notified by April 30. The Insurance and New Initiative Grants are reviewed and ranked, the complete list of recommended grants is provided to the Vice Chancellor for Research for approval and the faculty are notified by May 31.

Organized Research Unit Reviews

The methods for reviewing Organized Research Units (ORUs) on campus have evolved over the last year in order to ensure a timely review. The current ORU review committee is comprised on 3 individuals – one external and 2 internal reviewers. The Policy subcommittee recommends a set of people for possible service on these committees as per the request of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research. The Policy subcommittee also reviews the report of each ORU review committee.

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05

Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Student Faculty Relations

Total Meetings 4	Meeting frequency As needed	Average hours of committee work each week 4 – 5 for difficult case.
---------------------	--------------------------------	---

Total ---6----- Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed -0----- deferred from the previous year	Total -1----- deferred to the coming academic year
--	--	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None

Issues considered by the committee. Does a negotiated settlement in determining the grade replacing the disputed assignment of an Incomplete violate the Academic Senate Regulation against reevaluation of a student's work? The Committee felt that the situation warranted the use of the negotiated settlement in determining the student's course grade, and that the negotiated settlement was a contract between the faculty member and student.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: Distribute the fact finding investigation between two members of the Committee with one Committee member getting the necessary information from the student and the other from the faculty member. Historically, the Chair did most of the fact finding investigation. Distributing the investigation among the Committee members will significantly reduce the workload of the Chair.

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Undergraduate Council

Total Meetings: 10	Meeting frequency: Meetings are scheduled every third week of each quarter.	Average hours of committee work each week: Chair can expect to put in 4-5 hours/week; committee members no more than 1 per week.
--------------------	---	--

Total ----- Reviewed: Not applicable. (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total projects deferred from the previous year: One	Total projects deferred/continued to the coming academic year: Two
---	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: DDR-A544 relating to intercampus credit transfers and DDR-A552 relating to a complete overhaul of the Minimum Progress requirements.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: Guidelines and procedures governing the Academic Senate's role in the development of a new campus and for granting divisional status; SCIGETC (Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum; Streamlining the course-major-articulation process between UC campuses and the California community colleges; student computer requirement revision for a Windows-based laptop; Design program transfer from CA&ES to L&S HARCS; BOARS admission criteria; UC Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly Subject A) legislation; Suggestion to change the "University Writing Requirement" and "University Writing Examination" to the "English Writing Requirement" and "English Writing Examination"; Minimum Progress/Time-to-Degree Task Force report on Davis Division Regulation A552; 2008-09 academic calendar proposal; Science & Technology Studies major proposal; Posthumous recognition of student achievements (DDR-A542); responding to the *Mending the Wall* report and response to proposed bylaw amendments; Internationalizing the

Curriculum Joint Task Force Report; Course recordings draft policy; Discontinuance of Civil Engineering/Materials Science and Engineering combined degree; Internship and Career Center administrative review; Program Reviews from the UI&PR Committee; Family friendly policy revisions; Health, safety and environment policies; Streamlining UC course articulation system wide policy (SR477); and the proposed Math/Science Initiative to entice more UC students to become math and science teachers and receive their degree and credential in a 4-year program.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: DDR-A542 relating to Posthumous recognition of student achievements and introducing a regulation regarding English proficiency requirements (now referred to as <i>UC Entry Level Requirement</i> and <i>Analytical Writing Placement Exam</i>).

Committee's narrative:

The Chair of the Undergraduate Council is automatically on the Provost/Senate Chairs meetings, Executive Council, and Undergraduate Advising Council. In addition, I served on the Athletic Administrative Advisory Committee (AAAC), the Program Review Task Force, Co-chaired the Time-to-Degree Task Force, and I chaired the Special Committee on Minimum Progress.

