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

Thursday, October 12, 2006
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

Page No.

1. Transcript of the June 1, 2006 Meeting
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 Associated Students of UC Davis President - Darnell Holloway (pending confirmation)
   b. Remarks by the Divisional Chair - Linda Bisson
   c. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
   d. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel
      i. *Appellate Committee
      ii. *Oversight Committee
   e. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Planning and Budget Review
   f. *Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment
   g. *Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
   h. *Annual Report of the Committee on Committees
   i. Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction
   j. *Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards
   k. *Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
   l. *Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee
   m. *Annual Report of the Executive Council
   n. *Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare
   o. Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee (not yet available)
   p. Annual Report of the Graduate Council (not yet available)
   q. *Annual Report of the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges
   r. *Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee
   s. *Annual Report of the Library Committee
   t. *Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure
   u. *Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service
   v. *Annual Report of the Committee on Research
   w. *Annual Report of the Committee on Student-Faculty Relationships
   x. Annual Report of the Committee on Transportation and Parking (not yet available)
   y. *Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council
      i. *Annual Report of the Committee on General Education

*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

Thursday, October 12, 2006
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Memorial Union, MU II

ii. *Annual Report of the Committee on Preparatory Education 135
iii. *Annual Report of the Committee on Special Academic Programs 141
iv. *Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review 143
z. *Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes 146

7. Reports of standing committees - None
8. Petitions of Students - None
9. Unfinished Business - None
10. University and Faculty Welfare - None
11. New Business - None
12. Informational Items
   a. Annual Report Executive Summary 150

Patricia Harrison, 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.
In accordance with DDBL 160 the agenda has been reordered by the Academic Senate Chair with the approval of the Secretary.
1. Transcript of the February 3, 2006 Meeting
   Action: Approved
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 Divisional Chair – Daniel L. Simmons
   b. Remarks by the Staff Assembly Chair – Lin King
7. Reports of standing committees
   a. Graduate Council
      i. Proposed Amendments to DDR 500-520
   Action: Amendment to DDR 500-520 approved unanimously
   Motion: Amendment to DDR 500-520 becomes effective immediately; approved unanimously.
   b. Undergraduate Council
      i. Subject A
   Motion: Adoption of proposed amendment to DDR 529
   Action: Approved
   c. Committee on Committees
      i. Confirmation of 2006-2007 Committee Appointments
   Motion: to request that the Committee on Committees reconsider the Privilege and Tenure Committee appointments
   Action: Motion failed 17:29
   Motion: In the spirit of shared governance we are concerned about the length of time it takes for the administration to respond to the recommendations of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and request a more cooperative association with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
   Action: Unanimously approved: Divisional Chair to write to the Administration communicating the approved motion.
   Motion: to approve the 2006-2007 committee appointments as submitted
   Action: Approved
   d. Distinguished Teaching Awards Committee
      i. Confirmation of the 2006 Distinguished Teaching Award recipients
   Action: Confirmed
   e. Public Service Committee

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.
i. Confirmation of the 2006 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award recipients

**Action: Confirmed**

8. Reports of special committees and/or task forces
   a. Executive Council Special Committee on Shared Governance and Senate Operations:
      i. Proposal to amend DDBL 40-D as endorsed by Executive Council during the December 2005 meeting
      ii. Proposal to amend DDBL 28-C as endorsed by Executive Council during the December 2005 meeting
   b. ICA Task Force Report

9. Petitions of students – None

10. University and faculty welfare - None

11. New business
   a. Visas for International Scholars

**Motion: Resolution regarding the process by which foreign scholars are granted visas to the United States**

**Action: Approved pending revision to remove President Dynes from the list of recipients**

Susan Kauzlarich, Secretary
Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Annual Report: Academic Year 2005-06  
Davis Division: Academic Senate  
Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total ----------------- | Total of reviewed ------------ | Total -------------- deferred to the coming academic year |
| Reviewed 3             | deferred from the previous year 0 | 0                 |
| (courses, proposals, cases, etc.) |                           |                   |

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None

Issues considered by the committee:
Response to Federal agents
Class size and educational value compromised
Boating Safety and effect on Academic Freedom of policy

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

Committee’s narrative:

The committee met three times during the 2005-2006 academic year (1-27-06, 4-7-06, 6-16-06) and submitted three position reports to the Chair of the Academic Senate. One individual case of concern over violation(s) of APM 010 was brought to the committee (see third report).
The first report dated May 3, 2006 contained a series of actions recommended by the campus council. This action was in response to a request by a member of the CAFR for guidelines in dealing with Federal agents requesting information from faculty under the provisions of the Patriot Act. The report requested that the information, supplied by campus council, be placed on the My UCDavis Academic Senate web site. The full report is in Appendix I attached.

The second report dated May 18, 2006 was requested by the Chair of the Academic Senate and is a position paper on the rights of the faculty to limit class size when they feel the educational value of the course is being compromised by the number of students Deans are insisting be accommodated in department courses. The faculty in some colleges find themselves without funds to hire student readers or TA's to correct writing assignments or grade essay examinations. Without this assistance returning graded papers in a timely fashion is not possible and hence neither term papers nor essay examinations are used. Some faculty and students feel this weakens the educational value of the course. The committee opinioned that while this was not an academic freedom issue per se it was a shared governance issue and recommended that in accordance with the AAUP 1915 declaration and Standing Order of the Regents 105.2 b faculties or Department Chairs should bring this issue to the attention of the Academic Senate for discussion and resolution. The full report is in Appendix II attached.

The third report dated July 12, 2006 involves a complaint brought to the committee by a senate member regarding a draft proposal of a boating safety policy unilaterally developed by the Office of Research without Senate or Federation advice or supervision. This policy delegates to an administratively appointed committee the authority to among other things grant approval or disapproval for research projects involving water craft of any kind, recommend faculty discipline, revoke authorization to use water craft in research and establish criteria for determining if a boat operator is adequately trained in water craft safety. It was the opinion of the CAFR that the draft proposal of the Boating Safety Policy is in violation of APM 010 in several sections, and contains arbitrary requirements without adequate delineation of standards to be met, and leaves much of the decisions in the hands of a single individual, the Boating Officer. The full report and the sections that are in need of revision or elimination are contained in Appendix III. A copy of this report will be sent to the incoming Chair of the Academic Senate, with a request to follow up on CAFR recommendations, and the Office of Research.
To: CAFR Members:

Alan Brownstein, Law School
Diana King, Librarian
Catherine Kudlick, History Dept.
Albert Lin, Law School
Ana Vasquez, Student

From: J.H. Theis, Chair

Re: Notification of Faculty regarding Protocol to be followed when Federal Law enforcement officers, acting under the Patriot Act, come to question Faculty Members.
May 3, 2006

To: Chair Academic Senate

From: Chair Academic Freedom & Responsibility Committee

I have obtained from Campus Council a suggested methodology for the faculty to follow in handling requests from Federal agents for information about the faculty members teaching, research or students. I am requesting that this information be placed in the My Senate website and that all faculty be notified that the information is available on the web site.

If a faculty member is contracted in any way by a Federal agent under the provisions of the PATRIOT ACT the faculty member should be aware that the Patriot Act does NOT entitle the FBI to information without a court order.

I.) When a court order is claimed.

Faculty should ask the agent to show them the court order so they may determine precisely what information the court order allows the agent to obtain.

II.) Faculty should inform the agent that any information requested on students, other faculty members, research programs, patient data must first be reviewed by the Campus Council to ensure confidentiality protections are observed before such information can be released.
III.) Faculty should contact the Office of the Campus Council immediately and notify the Office of the court order.

IV.) If the campus council is not available request that the UC Office of the General Council in Oakland be notified.

V.) If the agent is accompanied by a member of the Davis Police Department obtain identification of the Officer. Notify the Campus Police Department of the presence of the FBI agent and his/her identification.

VI.) Specifically request a reasonable amount of time to comply with the court order so that University Council is afforded an opportunity to review the court order for its legal sufficiency, narrow the scope of the inquiry if possible and advise the faculty member how to respond to the court order.

a. If the court order is for specific documents, such as research data, papers, correspondence, several days would be a reasonable time to request for a response.

b. If the court order is a search warrant a request for a delay of several hours in order to contact Campus Council and the Campus Police is reasonable.
Be absolutely certain to document your request for additional time either in writing or by witnesses to your request.

c. If the agent is in possession of a court ordered search warrant and insists upon immediate execution of the search, document the interaction with the agent by witnesses and obtain the identification of the agent but do not impede the search.

d. Request a list of any and all items removed from the Faculty members office or lab before the items are taken. Make the request in the presence of witnesses.

VII.) When there is no court order.

The faculty member has the following options if the agent does NOT have a court order.

a. Decline to talk to the agent.

b. Ask the agent to schedule a more convenient time to meet, but you are NOT required to meet with the agent at all if you choose not to.

c. Redirect the agent to the Campus Council Office or other Officials who may have the information the agent is looking for.

d. DO NOT give any information out if you are NOT certain as to its protection under confidentiality laws until you have consulted the Office of the Campus Council.
e. Request the agent to provide you with a list of the specific information being sought so the Campus Council can determine if any of it falls under confidentiality laws.
To: CAFR Members:
    Alan Brownstein - Law School
    Dianna King – Librarian
    Catherine Kudlick – History
    Albert Lin – Law School
    Ana Vazquez – Student Member

From: J.H. Theis – Chair

RE: The meeting of April 17, 2006 on the matter of Professors determining class size as it
    effects the educational experience at UC Davis.

    Enclosed is the complied report of the committee deliberations on the above issue.

Please read it over and be sure that the report is an accurate representation of the
    committee’s opinion. If I do not hear from any of you by May 18, 2006 I will assume all
    are in agreement with the report and transmit it to the chair Academic Senate.
To: Daniel Simms

Chair UC Davis Academic Senate
301 Voorhies
UC Davis

From: Committee Academic
Freedom UC Davis
J. H. Theis, Chair

Re: Class Size Restrictions by Teaching Faculty.

Academic freedom protects the Professorate from governmental and UC administrative interference in the course content and methodology used by the instructor in teaching and by extension examinations. (APM 010). You requested this committee to produce a position paper on whether APM 010 in and of itself provides the Professorate with the right to refuse to teach class sizes that are too large in their opinion to provide an optimal educational experience for the student.