The Undergraduate Council dealt with a number of issues of great importance to the campus. Chief among these were the proposed legislation regarding English proficiency (the "Subject A" question), and the major changes to the way minimum progress is calculated and enforced. However, as is evident in the body of the report, these were not the only issues we dealt with, just the biggest ones. There are many more that the Undergraduate Council will be dealing with in the coming year/years as this council serves a very important role for the campus and care should be taken to ensure that it's value is not diminished.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew Farrens, Chair
Stephanie Dungan, Vice Chair
David Bunch
James Harding

Jay Mechling
Juan Medrano
Lorena Oropeza
Dan Potter
Kathryn Radke
Wendy Silk
Keith Williams
You-Lo Hsieh, ex officio
Fred Wood, ex officio
Lora Jo Bossio, ex officio (F, W)
Frank Wada, ex officio (S)
Aliko Dragona, AF Rep
Ellen Lange, AF Rep
Brianne Beisner, GSA Rep
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on General Education

Total Meetings 5 meetings, averaging 1.5 hrs. each	Meeting frequency 1-3 times per quarter	Average hours of committee work each week: 1 hr members, 3-5 hrs chair.
---	--	---

Total 8 proposals, reports, requests reviewed.	None of the reviewed proposals were deferred from the previous year	None of the proposals were deferred to the coming academic year
--	---	---

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

No bylaw changes were proposed.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Implemented guidelines for interpretation of Davis Division Regulations on General Education. Guidelines are to be used by COCI in review of course submissions.

Issues considered by the committee:

COCI query about topical breadth certification for a specific course as an exemplar

CISE certification of GE courses for Education Abroad Program

WASC criticisms of UCD GE Requirements

SCIGETC proposal

Task Force on Internationalizing the Curriculum recommendation to add an international dimension to GE requirements

The University Writing Program and the GE writing requirement

Concerns about the GE social-cultural diversity requirement

DHC request for GE certification of 4-unit seminar courses

Should UC Davis change its GE requirements?

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

None

Committee's narrative:

The charge of the General Education (GE) committee is to supervise the General Education program. This year, the committee focused on the following items:

- **Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) review of course for GE certification**
 - Guidelines to assist COCI with course review were implemented and distributed to COCI. A GE Committee web site was developed and includes links to these guidelines.
 - COCI requested guidance about GE topical breadth certification for a specific course. The GE committee agreed that the way in which course material is framed and presented to students is central to the intent of the topical breadth requirement. Such a course should take “a critical, analytical perspective on knowledge, considering how knowledge has been acquired and the assumptions, theories, or paradigms that guide its use.” (UC Davis catalog).
 - One member of COCI is also a member of the GE committee, to provide an informed link for implementing policy.
- **Committee on International Studies and Exchanges (CISE) review of courses from the Study Abroad program for GE credit**
 - The committee agreed that EAP courses and summer session abroad courses are closely enough aligned to warrant review by CISE, using current GE guidelines and policies. Guidelines were sent to the chair of CISE.
 - The GE committee chair advised CISE about evaluating an EAP petition requesting GE writing credit.
- **Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) criticisms of UCD GE requirements**
 - The committee is considering how best to address the major WASC criticisms. (UCD requires too few GE units; the WASC goal is 67.5 quarter units. UCD needs to develop ways to demonstrate student achievement in its stated GE objectives.) Proposals for restructuring GE are being evaluated. An interim report from the campus is due to WASC in Fall 2006.
 - The committee reviewed the report “General Education Coursework of Students Graduating in Spring of 2003” prepared by Steve Chatman and Thomas Estes (SARI report 311, Aug 2004) in response to a request from the 2003-04 GE committee. The study assessed the number of GE courses of any classification that were taken by students who matriculated as freshmen and graduated in 2003. Totals were widely dispersed, with significant differences by academic division with which the student's major was associated.
 - The GE committee chair attended the spring 2005 annual meeting of WASC, which focused on “Building Cultures of Learning: Beyond Rhetoric.”