This issue is particularly relevant to many undergraduate courses offered through departments in the College of Letters and Sciences, but has relevancy throughout the University.

The majority of the committee was of the opinion that the issue of class size was not an academic freedom issue per se. The reason for this opinion is based upon two points. First, APM 010 specifically protects interference in course content and teaching methodology by governmental and administrative authority. To expand the interpretation of APM 010 beyond its specific protections could weaken the ability of the Professorate to rigorously defend the rights as expressed in APM 010. Secondly, APM 010 makes no guarantee that there will be an allocation of resources to ensure that the Professorate has the where with all to teach and examine students in a fashion they feel maximizes the
educational experience. However, the committee was unanimous in its opinion that the quality of the educational experience at UC Davis is of great importance to the society that the University serves and because of this should be of importance to the Academic Senate and Federation Members.

There is merit in considering this issue of excessive class size as a shared governance matter in which the faculty has lost complete control over the allocation of fiscal resources necessary to carry out the teaching mission of the University. Assignment of courses offered by departments to faculty of those departments is the responsibility of the chair of the department; however the 1915 declaration of Principles by the AAUP makes it clear that the Professorate is not without rights in refusing to accept assignments that infringe on the quality of the instruction. The AAUP made a special point of stating that the faculties are the appointees but are not in any sense the employees of the administration.

The student representative on the Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committee had the following to say about class size. “Large classes make the student lazy. You don’t make an effort to really study for classes when you have multiple choice exams. It limits what students gain from the college experience. You are not really getting an education out of these types of classes”.

The standing order of the Regents 105.2b specifically delegates authority to the Academic Senate to authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate division or other University academic agencies approved by the Board except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in
Professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, or over non degree courses in the University Extension. The Senate therefore has supervisory powers over courses and should evaluate its role in determining course support.

Furthermore, as stated in the Privileges and Duties of members of the faculty, prepared by the Special Committee on Educational Policy and issued by Robert G. Sproul Feb 15, 1935, “An intelligent planned educational economy, which formulates plans essential for the realization of the ends for which the university exists, will necessarily define and limit the activities of individuals and departments. Such definition and limitation are no infringement of academic freedom provided a). The plan or idea is itself reasonable and b). The plan has come into being through the democratic means of discussion and mutual give and take within the faculty rather then arbitrary imposition from without”. To the extent that assignment of class size by Deans and department chairs exceeds the limits necessary to maintain quality of instruction, such plans are not educationally reasonable. Similarly, the assignment of such classes to teaching faculty without appropriate discussion and input from faculty would constitute an arbitrary imposition.

It is important for the Senate to consider this issue either as a result of a group of faculty or departments coming forward with a resolution to defend the quality of the educational experience as UC Davis by limiting class size in accordance with the instructors methods of teaching or for the Chair of the Senate to bring this matter before the Senate for discussion and resolution.
CAFR Review of the Draft Proposal

In response to a grievance submitted to CAFR by an academic senate member with regard to the policies of the Boating Safety Manual, the committee met to discuss the proposal in light of APM 010 and the issues of shared governance raised by the policy’s provisions.

It is the findings of CAFR that several sections contain provisions or regulations that impinge on APM 010 and principles of shared governance.

Section 2.20-1 stipulates that the boating safety committee “shall review and request revisions to all projects using boats” 4.10 “Project Approval” requires description of project and its goals. The scientific goals and the methodology are the purview of the Researcher and may not be dictated or otherwise compromised by administrative direction. Further APM 010 specifically carries with it the necessity of only peer review of scientific work. The methods used to determine membership of the committee 2.10 1-2(a-b) and 3 do not provide for ensuring that scientists with expertise to review the merits of the project or its goals will constitute the committee membership. Out of 15 current members, only 2 could be considered peer review scientists.

All sections not dealing specifically with matters that pertain to the safe operation of water craft must be amended and those aspects related to the evaluation of the scientific goals or project per se must be stricken from the Boating Safety Policy.

Item 2 under 5.30 communications encroaches on APM 010 in that it makes the research work and the researcher subservient to complying with arbitrary business hours and radio and phone availability. Field research is not predictable in terms of time expended and does not start or stop according to the clock or some non-business hour designation. The field work may by planned for a specific period of time, but if conditions change and the researcher decides to stay in the field for a longer period that is their right under APM 010 whether it is possible to notify anyone of those changes at the time let alone before the fact is not relevant. Section 5.30 1 and 2 need to be completely revised. Ocean going vessels are not the same as kayaks, sail boats, or inner tubes and hence one stipulation on communications will not fit all use conditions of water craft.

The second category of problems with the draft proposal of the Boating Safety Manual falls under shared governance.

The authority granted to the Boating Safety Committee under 2.20, 2.30, and the stipulations contained in 2.40, 2.50, 2.60, and 2.70 require that appropriate Academic Senate committees be consulted in the formulation of these regulations. For example 2.20-8 states that the Boating Safety Committee “shall sit as a board of investigation to inquire into the nature and cause of boating accidents or violations of the University Boating Safety Manual.” Investigations of faculty misconduct are joint responsibilities of the administration and Academic Senate committees. It is unacceptable for the Office of Research to unilaterally delegate such responsibilities to an administrative appointed committee without academic senate approval.

The Boating Safety officer under 2.30 assumes arbitrary and potentially capricious authority. Under 2.30-3, the Boating Safety officer shall suspend boating
operations considered to be in imminent danger of causing bodily injury, death, property loss or environmental damage. There are no criteria specified as to when any of these actions may be appropriate. It is not possible for the Boating Safety Officer to be on every field trip involving a water craft so the ability of the Boating Safety to "know" when there is "imminent danger" is non-existent.

Section 3.00 administrative procedures and training requirements including 3.10 through 3.50 are arbitrary and they contain no specific declarations of standards to be met, where they can be met, and what training program(s) is/are recognized by the university as meeting the requirements. For example under 3.10-1 "Complete appropriate boating training." There is no specified course or boating organization designated as having the necessary training program to satisfy 3.10-1. Item 3.50 provides no indication as to what or how one is to "document successful completion of boat safety training." Is it necessary to cover and know how to operate aids to navigation systems if one is only using an inner tube as a watercraft or a kayak? Section 3.00 must be completely rewritten and all arbitrary authority and standards deleted. The most valuable information for this section would be to specifically list courses in boating safety that meet university standards and who gives such courses, where they are given, what they cost, how often one needs to be re-certified, and what types of water craft each course is designed to cover.

The following recommendations are made:

1. The Boating Safety Committee should be appointed by the Committee on Committees to include both Academic Senate and Academic Federation members only. Ex-officio members that are recognized boating safety experts may be included at the discretion of the Boating Safety Committee.

2. The Boating Safety Officer should be chosen by the Boating Safety Committee members.

3. The duties of the Boating Safety Committee should be confined to:

   A. Determining the locations, times, course content, and costs and qualifications of extramural boating safety courses that cover different water craft issues and ensuring that faculty involved with research that use water craft have been certified as completing the appropriate course for the type of watercraft they will operate in their research activities.

   B. Providing course information through the Office of Research to faculty using water craft in their research activities.

   C. Notifying faculty when their certification is in need of renewal.

   D. Collecting and maintaining records of boating accidents reported by faculty to the US Coast Guard or the California
Department of Boating and Waterways as appropriately provided by the faculty member making such reports.

Respectfully submitted,

Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
Alan Brownstein
Catherine Kudlick
Albert Lin
Diana King
Jerold Theis, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 8</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: upon receipt of appeal(s)</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 3-4 when appeals are received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total appeals reviewed: 28</td>
<td>Total of reviewed appeals deferred from the previous year: 8</td>
<td>Total appeals deferred to the coming academic year: 3 (not included in this report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: None.

Committee’s narrative:

The 2005-2006 Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC) received 28 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 8 times, averaging 2 hours per meeting, to discuss these appeals. Three appeals were received late in the summer and were deferred to the incoming CAPAC (2006-2007). These three appeals were not included in this report.

CAPAC recommended granting five of 28 appeals reviewed. In two of the five cases, CAPAC recommended actions 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th># Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(excluding the 3 pending cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th># Cases</th>
<th>GRANT APPEAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grounds of Procedure</td>
<td>Grounds of Merit</td>
<td>Grounds of Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: CAPAC Recommendations to the Individual Deans
(excluding the 3 pending cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th># Cases</th>
<th>Grounds of Procedure</th>
<th>Grounds of Merit</th>
<th>Grounds of Merit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: CAPAC Recommendation vs Final Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th># CASES</th>
<th>GRANT</th>
<th>DENY</th>
<th>GRANT</th>
<th>DENY</th>
<th>PENDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Lenora Timm, Chair (Spring/Summer)
Linda Bisson, Chair (Fall/Winter)
Stuart Cohen, Bruce Gates, Gail Goodman, Eugene Steffey, and Diana Howard
(Academic Senate Analyst)
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, as well as 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 effort, impact and outcome.

The files that were forwarded to CAP were mostly well prepared. Evaluations of the impact of service activity were usually absent. Descriptions of administrative functions seldom came to CAP with sufficient documentation of effectiveness or impact to be useful.

**Pace of Activity**

During the 2005-06 academic year (September through August), CAP met 41 times and considered 472 personnel actions. CAP also provided advice on numerous other issues related to academic personnel. The normal turnaround time for agenda items was 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 212 cases fell into this category in 2005-06. 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 21 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 2005-06 academic year, 16 assistant professors were appointed by the Vice Provost to serve as non-voting observers on ad hoc committees.

Academic Personnel Actions, 2005-2006

Table 1 provides a summary of CAP’s deliberations by category for the past academic year. CAP considered 79\(^1\) appointments, 116 promotions, 178\(^2\) merit actions, 43 appraisals, and 56 other actions. Twenty-one 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 53 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.

Promotions: With respect to promotions to Associate Professor, CAP recommended promotion in 48 of 60 cases (Table 3). Based on career equity reviews, CAP recommended a further acceleration of the candidate than was requested in four cases. In 54 cases, the faculty members were promoted by the administration. Three additional faculty received merit increases in lieu of promotion.