- **Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC) proposal**
 - The committee reviewed and discussed the SCIGETC proposal. Comments were forwarded to Chair Simmons. A major concern was that community college students clearly understand that upper division work in the sciences requires more than the minimum lower division science and math specified in SCIGETC.
- **Task Force on Internationalizing the Curriculum recommendation (Appendix 8) that an international dimension be incorporated into the GE requirements**
 - The GE committee agrees with the value of international experiences and the many study abroad options available to students. However, the specific proposal seemed unworkable in terms of other major and GE requirements, especially for students majoring in science or engineering. The committee recommended that CISE re-examine the proposal to try to fit such a requirement within existing unit limitations and time-to-degree considerations. These issues, as well as affordability over a wider range of students, need to be explicitly addressed by CISE.
- **The University Writing Program's assistance with improving the delivery of the GE writing requirement**
 - Gary Sue Goodman, Director of the University Writing Program (UWP), attended a meeting to discuss how the UWP can assist faculty with effective delivery of the GE writing component of their courses. The intent of the writing component is for students to learn how writing affects thinking and how writing is used in different disciplines. Ways in which the UWP can assist include individual consultations, short presentations to groups of faculty, and day-long writing workshops offered at the start of each academic quarter.
- **Undergraduate Advisory Committee's concern with the broadness of the course list for Social-Cultural Diversity GE requirement**
 - Two members of the Undergraduate Advisory Committee to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies attended a meeting to discuss the diversity requirement. They proposed a stand-alone requirement for a course focused on social-cultural diversity and requested an evaluation of courses currently listed in this category to ensure that current GE criteria are being met. The GE committee is currently reviewing a proposal to revise the diversity requirement.
- **Davis Honors Challenge request for GE breadth credit for 4-unit DHC courses.**
 - In accordance with Bylaw VI, Title V, Section 56C, the Davis Honors Challenge program was referred to COCI for course evaluation to determine general education certification for 4-unit seminars. The discussion between the GE committee and the directors of DHC and Integrated Studies illuminated the need for directors of programs having courses with "umbrella" designations

to inform individual instructors about the GE criteria for courses carrying topical breadth credit.

- **Comments on “Mending the Wall” report**
 - Committee members responded individually to Chair Simmons.
- **Should UC Davis change its GE requirements?**
 - The committee pursued this discussion throughout the year. We agreed that strengthening the writing requirement is the minimum step that must be taken. A number of arguments can be made for a more comprehensive revision of GE. Doing this will be a major effort and will require buy-in by the faculty as a whole as well as the colleges granting undergraduate degrees. The Undergraduate Council and the Executive Committee of the Senate must support the effort and assign high priority to it. Political will and resources must be committed by the campus administration. During the summer, the co-chairs of the 2004-2005 GE Committee met with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Senate, the Chair of the Undergraduate Council, and the Vice-Provost and Assistant Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies to assess support from these quarters. Early during Fall 05, the committee will evaluate the responses and decide how to proceed.

Respectfully submitted: Kathryn Radke (chair), Tom Famula, Gail Finney, Carl Jorgensen, William Lucas, Jay Lund, Roger McDonald, Gail Martinez, Elizabeth Schanker, and Marci Buell (staff analyst)

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Preparatory Education

Total Meetings: 2	Meeting frequency: Upon demand.	Average hours of committee work each week: There is no weekly commitment. The total number of hours required for the total year was between 6-8 hours. The Chair must also attend UGC meetings, which adds a commitment of another approximately 1 hr/week commitment.
-------------------	---------------------------------	--

Total ----- Reviewed: Not applicable. (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed ----- deferred from the previous year Not applicable.	Total agenda items carried forward to the coming academic year: One.
---	--	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: The University of California Entry level Writing Requirement legislation has been approved by our committee and Undergraduate Council. It will be presented for approval to first Executive Council and then Representative Assembly in Fall 2005-06.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: Formulating bylaw language for satisfying the University of California Entry level Writing Requirement (formerly Subject A) and the proposed addition of Linguistics 24 for ESL students.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None.

Committee's narrative:

See below for the proposed language for satisfying the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly Subject A) clarifying what a student has to do to satisfy the requirement both before enrollment and after being admitted to UC Davis. It will be presented to the Executive Council for approval and, if approved, submitted to the Representative Assembly for final approval and implementation of legislation.

Proposed Legislation for the University of California Entry Level Writing (formerly Subject A) Requirement at UC Davis

Students entering the University of California, Davis, must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (SR 636).

A. Prior to enrolling at the University of California, each student may satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement **either**:

1. by attaining a score approved by the University Committee on Preparatory Education on one of the following examinations:

- a. the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam (formerly Subject A Examination)
- b. the SAT II Writing Test
- c. the Advanced Placement English Language and Composition Examination
- d. the Advanced Placement English Literature and Composition Examination
- e. the International Baccalaureate Higher Level Examination in English (Language A only)

or

2. by earning at least 3 semester credits or 4 quarter units of transferable college credit in English composition with a letter grade not below C.

B. A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement prior to enrolling at the University of California, Davis, must satisfy the requirement **either** by passing the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam administered system-wide or on the Davis campus, **or** by enrolling in Workload 57, offered by Sacramento City College, and passing the course with a C or better. The final exam for Workload 57 will be the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam, which shall be evaluated by writing faculty from both UC Davis and Sacramento City College. The final exam will count for a minimum of 15% and a maximum of 25% of the total course grade.

Students must enroll in Workload 57 as early as possible in their first year in residence. A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement after three quarters of enrollment will not be eligible to enroll for a fourth quarter. Exceptions will be made for students placed into Linguistics 21, 22 and/or 23 coursework: these students will have three

quarters plus one quarter for each required linguistic course to meet the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement.

Senate Regulation 636 states that “only after satisfaction of the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement can students take for transfer credit a course in English composition *after* enrollment at UC.”

Respectfully submitted,

Lorena Oropeza, Chair

John Bolander

Linda Morris

G. Thomas Sallee

Wendy Silk

Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst

Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Special Academic Programs

Total Meetings: 2	Meeting frequency: Upon demand; this year twice spring quarter.	Average hours of committee work each week: There is not a weekly requirement. This year only required approximately 6-7 hours for the year.
-------------------	---	---

Total ----- Reviewed: Not applicable. (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed ----- deferred from the previous year: Not applicable.	Total requests carried forward to the coming academic year: One.
---	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: We were asked to continue to look at the potential impacts on academic standards that the move to Division IAA would have on UC Davis. We also were asked to strategize on methods to reduce the increasing cases of academic misconduct. This item will be carried forward to ay 2005-06.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: None.

Committee's narrative:

The Special Academic Programs Committee met this year to discuss issues related to the various academic impacts of the move of Intercollegiate Athletics programs to NCAA Division 1 and to discuss issues of Student Misconduct.

We began discussions of the possible impacts the move to Division 1 NCAA will have on academic standards at UC Davis. However, Division Chair Simmons appointed a Senate Task Force to examine the 2004 report of the Athletic Administrative Advisory Committee subcommittee on Academic Issues, Chaired by Fred Wood. Consequently, we decided not to duplicate the work of the Task Force.

We also met to discuss issues related to student misconduct suggested by Vice Provost Fred Wood, who suggested that Special Academic Programs might need to develop mechanisms to cope with increasing problems of plagiarism and cheating. We considered whether more information is needed from the faculty, but decided against a questionnaire at this time. We suggest that next year the Special Academic Programs Committee explore two types of educational programs.

The first program would be aimed at increasing faculty awareness of these problems and provide guidance on methods to minimize possible plagiarism and cheating. We suspect that many faculty are not aware of the problem and explored ways that term papers can be structured that challenge students to provide their own synthesis, or analysis, and hence, make it virtually impossible to simply download text from the internet.

Another program needs to be developed for students. We suspect that for years students have been allowed, even encouraged by previous teachers, to download information from the internet. They need to learn the differences between plagiarism and the proper use of, and credit for such information.