CAP supported 50 of 56 promotion actions to full Professor (Table 4). In one of these cases CAP recommended a further acceleration than was requested at earlier levels of review. The administration promoted 51 faculty members to full Professor.

---

\(^1\) Includes via change in title, endowed chair, and initial continuing non-Senate faculty appointments.

\(^2\) Includes retroactive, accelerated continuing lecturer and lecturer merits.
High Level Merit Increases: CAP considered 37 actions for advancement to Professor, Step VI and supported 32 of these cases for advancement (Table 5). The administration gave a merit increase to Step VI (or above) in 32 of these cases. There were a total of 16 requests for advancement to Professor, Above Scale (Table 6). CAP supported advancement in 12 cases. The administration granted advancement in 13 cases. CAP recommended 16 of 19 proposed merit actions within Professor, Above Scale (Table 7). The administration granted 17 merit increases, with 1 action pending decision.

Other Merit Actions: CAP also considered merit actions within the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor ranks. For the rank of Professor, CAP considered a total of 53 actions (Table 8). CAP supported 36 actions as proposed, including advancement in addition to that requested by the faculty member in 2 cases. An additional 15 cases were supported by CAP for a lower step than proposed, among which eight received retroactive merit increases. The administration granted merit increases in 52 cases. At the Assistant and Associate levels, CAP reviewed a total of 30 proposed merit actions (Table 9). CAP supported 27 actions as proposed, and in 2 cases recommended a retroactive merit increase to a lower step. The administration concurred.

Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV: In previous years, it has been policy that a faculty member who had spent six 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 six 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 three 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.” Two of the 22 cases that CAP reviewed involved skipping a step. CAP recommended favorably in all 22 cases and the administration agreed.

Career Equity Reviews: To address potential inequities at both the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement, Career Equity Reviews are
conducted. 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 6 career equity reviews that were initiated by faculty (Table 10). Out of these, CAP recommended an equity adjustment in 5 cases. CAP also routinely performs a career equity review for every major advancement.

**Five-Year Reviews:** CAP made 15 five-year reviews, recommending 2 “advancements,” 11 “performance satisfactory, no advancement,” and 2 “performance unsatisfactory, no advancement.”

**Initial Continuing Appointments:** CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 13 initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2005-06. CAP made favorable recommendations for an initial continuing appointment in 11 of these cases. The administration approved all 13 initial continuing appointments. Teaching excellence, with a capital “E,” is a requirement for a continuing appointment.

**Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers:** CAP considered 9 cases of accelerated merit advancement for Continuing Lecturers. While CAP made favorable recommendations in all 9 cases, it recommended a further one-step accelerated merit increase beyond the normal two-step in 5. Teaching excellence, course design and organization of teaching materials, contribution to curriculum and workshop development, student advising and mentoring, instruction-related service to campus and profession are some considerations that CAP looks upon favorably in making positive recommendations.

**Faculty Personnel Committees:** Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise the deans with personnel actions redelegated to the deans. In 2005-06, 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 293 cases (Table 11). In addition, the Committees conducted 53 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):** Catherine Morrison Paul 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 on salary scales and off-scale salaries, assessment of the relationship of UC’s faculty salary schedule to the merit system, proposed modifications to the language criteria for advancement to Step VI and above scale, comparison of CAP practices/differences on sister campuses, responding to challenges facing scholarly communication, role of research collaborators, and various amendments to the APM.
Other Policy Matters: During 2005-06, CAP commented on several campus or Universitywide policy matters. CAP made appointments of Faculty Personnel Committees based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. CAP reviewed voting procedures for the following departments:

Family & Community Medicine  
Human & Community Development  
School of Education  
VM Surgical & Radiological Sciences

The Committee reviewed various other items, including the following:

- Cross-Departmental Searches Based on Campus Initiatives
- Disestablishment of Exercise Science
- Review of Faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series
- Proposed revisions to the APM regarding advancement to Professor, Step VI and advancement to Professor, Above Scale
- Proposed revisions to UC Davis Policy and Procedure Manual Sections 200-20 – Establishment or Revision of Academic Units and 200-25 – Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs.
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### Table 1. Personnel Actions Referred to CAP 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointments</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Accelerations</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor*</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Change in Title</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Continuing Non-Senate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appointments</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor*</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Promotions</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merit Increases*</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor*</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retroactive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Lecturer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer, SOE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Merit Increases</strong></td>
<td>178</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Actions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Deferrals</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Reviews</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOE Screenings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP Screenings</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actions</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miscellaneous Actions</strong></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Personnel Actions   | 472   | 135           | 21     |

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Associate Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion to Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Increase to Professor VI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit Increase to Above Scale</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Promotions to Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>CAP(∞)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion denied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate resigned; no decision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(∞) These are CAP’s recommendations based on original proposed action
### Table 4. Promotions to Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>CAP(∞)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion approved at a lower step than proposed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion approved at a higher step than proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion denied, but a merit increase approved</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion denied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5. Merit Increase to Professor, Step VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>CAP(∞)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit approved at a higher step than proposed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit approved at lower step than proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step VI denied, but normal merit approved to Step V retroactively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step VI denied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
<th>CAP(∞)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit approved at a higher step than proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit denied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+) one ad hoc split 1-1-1

(∞) These are CAP’s recommendations based on original proposed action
Table 7. Merit Increases within Professor, Above Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept. Yes</th>
<th>Dept. No</th>
<th>Dean Yes</th>
<th>Dean No</th>
<th>CAP(∞) Yes</th>
<th>CAP(∞) No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Merit Actions Concerning: @

- Skipping a step (23)
- FPC Members (10)
- Department Chairs (11)
- Associate Deans, Vice Provosts, etc. (11)
- Request by Dean for CER (1)

By target level: P2 (1), P3 (10), P4 (16), P5 (9), P7 (7), P8 (6), P9 (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept. Yes</th>
<th>Dept. No</th>
<th>Dean Yes</th>
<th>Dean No</th>
<th>CAP(∞) Yes</th>
<th>CAP(∞) No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action approved as proposed</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit approved but at a lower step than proposed</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit approved but at a higher step than proposed, including Dean's CER request</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(+ seven FPC member actions lacked Dean’s letter
(*) eight of the lower step merits were awarded retroactively to 7/1/05 per CAP’s recommendation
@ three candidates were in two categories, i.e., being an FPC member and skipping a step
(∞) These are CAP’s recommendations based on original proposed action
### Table 9. Merit Increases Within Assistant and Associate Professor Ranks, including 10 Accelerated Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP(∞)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit approved but at a lower step</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10. Career Equity Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Dean</th>
<th>CAP(∞)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action approved</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action denied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are CAP’s recommendations based on original proposed action*
### Table 11. Redelegated Merit Actions+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FPC Recommendation</th>
<th>Dean’s Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Humanities, Arts and Cultural Studies</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Social Sciences</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*+) The figures do not include “first actions after promotion” in which the Dean makes decisions without FPC input.

(++) The School of Education had five “first actions” in which the FPC did not participate.
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.


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

**2005-2006**

### College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joy Mench</td>
<td>Animal Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adel Kader</td>
<td>Pomology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Jenkins</td>
<td>Biological &amp; Ag Engrg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Reid</td>
<td>Food Science &amp; Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Brush</td>
<td>Human &amp; Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Dvorak</td>
<td>Plant Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kyaw Tha Paw U on sabbatic leave 2005-06

### College of Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmet Palazoglu</td>
<td>Chem Engrg &amp; Materials Sci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Lund</td>
<td>Civil &amp; Environ. Engrg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biswanath Mukherjee</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Miller</td>
<td>Applied Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Lewis</td>
<td>Electrical &amp; Computer Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case van Dam</td>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Aero. Eng</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### College of Letters & Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Nutter</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Mani Tripathi</td>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Cecilia Colombi</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Roussas</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Cogley</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Warren</td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Division of Biological Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Harada</td>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Sanderson</td>
<td>Evolution &amp; Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Myles</td>
<td>Molecular &amp; Cellular Biology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carlito Lebrilla (Chemistry)

Andrew Ishida (NP&B)
**Graduate School of Management**

Peter Lindert (Economics) - Chair  
Robert Smiley (GSM)  
Anand Swaminathan (GSM)

**School of Law**

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

**School of Medicine**

John McGahan (Radiology) - Chair  
Joseph Antognini (Anesthesiology)  
Richard Maddock (Psychology)  
Michael Holland (Biological Chemistry)  
Jerold Last (Internal Medicine)  
Peter Franks (Family & Community Medicine)  
Mary O’Hara (Ophthalmology)  
Carroll Cross (Internal Medicine)  
Robert Berman (Neurological Surgery)

**School of Veterinary Medicine**

Alan Buckpitt (Molecular Biosciences) - Chair  
Mary Christopher (Pathology, Microbiology & Immun.)  
Richard Lecouteur (Surgical & Radiogical Sci.)  
Peter Ihrke (Medicine & Epidemiology)

**School of Education**

Suad Joseph (Anthropology) - Chair  
Jon Wagner (Education)  
Barbara Merino (Education)
### Committee on Planning & Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 22</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: biweekly</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: members: 2-3 hrs/week. Chair: 4-5 hrs/week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total proposals reviewed: 29 TOE (6), POP (7), and Endowments (15)</td>
<td>Total deferred proposals from the previous year: none</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year: 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed: none

### Listing of committee policies established or revised: none

### Issues considered by the committee: See narrative below.

### Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
- Establish the flow of required data/reports annually from outside sources (Athletics, ORMP, etc.). The Committee requires ample time to review the information before guests attend meetings.
- Review POPs, TOEs, and Interdepartmental Initiative Hire policy/procedures, and assessing outcome of these hires
- Review and comment on the FTE formula
- Review and follow-up on ORUs (policy on ORUs calls for Deans to compile information from individual centers and then report to CPB)
Committee's narrative:

(Please see the Instructional Space Advisory Group's (subcommittee of CPB) annual report for ISAG details.)