Some faculty have taken it upon themselves to deliver a lecture or a series of lectures on Academic Integrity, but we fear that many, or even most students miss this important opportunity. This seems to be of at least equal importance to our current General Education Requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

James Harding, Chair
Will Benware
Chia-Ning Chang
Jay Mechling
Marianne Page
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst

**Annual Report: Academic Year 2004-05
Davis Division: Academic Senate**

**Committee on Undergraduate
Instruction and Program Review**

Total Meetings 3	Meeting frequency Monthly during winter quarter	Average hours of committee work each week Highly variable
---------------------	--	---

Total -18 Programs----- ----- Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)	Total of reviewed -10 Programs----- deferred from the previous year	Total ----- deferred to the coming academic year – None.
--	---	--

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Issues considered by the committee
See accompanying narrative.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Committee's narrative:

Please see following pages.

During winter quarter of 2005, the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review of the Undergraduate Council completed its reports on the reviews of the following 18 majors:

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (A&ES):

Agricultural Management and Rangeland Resources	Hydrology
Atmospheric Science	Managerial Economics
Environmental Horticulture and Urban Forestry	Nutrition Science
Environmental Toxicology	Soil and Water Science
Genetics	

College of Letters and Science (L&S):

Art History	Medieval and Early Modern Studies
Art Studio	Sociology
Chinese	Spanish
Economics	Statistics
English	

For each of these programs, the committee reviewed the following materials: the self-review by the home department of the program, the report on the program by the relevant college program review committee (UPRC for A&ES, TPPRC for L&S), and the responses from the department chair and/or master adviser, the dean, and the college executive committee. We have provided specific comments on each of the program reviews in the enclosed reports. In all cases but one, we have endorsed acceptance of the reports by the relevant college review committees. The one exception is the review of Art Studio, for which we found the major conclusions and recommendations unjustified and the resulting punitive action against the department unwarranted and inappropriate.

In addition, we identified six issues that seem to be recurring themes in a significant number of the reviews and that we consider to be important concerns for the entire campus. These are described with specific reference to particular programs in the enclosed reports, and summarized in more general terms in the following paragraphs.

1) Several of the reports were quite old, the departmental self-reviews having been initiated 3-6 years ago. Specifically, seven of the self-reviews were initiated in 2001, three in 2000, and one in 1999. Consequently, the committee questioned whether or not the recommendations made by the college committees, and our comments on them, are still relevant. Efforts should be made to expedite the program review process, ideally so that no more than a year elapses between the initiation of a review by the department and the completion of the report by our committee.

2) Several programs reported a crucial lack of adequate space and/or facilities for teaching. While the committee acknowledges that probably every program would like to have more space, there are certain cases (e.g., the lack of an undergraduate computing lab for the program in Statistics) where such shortages seriously threaten the quality of education provided by the program.

3) Lack of adequate advising for students was raised as a problem in a number of programs. The reports emphasized the importance of dedicated long-term advising staff and of increased faculty involvement in advising.

4) Loss of faculty FTE due to retirements and other causes has already had a significant impact on many programs and these effects are likely to increase in coming years. The potential effects of projected and possible unexpected loss of faculty on teaching programs should be an important consideration in planning efforts for the campus.

5) It appears that a disproportionate number of majors have either a very large number of students or very few students relative to faculty. While we recognize that considerable variation in the size of majors is inevitable, we are concerned that the large class sizes in some programs (e.g., Economics) have negative consequences on the quality of education, while the low student numbers in some very strong majors may threaten their viability. One way to address this problem is by increasing student awareness and knowledge of different majors through improved advertising, increased availability of information, and better internet searching capabilities on the campus website (see number 6 below). Students should have a clear understanding not only of the academic content and requirements of the majors they are considering, but also of average class sizes, proportion of courses taught by visiting lecturers, and opportunities for contact with regular faculty within each program, as well as current career prospects in various fields.