CPB met with the following guests in the 2005-06 academic year:

- Virginia Hinshaw, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Barbara Horwitz, Vice Provost – Academic Personnel
- Daniel Simmons, DD Academic Senate Chair
- Linda Bisson, Academic Senate Chair Elect
- Kelly Ratliff, AVC-Resource Management and Planning
- Cheryl Lohse-Brown, Associate Vice Chancellor for Development
- Babs Sandeen, Interim VC of University Relations
- Jan Corazza, Director of Camp Plan/Prog
- Martin Grenzebach - President of Grenzebach, Glier and Assoc. (consultant)
- Greg Warzecka, Director of Athletics
- Bob Bullis, Associate Athletic Director, Business & Facility Operations
- Janet Gong, Associate Vice Chancellor-Student Affairs
- Rick Keller, AVC, Capital Resource Mgmt
- Terrence Murphy, Chair of College of Biological Sciences
- David Webb, Chair of Letters and Science
- Howard Day, Incoming Chair of Letters and Science
- Thomas Joo, Chair of Law
- Richard Plant, Chair of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences
- Matthew Farrens, Chair of College of Engineering
- Jay Lund, Civil and Environmental Engineering Professor
- Jeffery Gibeling, Dean of Graduate Studies
- Fred Wood, Interim Vice Provost, Undergraduate Studies
- Robert Agee, Associate Director, Budget in ORMP

Endowments, POPs, and TOEs Reviewed:

- **Table 1:**
  - Endowment Proposals Reviewed (15 total, 7 unapproved, 8 approved)

- **Table 2:**
  - Partner Opportunity Program Proposals Reviewed (7 total; all approved)

- **Table 3:**
  - Target of Excellence Proposals Reviewed (6 total; all approved)
**Table 1: Endowment Proposals Reviewed (15 total, 7 unapproved, 8 approved)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endowment Proposals Reviewed (15 total)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not approved (7):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Bo Tomas Brofeldt Endowed Chair in Emergency Medicine – FFE, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Endowed Professorship for Roger Tatarian in Cardiovascular Medicine in the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*School of Medicine Cancer Center Professorship in Basic Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dean's Endowed Chair in Medical Research the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed John and Joan Fiddyment Chair in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Family Professorship of Engineering and Entrepreneurship Endowed Professorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. K. Kellogg Endowed Chair in Sustainable Food Systems, College of Environmental Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[*deferred to 2006-07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved (8):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Professorship in Schizophrenia Research in the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Professorship for Physician's Training in the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's Endowed Professorship for Clinical Teaching Excellence in the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly and David Fiddyment Chair in Teacher Education in the School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Chair in International Economics, Department of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Professorship for Physician's Training in the School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Professorship for Luke and Grace Kim in Cultural Psychiatry, School of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel J. Dykstra Chair in the School of Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Partner Opportunity Program Proposals Reviewed (7 total; all approved)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Opportunity Program Proposals Reviewed (7 total; all approved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua Breslau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Geddes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiela David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Margininer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camie Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marya Schedchtm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Schweitzer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Target of Excellence Proposals Reviewed (6 total; all approved)

| Target of Excellence Proposals Reviewed  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6 total; all approved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Svoboda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Szalay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Zaller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dubielzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Deneckere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other proposals reviewed:

- Proposal to Establish a New Graduate Group and M.S. Degree Program in Environmental Policy and Management (EPM)
- Reviewed the Proposal to Establish New Ph.D. Program - Horticulture and Agronomy
- Administrative Name Change – Lacy Unit Name Proposal
- Quarter Campus Calendar
- Academic Council Review of UCAAD Statement on Diversity
- APM 700, 710, 711, 080 Formal Review
- Initiative Hiring, Guidelines, and Recruitment
- Task Force Report on Compensation, Accountability, & Transparency
- Establishment and Disestablishment of Departments - PPM 200.01, 200.20, 200.25
- Private Funding for Salaries
- Nominations for the Chancellor (naming opportunities)
- DDR 141
- Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Exercise Science
- UCAAD Statement on Diversity
- Proposal for SOM Division of Critical Care, Dept. of Pediatrics

Key issues reviewed/discussed by the Committee:

- Monthly Systemwide Planning & Budget (in Oakland) updates were given to CPB by attendee. UCPB highlights:
  - CPB noted concerns with the letter that was mailed to incoming UC freshman signed by the Governor & President Dynes supporting the 4 year Math/Science teaching programs. The program was seriously under-funded and not ready to be implemented.
  - Davis noted as greatest debt load of UC campuses due to major construction
o UC receives less and less funding from state – it operate more like a private university; working on potential impact of privatization
o Discussed the impact of a proposal for funding high-level executive salary increases using private donations as a means for improving compensation at UC. The proposal was withdrawn
o Lack of funding of the Education Abroad Program
o UC Laboratories are being viewed as businesses
o Reviewed Sick Leave policy in order to clarify/create procedure

- Non-resident tuition fee discussed. The Committee viewed it as a solution to the disincentive to hire best and brightest international students due to exorbitant fees and paying salaries on research grants. The impact for the approved NRT Memorial was analyzed.
- Arranged the Instructional Space Advisory Group Subcommittee for the academic year
- Discussed the requirements, criteria, and the need for an annual performance evaluations from CPB for Organized Research Units (ORUs).
- Highlighted the Administration’s view that graduate education is ranked second after undergraduate education in the allocation of teaching resources
- Reviewed the proposed guide for allotment of supplemental instructional resources and recommended to ORMP that a TA's in graduate courses be included (since they were excluded from the TA need calculations)
- Reviewed the disposition of the gift tax and accountability for the use of those funds
- Noted that Athletic Department report was due to the committee before the end of the fall quarter; however, it was delayed until later winter
- Evaluated the lack of adherence to general hiring procedures on campus and highlighted the need to create awareness of impact to FTEs, ORUs, etc.
- Discussed Non-UC Student Lab Research
- Reviewed The Dollar Guidelines, which provided minimums, not maximums, and did not cover naming schools and colleges. CPB was concerned that the donor never sets academic priority or policy, and also noted the misleading use of the term “distinguished”
- Discussed the Advancement Finance Plan with ORMP & Development. Suggested a change in slope to get a picture of the real costs of fundraising. Division I and the new stadium fundraising were discussed.
- Reviewed hiring practices and search plans. Outlined that the practices should be looked at as a principle verses defining a process
- Requested the attendance of all Faculty Executive Committee Chairs from each college/school to consult with CPB on the interdepartmental/cluster hire initiatives in order to understand what was working and not working campus wide
  o Discussed Initiative Hires in detail and wrote the attached letter as a summary to the Committee’s and Faculty Executive Chair’s concerns.
Hosted the annual Provost/Office of Resource Management & Planning/Committee Planning & Budget Retreat. The following priorities of the Provost were discussed the following: 1) FTE Allocation, 2) Graduate Student Support, and 3) Faculty Salaries

Discussed supplemental instruction and the capital building plan and the operating budget with Office of Resource Management & Planning

Discussed the Comprehensive Campaign

Reviewed the Education Abroad Program Budget situation for UCD. Noted the program’s serious financial situation and future issues

Reviewed the Comprehensive Campaign Report and noted that University Relations has a 1 million dollar budget shortfall. CPB agreed that another Academic Senate committee, not necessarily CPB, should agree to review the budget part of Athletics Program on an annual basis and analyze consequences (suggested perhaps Undergraduate or Executive Council).

Reviewed the Athletics Report: Budget. The Committee noticed that the Athletics budget is short $200,000, and will be short funds until 2008. Also highlighted that the “Campus Reserve Fund” will pay for stadium

Discussed the Faculty Salary [De]Compression Issue and reviewed alternative approaches that could be utilized for Rank or Step Options for UCD Faculty with Vice Provost Horwitz and Kelly Ratcliff. Also discussed the salary allocation of .05%

- Requested that the School of Medicine report to the Executive Committee with a detailed analysis of the Dean's proposal for the use of the allocated 0.5% of base funds that were distributed to address faculty salary compression

Discussed the Capital Building Plan, the Campus Budget Overview, and Operating Budget and Five-Year Capital Program Report with ORMP

Reviewed how teaching is viewed as penalty during faculty merit and promotion review discussions

Questioned the use of POP and TOE process/procedures

Discussed graduate student fees and grants with Dean Jeffery Gibeling

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Orel, Chair

Patricia Conrad, Jozsef Lango, Ross Bauer, Ian Kennedy, Jane Ling-Wang, Shirley Chiang, Richard Sexton, Dan Simmons, Bruno Nachtergaele, Jerry Last, Ted DeJong
VIRGINIA HINSHAW, Provost  
Office of the Chancellor and Provost

RE: FTE Initiative Process Summary

Dear Provost Hinshaw:

As the campus ends the first round of the FTE initiative process, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has analyzed and critiqued the process using input from the College Executive committees and information from the Provost's office. We hope our input will improve the process for future initiatives. This letter provides a summary of the conclusions CPB has reached.

First, and most important, the initiative process coupled to a lesser extent with the current POP and TOE process, have shifted a major portion of academic planning from the departments who are responsible for core disciplines to the administration and to ad-hoc clusters of faculty. Coupled with the constraint of small or zero faculty growth over the recent past, and the fact that FTE generated by retirements are now collected centrally, this has lead to an erosion of resources needed to maintain core areas. However, CPB recognizes that some flexibility in the system is necessary to allow the campus to adjust to changing times and identify new research foci. Therefore we recommend the following:

1) The campus should recommit to the principle that the majority of FTE allocated should be normal department based FTEs based on department academic plans that address the academic goals and needs of the campus. CPB and the various executive committee chairs from the Schools and Colleges agreed that some administrative flexibility in the FTE allocation process is needed, but that it should represent no more than 10-15% of the total FTEs allocated.

2) No FTE allocated by formula should require matching or otherwise also be devoted to the initiatives.

3) Faculty-generated initiatives that build on existing and unique strengths and opportunities of the Davis campus should be supported over top-down proposals that are based on seeking extramural funds that may be immediately available. The last initiative process, due in part to the shortened time-line, did not fully engage the faculty in the process.

4) Since all of these new FTE positions were created from student growth, any position that is allocated should have some teaching component articulated in the original request for the position. Even if that description of teaching is primarily limited to graduate instruction, some clear expectations for filling existing teaching/mentoring needs or opportunities for developing or expanding of teaching programs must be articulated.

Finally, CPB was concerned about the implementation of the FTE process as regard to hires. We endorse the recent memo from the Chair of the Academic Senate addressing this issue. We are only commenting on those issues that have the highest importance and relevance to academic planning issues. We recommend:
1) All FTE allocations should go to colleges/schools and departments. Those that are allocated for interdisciplinary initiatives must be recruited with appropriate interdisciplinary input from other units, including ORUs, but the final decisions and negotiations must be done by the responsible department chairs and deans and be in accordance with department academic plans. All initiatives must have a letter of support from the chairs of all of the (potentially) affected departments.

2) Details as to the area of research for the FTE, the proposed home department (or departments for split appointments), and the proposed hiring procedure should be clearly outlined in the proposal. Proposals which are vague on these details should be rejected or returned for modification.

3) The current FTE initiative process required interdepartmental proposals and encouraged intercollegiate proposals. This ignores the possibility of a (single) department-based initiative that would lead to excellence in research and meet core academic needs. The FTE initiative process should be amended to also encourage such activities.

Sincerely,

Ann E. Orel, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

C: Dan Simmons, Academic Senate Chair (Davis Division)
## Committee on Admissions and Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 6 (2 hrs each)</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: approximately bi-monthly (as needed)</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 1 Average hour of Chair work each week: 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 total policies/procedures reviewed</td>
<td>0 proposals were deferred from the previous year</td>
<td>0 total proposals deferred to the coming academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed
None.

### Listing of committee policies established or revised
- Committee approved admitting all ELCs for Fall 2007
- Structured Committee in adherence to Bylaw 50

### Issues/topics considered by the committee
- High school GPA and SAT scores in UC eligibility and selection
- UCD and Systemwide comprehensive review guidelines and criteria weights
- Subject A requirements at UCD
- UC eligibility policy
- UC honors grade bump policy
- American Tribal Members & UCD selection
- Time to Degree
- Reviewed “The Impact of the High School Academic Performance Index (API) on Student Eligibility” (CPEC, 2006)
- Reviewed “The Role of Advanced Placement and Honors Courses in College Admissions” (Geiser, Santelices, 2004)
- Reviewed “Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions”
- Reviewed “The Impact of the High School Academic Performance Index (API) on Student Eligibility”
- Per request of Davis Division Chair Simmons, the following items were reviewed:
  - DDB 141
  - Naming Opportunities
  - APM 700, 710, 711, 080
  - Initiative Hiring Recruitment documents
  - Task Force on Compensation, Accountability, & Transparency report
  - PPM 200-20
Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

- More committee involvement in reading process
- Impact on Time to Degree and on SAT scores of SES indicators in the UCD comprehensive review process
- Progress in moving towards a more holistic comprehensive review process, as well as focus more on the marginal applications and transfer students

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 2005-06 academic year are listed below:

- The main focus of the Committee involved studying and exercising stewardship of the comprehensive review process. Also, since many students apply to other UC campuses, their applications are being read multiple times. The Committee briefly discussed a centralized review process.

- During each meeting, the Admissions Office provided and discussed regular updates regarding the admissions cycle for freshman and transfer students. The Committee would like to be more involved in the reading process as well as the transfer selection process (the majority of the Committee’s focus was previously on freshman admits) in the upcoming year.

- A data project involving SATII writing scores in combination with ESL status was commissioned by the committee and completed by analytic staff in the Admissions Office. The project involved, among other things, data on the application relating to the language spoken in the home (English, English and another language, or primarily another language).

- 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. The issue underwent intensive examination in BOARS and was discussed at the Committee level. BOARS decided not to remove the bump in order to focus efforts on the greater need of reforming the eligibility construct itself and working on foundational issues.

- Conducted a meeting devoted to a mini reader-training session in order to understand the readers’ challenges and processes. The Committee obtained a greater appreciation for the process and more in-depth knowledge of the requirements than it had previously.

- Reviewed a proposal under which Native American tribal status would be considered a “plus” factor in the admissions process. A letter from A&E sent to Vice Chancellor Judy
Sakaki encouraged continued attention from systemwide due to the extremely low rate of Native Americans at the UCs.

- Discussed results and data of a study reviewing the impact of doubling the weight of the SATII writing score in the admissions process. There was only a small change to overall time-to-degree statistics, although the change reorders students in the admissions process. The data and conclusions were passed on to Fred Wood and time-to-degree task force.

- The College of Biological Sciences & College of Engineering removed their floors on test scores in order to comply with systemwide guidelines regarding comprehensive review.

- The Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) process was reviewed. 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. The Committee approved admitting all ELCs for Fall 2007.

- The Davis Comprehensive Review CR selection procedure was discussed at various times throughout the year, specifically how to obtain a more holistic review (which includes academic context). The correlation of low family income and low test scores was discussed. The Committee met with systemwide directors, Susan Wilbur (Director of Undergraduate Admissions) and Nina Robinson (Director of Policy & External Affairs), to discuss the CR process. Susan and Nina provided thoughts/ideas on how Davis could improve the sophistication of its CR process, as well as the Systemwide CR process overall. Clarified the need to take extra personalized time with the marginal applications and not necessarily read each application that is easily accepted. Susan Wilbur and Nina Robinson to assist with obtaining more pre-packaged data for the read process in the future.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark Rashid, Chair of the Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Terry Nathan, Jennifer Chacon, You-Lo Hsieh, Keith Widaman, Pamela Burnett, Darlene Hunter, Tom Lindholtz, Mary Dubitzky, James Schaaf, Sue Williams (Fall only), Ken Machida, Ami Vora, and Diana Howard (Senate Analyst)
Annual Report: Academic Year 2005-06
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 5</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: As needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 1-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average hours of Chair work each week: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total policy/procedure reviewed: 9 | Total of policy/procedure deferred from the previous year: 0 | Total policy/procedure deferred to the coming academic year: 0 |

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: none.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: none.

Issues considered by the committee: also see below in Committee's narrative.

The following policies/procedures were reviewed as requested from Davis Division Chair Dan Simmons:

- APM210 - examples of criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Appraisal
- APM 700, 710, 711, 080 - family friendly policy 700
- APM 240 and 245 - Audit monitoring, procedures implemented for searches
- APM 210 and 500 - Points of accountability, monitoring of Deans and the Provost
- Initiative Hiring Documents
- Task Force on Compensation, Accountability, & Transparency final report
- UC Statement on Diversity
- Faculty Salary Scales Memo from PEVC Barbara Hinshaw
- Revised Administration of Student Discipline Report
- Diversity data added to website

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

- Permanent position on the Davis Division Executive Committee
Committee's narrative:

- The Committee determined the need to have a permanent position on Executive Council. The Chair was able to participate on Executive Council for the majority of 2006 as a rotating seat; however, the position was not permanent. The Davis Division 2006-07 Senate Chair pledged that the Chair of A&E would have a permanent position in 2006-07.

- MySenate was a web portal utilized as a tool in order to schedule meetings and review and post documents for the Committee.

- A direct link to UC Davis diversity information on the home page of the UC Davis web site was established. The UCLA’s web site provided the example of how accessible and detailed diversity information should be to the public.

- A diversity data project was completed by the previous Academic Senate analyst regarding faculty diversity efforts. The diversity data was added to the webpage.

- The role of the Senior Advisory Group was discussed. Twenty major units on campus have senior advisors (usually at the Assistant Vice Chancellor level) who attend regularly scheduled meetings. These individuals (the Diversity Unit Coordinators) are trained to implement policies and priorities for their respective units. A training and orientation program has been in development over the past year to train the senior advisors on affirmative action and diversity issues such as APM 210, 500, and diversity issues as a whole. The training program was effective in Spring 2006.

- A Campus Climate Survey was developed. The Administration’s Affirmative Action and Policy Work Group created a subcommittee to work specifically on the survey. AEVC Rahim Reed suggested an operation of collaboration; therefore, a member of the Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee (Michael Moroski) was nominated to sit on the Affirmative Action & Policy Work Group in order to provide feedback on all affirmative action issues.

- The Committee discussed the status of the UC “Target of Diversity” hiring program. UCSC was rumored to be using the “Target of Diversity” program as a tool to hire qualified Post Docs. At UCSC, this program utilized Post Docs who had worked successfully is then possibly transitioned into a tenure track position without going through the recruitment process. AA&D worked with AEVC Rahim Reed to review the diversity of Academic Federation in order to determine if a case should be made for being considered a feeder group for tenure track positions as well at UC Davis.

- The Committee reviewed the uses for the following programs: Target of Excellence, Target of Opportunity, and Target of Diversity.

- The campus previously implemented an exit interview/survey for staff. AEVC Reed wanted to revive the exit interview/survey process (6-8 questions) for faculty who leave the university in order to understand the reasons behind their departure. The Committee requested data from 3-5 years ago as well. The goal was implementation by the end of 2006 in order to survey those scheduled to depart UC Davis this year. AA&D expressed interest in participating in the development of survey questions.

- Pamela Burnett, Director of Admissions, attended the last meeting in order to discuss the declining enrollments of African American (AA) students. She noted that the over enrollment in 2006-07 increased minorities/diversity. The Committee and Pamela also
discussed the handout “AA Students by Gender”, why graduation rates are lower for minorities, and dispelled the myth that AA students are mostly athletes. The Committee was also interested in demographic admissions information and in obtaining data regarding student academic migration for the Committee in 2006-2007.

- The President’s Task Force on Faculty Diversity was established in order to review what is working, what is not working, retention issues, the campus diversity climate, geographical challenges, best practices, and other issues at UC Davis.

The Committee reviewed the Diversity Task Force Report. This is the third diversity taskforce completed; a report has been published approximately every 10 years in an attempt to correct the issue. A task force for each campus will be convened in order to address specific campus issues in 2006-2007. In 2006-07, AA&D will thoroughly review the report and create a drafted statement (with the collaboration of the other diversity committees on campus) to send to the administration and Academic Senate Executive Council.