6) Many majors are not well known or clearly understood by students due to lack of adequate advertising and via websites and/or lack of clear and thorough information in the general catalog. We suspect that many students are simply unaware of the existence of some programs and/or that they do not understand what various majors involve and they enroll based on insufficient information. We encourage the administration to work with departments to assist them in improving the quality of their web pages and catalog descriptions of specific majors and to improve the searching capability from the campus website. Ideally, a student should be able to enter a description of the kind of major (s)he wants, with options to include not only information about the student's academic interests but also about issues such as class size in the program and career opportunities for graduates, and thereby call up a list of suitable majors with brief synopses and/or links to up-to-date web pages and more thorough descriptions. As mentioned above, increasing the availability and accessibility of information about all possible majors and the types of educational experiences and professional preparation they provide should help to mitigate the uneven distribution of student numbers across programs.

Partially in response to some of the concerns raised above, Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons last year convened a Program Review Task Force to work towards standardizing the materials and information requested and the procedures for program reviews in the various undergraduate colleges as well to determine the appropriate role for the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction & Program Review in the review process. Committee Chair Dan Potter participated in meetings of the Task Force during winter and spring, 2005, and good progress was made. It is expected that the task force will continue to meet during the 2005-06 academic year.

Committee on Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction
Steps in the Constitution of the New College of Biological Sciences Faculty

- (1) A Divisional Bylaw establishing the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) Faculty must be approved by the Representative Assembly for adoption before any official business may be conducted by CBS. (A proposed Motion and Bylaw are attached.)
- (2) After adoption of the enabling Divisional Bylaw, the Divisional Committee on Committees will appoint an Interim Chair for the sole purpose of drafting the CBS Bylaws. (The Interim Chair may enlist others to assist in this task.) It shall also appoint a college Committee on Nominations, Elections and Rules to conduct a vote on the Bylaws and to nominate a chair and vice chair/secretary of the Faculty.
- (3) The Interim Chair (and others he or she may include in the drafting group) will prepare a set of proposed CBS Bylaws. CERJ (which is charged with reviewing the proposed Bylaws) will meet directly with the drafting group to facilitate the timely production of the proposal.
- (4) Undergraduate Council will consider the proposed CBS Bylaws. We would hope that any concerns could be resolved informally. But in the event of “sharp divisions” over undergraduate educational policy, UGC may choose to bring the proposed CBS Bylaws before the RA. (This would delay finalization of the proposal until after the February 3, 2006, RA meeting.)
- (5) The CBS faculty will vote on the proposed college Bylaws by mail ballot, with a majority of those voting being required for adoption.
- (6) Upon the adoption of the Bylaws of CBS, the college can proceed to organize itself under the terms of its own Bylaws, including the election of officers, appointment of committees and adoption of Regulations.

**Proposed Motion and Davis Division Bylaw
Establishing the College of Biological Sciences**

A new Bylaw 153 of the Davis Division is hereby proposed for adoption.

In addition, the Divisional Committee on Committees shall be empowered to appoint, as soon as practicable, an Interim Chair of the College of Biological Sciences (CBS) for the sole purpose of proposing Bylaws. It shall also appoint the initial membership of a CBS Committee on Nominations, Elections and Rules to (a) conduct a vote of the CBS faculty (as constituted under Divisional Bylaw 153) to adopt Bylaws for the faculty and (b) nominate a chair and vice chair/secretary of the faculty to serve as specified in the proposed CBS Bylaws. The Interim Chair may appoint other Senate members holding appointments in CBS to assist in this task, and the Divisional Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction shall review the proposed Bylaws to ensure conformity with the format and content of the Code of the Academic Senate.

The Bylaws and Regulations initially proposed by CBS shall be reviewed by the Undergraduate Council. If there are “sharp differences” over undergraduate educational policy, the Undergraduate Council may bring the matter before the Representative Assembly which may leave the CBS proposals unchanged or may, by motion, resolve the differences in the proposed College legislation prior to a vote by the CBS faculty.

The vote by the CBS Faculty on the new College Bylaws shall be by mail ballot in an election conducted by the Division, with a majority of those voting being required for adoption.

This resolution, and the Bylaw it proposes, shall become effective immediately upon adoption by the Representative Assembly.