The Committee noted the following areas of concern within the context of shared governance and best practices:

- the hiring promotional packages tied to declining minority representatives on campus
- the importance of the direction of outreach
- the strategy for accountability

Respectfully Submitted,

Bruce Haynes (Chair)

Angela Onwuachi-Willig, Christopher Elmendorf, Carlito Lebrilla, Dennis Wilson, Ching Yao Fong, Benjamin Lawrance, Rahim Reed, Michael Moroski, Martha Stiles, Avanindar Singh, Yuan Nui, and Diana Howard (Academic Senate Analyst)
### Total Meetings:
- **23**

### Meeting frequency:
- **Weekly**

### Average hours of committee work each week:
- **3½ - 4 hours per week**

### Total Committees/Task Force Members Appointed:
- **37 Academic Senate Councils, Committees and subcommittees with a total of 220 committee members.**
- **In addition, CoC provided names for 18 administrative task forces/committees.**

### Total deferred from the previous year:
- **Not applicable**

### Total deferred to the coming academic year:
- **Not applicable**

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
CoC proposed that the membership of the Faculty Research Lecture Award (DD Bylaw VI, TITLE V, 76) be appointed by Committee on Committees, using the rationale that all other standing committee membership is appointed by the CoC and that it would assure better balance of representation. It was approved.

### Listing of committee policies established or revised:
This was the first year CoC appointed a Chair Elect to begin as close to January 1, 2006 as possible and must be noticed at the first Representative Assembly meeting thereafter. DD Bylaw IV, 11.5 states: “The Chair-Elect shall confer regularly with the Chair of the Division and participate in the activities of the Executive Council, to insure thereby that the programs of the Division are not impaired by a change in its leadership.” The Chair Elect assumes the office of Chair on the following September 1 for a 2-year term.

This was also the first year CoC appointed a Parliamentarian as mandated by DD Bylaw VI. Title II. 34(G) and the charge is as follows: “...to advise the Chair of the Assembly on matters of Parliamentary procedure.”

### 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.
Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: CoC now sends confirmation appointments by both intercampus mail and email once the Representative Assembly confirms the membership.

Committee's narrative:

In accordance with Bylaws 11, 11.5, 12, and 13 of the Davis Division, we report the appointment of the following officers of the Davis Division for the academic year 2006-07:

Chair: Linda F. Bisson  
Vice Chair: Robert L. Powell  
Secretary: Patricia A. Harrison  
Parliamentarian: Jerry Kaneko, Emeritus

In accordance with Bylaw 29(C) of the Davis Division, we report for confirmation the following appointments to standing committees for the academic year 2006-07. 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 Personnel Oversight:  Catherine Paul Morrison, Chair, Chris Calvert, Vice Chair, William Casey, Laurel Gershwin, Ines Hernandez-Avila, Chip Martel, Jerry Powell, Chris Reynolds, and Steve Tharratt (UCPA Rep: Chris Calvert; Alternate – Catherine Paul Morrison).

Academic Personnel Appellate:  Bruce Gates, Chair, Stuart Cohen, Ron Hedrick, Joy Mench, and Lynn Roller.

Admissions and Enrollment:  Keith Widaman, Chair, Jennifer Chacón, Penny Gullan, Terry Nathan, and Ron Phillips (BOARS Rep: Jennifer Chacón).
Affirmative Action & Diversity: Bruce Haynes, Chair, Christopher Elmendorf, Ching Yao Fong, Carlito Lebrilla, Gloria Rodriguez, Jon Rossini, and Monica Vazirani (UCAAD Rep: Bruce Haynes)

Campus Council for Information Technology: Carolyn Bledsoe, Chair and, Michael Hogarth (MED), Recommended members (to be confirmed by Provost Hinshaw and Vice Provost –IET Yellowlees) are: At Large: Wes Wallender (CA&ES), and Niels Jensen (Engineering); COCI Rep: Roger McDonald (CA&ES) or Richard Plant (CA&ES); P&B Rep Bruno Nachtergaele (L&S MPS); COR Rep: Jon Ramsey (VM) or Keith Widaman (L&S SS); and UGC Rep: John Stachowicz (CBS) (ITTP Rep: Michael Hogarth)

Committee on Committees (Elected – not appointed): Robert Flocchini, Chair, Marta Altisent, Alan Buckpitt, Susan Stover, Craig Tracy, William Hagen, Zhojun Bai, Richard Lecouteur, and Brian Mulloney.

Courses of Instruction: Roger McDonald, Chair, Linton Corruccini, Adela de la Torre, Mohammed Hafez, Richard Plant, and Benjamin Shaw.

Distinguished Teaching Awards: Mike Saler, Chair, Frances Dolan, Krishnan Nambiar, Jim shackelford, and Gina Werfel.

Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction: Jay Helms, Chair, Tom Farver, and G. J. Mattey.

Emeriti: Alan Jackman, Chair, Zunilda Gertel, Bill Lasley, Maria Manoliu, Dean Simonton, Robert Smiley, and Haig Zeronian.

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers: Robert Rucker, Chair, Ed Imwinkelreid, Evelyn Lewis, Martine Quinzii, and Dino Tinti.

Faculty Research Lecture: Steve Kowalczykowski, Chair, Bruce Hammock, Zuhair Munir, Geerat Vermeij, and Tilahun Yilma.

Faculty Welfare: Brenda Bryant, Chair, Allison Coudert, John (Jack) Gunion (need to replace), Saul Schaefer, Lisa Tell, Chi-Ling Tsai, and Alan Jackman (UCFW Rep: Brenda Bryant).

Grade Changes: Greg Miller, Chair, Robert Becker, Paul Bergin, Andres Resendez, and Francine Steinberg.

Graduate Council: Shrini Upadhyaya, Chair, Nicole Baumgarth, Vice Chair, Anne Britt, Matt Farrens, John (Jack) Gunion, Lynette Hunter, Tonya Kuhl, Walter Leal, Martha Macri, Jay Mechling, Hans-Georg Meuller, Jeffrey Schank, and Jeff Gibeling, ex officio (CCGA Rep: Shrini Upadhyaya).
Graduate Student Privilege Adviser: Jerry Hedrick.

International Studies & Exchanges: Pablo Ortiz, Chair, Anne Britt, Beverly Bossler, Fadi Fathallah, Cristina Martinez-Carazo, and Frank Verstraete, (One vacancy for Art Krener who retired) (UCIE Rep: Beverly Bossler)


Library: Winder McConnell, Chair and Andrew Waldron (All other members are appointed by their colleges and/or are ex officio due to their positions) (UCIE Rep: Winder McConnell).


Instructional Space Advisory Group (Subcommittee of P&B): Patricia Boeshaar and Joseph Sorensen (Chair and one other member are appointed by P&B and other members are ex officio members).

Privilege and Tenure - Hearings: Bill Hing, Chair, Colin Carter, Mary Christoher, Deborah Diercks, Hanne Jensen, Robert Hendren, Thomas Joo, Denise Krol, Jim Maclachlan, Sally McKee, David Shelton, and Fern Tablin.

Privilege and Tenure – Investigative: Daniel Link, Chair, Greg Kuperberg, Vito Polito, Lisa Pruitt, and Eugene Steffey (UCPT Rep: Daniel Link).

Public Service: Paul Heckman, Chair, John Largier, Peter Moyle, Barbara Sellers-Young, and Steve Tharratt.


Student-Faculty Relationships: Joanna Groza, Chair, Rance LeFebvre, Raul Piedrahita, and Keith Williams.

Transportation and Parking: Judith Stern, Chair, Eitan Gerstner, Susan Handy, Charles Hunt, and Quirino Paris.
Undergraduate Council: Dan Potter, Chair, Keith Williams, Vice Chair, Matt Bishop, Linda Egan, Tom Famula, Alessa Johns, Phil Kass, John Yoder, Elizabeth Constable, Jay Mechling, Richard Levin, and John Stachowicz (UCEP Rep: Keith Williams).

UGC General Education: Kathryn Radke, Co-Chair, Jay Lund, Co-Chair, Elizabeth Constable, Bill Lucas and Patricia Boeshaar (COCI Rep: to be appointed by COCI).


UGC Special Academic Programs: Jay Mechling, Chair, Chia-Ning Chang, Krishnan Nambar, Ning Pan, and Wendell Potter.

UGC Undergraduate Instruction & Program Review: John Stachowicz, Chair, Timothy Morgan, and Aaron Smith (All other members are appointed by their college).

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes: Silas Hung, Chair, Hussain Al-Asaad, Abdul Barakat, Patricia Boeshaar, Andrew Chan, Christyann Darwent, Ting Guo, Sandy Harcourt, Rajiv Singh, Joseph Sorensen, Julie Sze, Matthew Traxler, Nancy True, Jean Vanderheynst, Bryan Weare, and Rena Zieve.

Our Davis Divisional Representatives and Alternates that were elected/appointed are as follows:

Representatives through 8/31/07: Robert Irwin, Brian Morrissey, and Terence Murphy.

Representatives through 8/31/08: W. Jeffrey Weidner, Matt Farrens, and Margaret (Peg) Rucker.

Alternate Representatives: Alternate #1 – John Rutledge (through 8/31/07); Alternate #2 – Jerold Last (through 8/31/07); Alternate #3 – Birgit Puschner (through 8/31/08).

To conduct our business, the Committee on Committees conferred with the following individuals as guests during Fall 2005 and Winter 2006:

- Daniel Simmons – Chair, Davis Division Academic Senate
- Virginia Hinshaw – Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Jeff Gibeling – Dean, Graduate Studies
- Andrew Waterhouse – Chair, Graduate Council
Dan Potter – Chair, Undergraduate Council
Marion Miller-Sears – Chair, Committee on Research
Carolyn Bledsoe – Chair, Campus Council for Information Technology
Ann Orel – Chair, Planning & Budget

In addition to replacing members on a routine basis throughout the year, assembling the 2006-07 Academic Senate committees, and designating fifteen individuals to serve as our Davis Representatives to the system wide counterpart of their divisional committees, the Committee on Committees fulfilled a broad array of requests. CoC appointed or nominated members of the Davis faculty to serve on the following administrative committees and task forces (information in parentheses indicates the origin of the request):

- Primate Center 10-year Review Committee (Vice Chancellor Klein, Research);
- Faculty Discipline Panel (Vice Provost Horwitz, Personnel);
- Review Committee for School of Education Dean (Vice Provost Horwitz, Personnel);
- UC Davis Prize for Scholarly Teaching and Scholarly Achievement Selection Committee (Chancellor Vanderhoef);
- Review Committee for Veterinary Medicine Dean (Vice Provost Horwitz, Personnel);
- Recruitment Advisory Committee for Vice Chancellor of University Relations (Chancellor Vanderhoef);
- Recruitment Advisory Committee for Dean of College of Biological Sciences (Chancellor Vanderhoef);
- School of Public Health Task Force (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- Graduate Student Support Task Force (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- General Education Task Force (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- ORU Review Panel for the Institute of Transportation Studies (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- ORU Review Panel for the Institute for Data Analysis & Visualization (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- ORU Review Panel for the Bodega Marine Laboratory (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- ORU Review Panel for the Institute of Governmental Affairs (DD Academic Senate Chair Simmons);
- Interim Chair of the College of Biological Sciences (DD Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons);
- Research Compliance Officer Search Committee (Associate VC Lynne Chronister, Research);
- College of Biological Sciences Committee on Nominations, Elections and Rules (DD Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons); and
Review Committee for UC Davis Extension Dean (Vice Provost Horwitz, Personnel).

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

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Powell, Chair
Robert Flocchini, Vice Chair
Marta Altisent
Alan Buckpitt
Cynthia Brantley
David Hills
Jerry Powell
Susan Stover
Craig Tracy
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst
Total Meetings: 2  
Meeting frequency: as needed  
Average hours of committee work each week: 4

Total: 410 Courses Reviewed  
Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: 0  
Total deferred to the coming academic year: 198

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:  
none

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

The 05-06 COCI agreed to put more trust in the lower committees with regard to course content, and to spend most of its time on matters of policy while continuing to carry out its responsibilities vis a vis oversight. The following policy revisions reflect that decision:

1) Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) (attached) were established with both the School of Education and the Graduate School of Management. Precedence had been set by a prior COCI's approval of MOUs with the School of Medicine and the School of Veterinary Medicine.

2) Review of Expanded Course Descriptions was limited to information governed by regulations. For example, review of grading information was limited to whether or not there is a final exam. COCI refrained from reviewing grading percentages as that information is unenforceable.

Issues considered by the committee

1) School of Education – Requests to hire Associate Instructors (AI) to teach graduate level courses. The Committee agreed that AIs may be appropriate for “credentialing” courses as long as the justification is adequate.

2) Policy on the hiring of Associate Instructors (AI) to teach Summer Sessions courses. The Committee was in agreement that the hiring of AIs is appropriate as long as the candidates are qualified, considering that the alternative would be to cancel the summer offerings.
3) College and School’s denial of GE credit. Some Colleges have separate GE requirements from the campus and this is appropriate. However, all students taking GE approved courses should be receiving campus GE credit for those courses. Students should also be informed of both their College’s and the campus’ GE Requirements.

4) Chair Sillman requested to attend the January 9, 2006 Campus Council for Information Technology (CCFIT) meeting to discuss the CAF and demonstrate the course approval system to CCFIT members.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
none

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 September 11, 2006 through August 31, 2006. Additionally, the Chair of COCI represented the Committee on (1) The Joint Faculty and Administration Steering Committee on Year Round Operation and (2) The Joint Faculty and Administration Committee on Time to Degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Cancel</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 127 Associate Instructors from 32 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 6 requests from 1 department.

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 has written and maintains policy for the hiring of undergraduate readers. However, the Committee 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 33 classes.

ACADEMIC SENATE
Committee Membership 2005-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At-large Members</th>
<th>Ex-officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Sillman, Chair</td>
<td>Robert Hansen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton Corruccini</td>
<td>James Holcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Grismer</td>
<td>Denise Krol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Macri</td>
<td>Tonya Lynn Kuhl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger McDonald</td>
<td>Emilio Laca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Shaw</td>
<td>Patricia Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Theg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank Wada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karen Watson-Gegeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Woodruff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Student Representative
Rose Carlson

Academic Federation Representative
Marlene B. Clarke

Undergraduate Student Representative
Daniel Berliner
Peter Markevich

Staff Consultant
Randall Larson-Maynard
Memorandum of Understanding  
Davis Division Committee on Courses of Instruction  
Graduate School of Management  
April 10, 2006  

Under the Regents’ Standing Orders, the Davis Division Committee on Courses of Instruction has authority over all courses offered by professional schools that also offer undergraduate courses of instruction. By this document the Committee on Courses of Instruction agrees to delegate its authority over courses in the UC Davis Graduate School of Management that are numbered 400 to 499, and that are open only to professional students in the Graduate School of Management, to the faculty of the Graduate School of Management. All proposals to create, modify, cancel or staff any course in this series in the Graduate School of Management shall, upon the approval of the appropriate faculty body, be forwarded directly to the Office of the Registrar, without requiring approval of the Committee on Courses of Instruction. The Graduate School of Management may, at its discretion, forward copies of its course proposals to the Committee on Courses of Instruction for comment.  

The Graduate School of Management agrees that the Committee on Courses of Instruction retains authority over all courses in the Graduate School of Management numbered 1 to 99, 100 to 199, and 200 to 299, as well as 400 series courses that are open to graduate students who are not professional students in the Graduate School of Management. All proposals to create, modify or cancel any course in these series in the Graduate School of Management shall require the approval of the Committee on Courses of Instruction after their approval by the appropriate faculty body in the Graduate School of Management.  

Courses numbered 400 to 499 may, with the approval of the Committee on Courses of Instruction, be duplicated and numbered in the series 200 to 299 in order to allow the enrollment in those courses of graduate students who are not professional students in the Graduate School of Management.  

This agreement shall apply to all course proposals (course approval forms) not received by the Committee on Courses of Instruction by April 10, 2006, and shall remain in force until abrogated by either the Committee on Courses of Instruction or the Graduate School of Management.  

[Signature] [April 10, 2006]  
David L. Woodruff  
Chair, Committee on Courses  
Graduate School of Management  

[Signature]  
Arnold Sillman  
Chair  
Committee on Courses of Instruction
Memorandum of Understanding
Davis Division Committee on Courses of Instruction
School of Education
January 2, 2006

Under the Regents' Standing Orders, the Davis Division Committee on Courses of Instruction has authority over all courses offered by professional schools that also offer undergraduate courses of instruction. By this document the Committee on Courses of Instruction agrees to delegate its authority over courses in the UC Davis School of Education that are numbered 300 to 399, and that are open only to professional students in the School of Education, to the faculty of the School of Education. All proposals to create, modify, cancel or staff any course in this series in the School of Education shall, upon the approval of the appropriate faculty body, be forwarded directly to the Office of the Registrar, without requiring approval of the Committee on Courses of Instruction. The School of Education may, at its discretion, forward copies of its course proposals to the Committee on Courses of Instruction for comment.

The School of Education agrees that the Committee on Courses of Instruction retains authority over all courses in the School of Education numbered 1 to 99, 100 to 199, and 200 to 299, as well as 300 series courses that are open to graduate students who are not professional students in the School of Education. All proposals to create, modify or cancel any course in these series in the School of Education shall require the approval of the Committee on Courses of Instruction after their approval by the appropriate faculty body in the School of Education.

Courses numbered 300 to 399 may, with the approval of the Committee on Courses of Instruction, be duplicated and numbered in the series 200 to 299 in order to allow the enrollment in those courses of graduate students who are not professional students in the School of Education.

This agreement shall apply to all course proposals (course approval forms) not received by the Committee on Courses of Instruction by January 2, 2006, and shall remain in force until abrogated by either the Committee on Courses of Instruction or the School of Education.

Sharon Dugdale 1/24/06
Associate Dean
School of Education

Arnold Sillman 2/6/06
Chair
Committee on Courses of Instruction
Committee on Distinguished Teaching Award

| Total Meetings: Two 2-hour meetings. | Meeting frequency: 2-3 times/year | Average hours of committee work each week: Approximately 3-6 hours for review of the nominations for each meeting. |

A total of 24 initial nominations were received and reviewed. Six undergraduate finalists and five graduate/professional finalists were selected. Of those, four undergraduate and two graduate/professional recipients were selected.

No nominations were deferred from the previous year. No nominations will automatically be carried forward.

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: No new bylaw changes were proposed.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: All nomination materials (with the exception of books) were posted to MySenate for review.

Issues considered by the committee: A single ceremony for all Academic Senate awards was discussed but not implemented at this time.

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

Committee’s narrative:

The sole charge to this committee is to select up to 6 members of the faculty for a Distinguished Teaching Award in either the category of a) Undergraduate Teaching or b) Graduate and Professional Teaching. A Call for nominations was sent to all faculty on November 15, 2005. The committee received a total of 24 nomination packets for review – with 11 in the “Undergraduate Teaching” category and 13 in the “Graduate/Professional Teaching” category. A total of 11 finalists were selected and dossiers were requested. At our April 3rd meeting, after much deliberation and discussion, 6 recipients were selected as follows:
Distinguished Teaching Award Recipients – Undergraduate Category:
- William Fink, Chemistry
- Charles Gasser, Molecular and Cellular Biology
- Tonya Kuhl, Chemical Engineering and Materials Science
- Norman Matloff, Computer Science

Distinguished Teaching Award Recipients – Graduate/Professional Category:
- Ezra Amsterdam, School of Medicine, Division of Cardiology
- Gary Anderson, Animal Science

In accordance with the bylaws, the above names were presented for confirmation at the June 1, 2006 Representative Assembly. All nominations were warmly received and confirmed.

A reception dinner will be held in honor of our 2006 recipients on February 8, 2007.

The Provost asked the Academic Senate to consider two changes: 1) To revisit the notion of a combined ceremony for all awards; and 2) To consider changing the format of the reception from a dinner to hors d’oeuvres. The Distinguished Teaching Award committee overwhelmingly was opposed to both proposals. They felt each award is separate and unique and should be treated that way with separate ceremonies. The committee was also opposed to the idea of hors d’oeuvres instead of a dinner reception stating it would lessen the importance and the level of recognition.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael T. Saler, Chair
Debra Long
Krishnan Nambiar
Anita Oberbauer
James Shackelford

Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst
Total Meetings:  
In Person: 4  
Electronic: approximately 45  

Meeting Frequency:  
In person: quarterly  
Electronic: several times weekly  

Average Hours of Committee Work Per Week: 10  

Total bylaw and regulation proposals, other advice matters, and elections supervised: 39.  