153. Faculty of the College of Biological Sciences

- a. The Faculty of the College of Biological Sciences shall consist of (1) the President of the University; (2) the Chief Campus Officer; (3) the Dean of the College of Biological Sciences; (4) all members of the Academic Senate who hold appointments in the College of Biological Sciences; and (5) all members of the Academic Senate who gained emeritus status as members of the former Division of Biological Sciences.
- b. For purposes of the Bylaws of the College and of the Academic Senate, a section of the College shall be treated as a department.

Rationale

Bylaw establishing the CBS Faculty: Academic Senate Bylaw 45 provides that “the membership of each Faculty is defined by the bylaws of the Division to which it is responsible.” Therefore, this enabling Bylaw is required before the CBS Faculty may conduct business. Academic Senate Bylaw 45 further specifies that membership in the Faculty shall include the President of the University, the Chancellor, the Dean of the College, and all Senate members who are members of departments (sections) assigned to that college, including emeritus faculty. The wording of this proposed Bylaw is similar to the wording of the Bylaws establishing the other Colleges and Schools of the Division (Davis Division Bylaws 141-152).

Role of the Undergraduate Council: The Representative Assembly and Academic Council endorsements of the reconstitution of the Division of Biological Sciences as the College of Biological Sciences were subject to the following condition (as summarized by the Academic Council on March 15, 2005):

The Council notes that approval of the College by the Davis Divisional Senate is conditional on a review of proposed College Faculty bylaws and regulations by the Divisional Undergraduate Council with the requirement that, if there are “sharp differences” over undergraduate educational policy, those differences shall be brought before the Davis Divisional Representative Assembly.

Robert’s Rules of Order, which governs Divisional parliamentary procedure, specifies that such conditions on the establishment of an entity are to be included in the motion to adopt the Bylaws of that entity, and the provided language does so.

Role of the Divisional Committee on Committees: The College is a new entity, and authority must be provided for the proposal of its Bylaws. Because the College is a committee of the Davis Division, the Divisional Committee on Committees can be vested with authority to start this process. After the adoption of the Bylaws, CBS business shall be conducted in accordance with the terms of its Bylaws.

Effective Date: Legislative changes are normally effective on the first day of September following enactment, unless the Representative Assembly specifies otherwise. This motion specifies that the change is effective immediately so that the new College can organize itself in fall 2005.

Graduate Fees and Tuition Academic Senate Resolution

California's sophisticated and technically advanced economy requires highly skilled, critical thinkers to compete in the international arena. Thus, advanced degree graduates are essential to our state's success. This sophisticated education includes hands-on experience in creating new knowledge via research or performance. The faculty are responsible for finding the finances to support research, but during state budget crises, administrative mandates have required that research project funding be applied towards the actual educational cost of graduate student researchers.

At present the campus administration defines both resident and non-resident tuition and fees for graduate student researchers (GSRs) hired on grants to be an employee benefit to be funded by the grant. The result is an increasing and improper burden on faculty research funds, and the likely consequences are

- fewer graduate students funded as GSRs
- increased substitution toward post-doctoral researchers
- changes in graduate program requirements to reduce costs that compromise educational quality
- cuts in other budget categories within grants, leading to reduced research productivity, and
- increased difficulties in faculty recruitment/retention because the same grant at other institutions pays for much more research.

Further impacts are likely to follow from the particularly high cost to faculty from hiring non-resident GSRs:

- the campus will not compete nationally and internationally to recruit the best possible students
- programs unable to recruit graduate students from outside California will likely enroll a weaker and less diverse student population
- programs will find it harder to achieve a critical mass of students in elective graduate courses
- fewer graduate students will be employed and the budget for teaching assistants will represent a higher share of a program's available funding.

These changes all erode research quality and productivity on our campus, threaten the campus reputation for graduate education, and undercut other goals such as internationalization.

We call on the campus administration to either abandon the policy of shifting the cost of graduate fees and tuition to faculty research funds or to articulate the compelling philosophical principles on which the policy is based.