Total matters deferred from previous year: 0  

Total matters deferred to coming academic year: 0  

CERJ took the following actions during 2005-2006. In addition, the committee constructed a website including a comprehensive archive of CERJ's Legislative Rulings and key Advice dating back to 1999. This is intended to provide a resource to Senate members seeking answers to frequently asked questions, to provide a searchable and readily-accessible record of past Rulings and Advice, and to contribute to the consistency of advice over time. The website is located at http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/cerj.

Formal Legislative Rulings Issued

CERJ issues formal Legislative Rulings to resolve disputes or clear up ambiguities in the Code of the Senate regarding Senate authority, procedures, or jurisdiction. Legislative Rulings are binding unless modified by subsequent legislative or Regental action.

(1) Legislative Ruling 5.06 on Senate Appointments to Academic Departments: This Ruling was issued on the basis of a request by Divisional Chair Dan Simmons for a formal Legislative Ruling on whether Senate faculty must hold appointments in academic departments, and whether they may be appointed to a position solely in the University Writing Program (UWP). On May 10, 2006 CERJ issued the following Legislative Ruling:

All Senate members must be appointed to academic departments (or their equivalent within the meaning of ASB 55). But, pursuant to DDB 141 and 143, a Senate member may not be appointed solely to a unit of the College of Letters and Science or of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences which does not offer a major, except by an explicit provision of the Bylaws.

The Ruling, with a description of its background and rationale, is hereby reported to the Representative Assembly by inclusion at the end of this Annual Report.

(2) Legislative Ruling 11.05 on the Handling of Student Petitions to the Division. This Ruling was issued on the basis of a request by Divisional Chair Dan Simmons for a formal Legislative Ruling clarifying what authority the Representative Assembly has with respect to student petitions and how that authority may be exercised.

All student petitions to the Davis Division are received by the Secretary, who may refer each petition to an appropriate committee in accordance with Davis Division Bylaw 13(E) and consistent with Academic Senate Bylaw 315(G).
The Representative Assembly has the authority to accept, reject, or modify the committee's actions (in accordance with Systemwide Legislative Ruling 8.95B). However, the Assembly is not required to consider or take any action on any given student petition, and a petitioner has no right to review by the Representative Assembly.

The Representative Assembly need not include a student petition on its agenda or meeting call except upon direct referral of the petition by the Secretary, by report of the committee to which it was referred, or by action of the Assembly itself. (11/14/2005)

The Ruling, with a description of its background and rationale, was published in the Call for the 2/3/2006 Meeting of the Representative Assembly

Formal Advice Issued

Most of the work of the Committee involves advising Senate officers, Senate committees, and individual members when questions or conflicts arise. Such advice is not formally binding but suggests the likely outcome should a formal Legislative Ruling be requested. Advice of a recurring nature and/or of general importance is listed below and is also published (including expanded explanations) in CERJ's online Archive of Advice.

(1) Petition Rights of Former Students. Advised that a student does not lose standing to file a petition simply as a result of his or her graduation. To find otherwise would make decisions rendered in a student's final quarter at Davis unreviewable. (11/14/2005)

(2) Time Limits and Arguments for Mail Ballots (Election on Resolution for a Vote of No Confidence on the Chancellor): Advised as follows:

a) At least 14 calendar days must be allowed for the return of ballots.

b) DDB 17 specifies that the mail ballot must include all duly submitted pro and con arguments which do not exceed two pages each. (The Secretary has exercised her authority to impose a two-page limit on each argument.) This is consistent with ASB 95 which specifies that the ballots are to be accompanied by such additional material as the Division may direct. (All arguments, including those exceeding two pages and those submitted by persons not in the Senate, were also posted in a Forum on the Senate web site.)

c) ASB 95 also specifies that “a brief summary of arguments pro and con” be included with the ballot, and the Divisional Bylaws are silent on this matter. DDB 13(F) specifies that the Secretary conducts elections requiring a mail ballot under the supervision of CERJ. The Secretary must therefore prepare a brief summary of the duly submitted pro and con arguments for inclusion with the ballot. (2/5/2006)

(3) Effective Date of Retirement With Regard to Departmental Voting Rights: Advised a member of the Division that Senate faculty retain full voting rights on personnel matters until the last day of the academic quarter of their retirement, the separation date for payroll purposes notwithstanding. Thus, for example, a faculty member retiring at the end of the winter quarter would retain full rights
through the end of the winter quarter. This is true even if the payroll separation date is February 28 -- that date being an artifact of a 9-month salary being paid over 12 months, so that employment for 2 quarters would lead to 8 monthly payments for the academic year. (3/3/2006)

(4) Faculty Access to Teaching Evaluations: Advised the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and Jeanne M. Wilson, Director of Student Judicial Affairs, that the administration of teaching evaluations is central to the supervision of courses, and therefore comes under Senate authority under Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b).

While CERJ is not charged to interpret the Academic Personnel Manual or state law, CERJ agrees with SJA that under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and the plain language of APM 160-20 faculty have a right to see original student evaluations that generally trumps student privacy rights. (3/23/2006)

(5) Scholastic Good Standing and Eligibility for Intercollegiate Athletics. Advised the Intercollegiate Athletics Task Force and the Undergraduate Council that the Academic Senate is the sole authority empowered to determine the meaning of phrases such as “good academic standing” for all students at the University. Senate Bylaws specify that “An undergraduate student is in scholastic good standing if not on academic probation or subject to disqualification for either qualitative reasons as defined in Senate Regulation 900(A) or quantitative (progress) reasons...” (DDR A552).

However, Athletics Director Greg Warzecka and Senior Associate Athletic Director Pamela Gill-Fisher have determined that NCAA Bylaw Interpretations do not require student-athletes to be in “good academic standing,” notwithstanding the language to that effect in NCAA Operating Bylaws 14.01.2.1, 14.02.5, and 14.4.3.3.

Therefore, because the Senate has no authority to interpret NCAA Bylaws controlling the eligibility of student-athletes, CERJ advised that the UC Davis definition of good academic standing is not relevant because this concept is not being employed in determining eligibility. (3/30/2006)

(6) Right to Serve on Committees During Sabbatical Leave or Upon Retirement: Advised that, pursuant to Standing Order of the Regents 105.1, Senate members retain full rights as a members (including the right to stand for election for committees and to serve on committees) notwithstanding being on sabbatical leave or leave of absence, and notwithstanding transference to emeritus status. The only exceptions are the limitations on departmental voting rights specified in ASB 55. (4/11/2006)

(7) Final Examinations Shorter Than Two Hours: Advised that, as long as the exam is administered within the time window published in the Class Schedule, an exam scheduled to be less than two hours in length would be in compliance with Senate Regulations. Davis Division Regulation 538(B) and Senate Regulation 772(A) only specify that the final may not exceed three hours, and the exam must fall within the published time window. (CERJ suggested that, to avoid any confusion, the instructor start the exam at the beginning of the published 2-hour window and announce the duration of the exam well in advance.) (4/25/2006)

(8) Enforcing Prerequisites of Stated Course Prerequisites (“Inherited” Prerequisites): Advised that, without in any way limiting the authority of the instructor under Systemwide Senate Regulation 542
or Davis Division Regulation 527, it is a reasonable exercise of the instructor's discretion to exclude a student from a course if the student has not satisfied the stated prerequisites, the prerequisites to the stated prerequisites, and so on. That is, “inherited” prerequisites are enforceable by the instructor. In this case the instructor may request that the Registrar drop the student from the course after providing notice to the student. (5/10/2006)

(9) Departmental Voting Procedures and Program Committees: Advised Undergraduate Writing Program Interim Chair Karl Zender that the Code of the Senate indicates that departmental voting procedures must satisfy the following conditions:

1. Voting within a department (or its equivalent) is limited to Senate faculty who are members of the department and who are themselves subject to being voted on by other eligible members of that department. That is, voting is a reciprocal responsibility, subject only to the eligibility rules of ASB 55. Therefore, extension of the vote to persons who are not members of a department (e.g., to nondepartmental members of a Program Committee) is in violation of the Code of the Senate.

2. Department membership requires the vote of the tenured faculty of that department; Senate faculty may not be added to a voting constituency by appointment (e.g., to a Program Committee) without a department vote conducted pursuant to ASB 55 even if confirmed by some other Senate body (e.g., a College Executive Committee).

In addition, we note:

3. Size per se is no bar to functioning as a departmental voting unit for ASB 55 purposes. (5/10/2006)

(10) Graduate Council Jurisdiction Over Professional Students’ Transcript Notations: The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils sought advice as to which committee had jurisdiction over professional school transcript notations. CERJ advised that the Graduate Council has this authority because professional students are “graduate students” for the purpose of the Bylaws. (6/16/2006)

(11) Quorums in Department Meetings and the Impact of Leaves of Absence: Advised that, in the absence of department bylaws to the contrary, a quorum in a department meeting is a majority of the entire number of department members entitled to vote under the provisions of ASB 55. This includes otherwise-eligible department members who are on sabbatical leave or other leave of absence. It also includes all faculty to whom the right to vote has specifically been extended pursuant to the provisions of ASB 55(C) and (D).

Duly-adopted department bylaws may specify that a quorum is a smaller percentage, or a fixed number. A department may also specify that the requisite number is to be calculated as a majority (or a specific percentage) of those not on leave, but only by explicit provision of the bylaws. Where the bylaws are silent on the matter, all faculty -- whether on leave or not -- are included in determining the number required for a quorum.
However the number required for a quorum is determined, all eligible faculty -- whether on leave or not -- must count equally towards determining whether a quorum has been achieved, and a department may not in any way restrict the right to vote on the basis of leave status. (Nonetheless, departments may require that members be present at a meeting in order to cast a vote.) (6/21/2006)

(12) Requiring Presence at a Department Meeting In Order To Vote; Imposing Substantive Restrictions on the Right To Vote: Advised that, in the absence of department bylaws to the contrary, voting in department meetings is limited to those who are present at the meeting and eligible to vote under the provisions of ASB 55.

The department may, but is not required to, adopt rules allowing absentee voting on particular types of votes. If absentee voting is allowed, then all eligible voters must be allowed to cast a vote in this manner on a strictly equal basis. (Thus, for example, the department may not allow absentee voting only for those on leave, or only for those with excuses which are deemed acceptable by a department chair.) Alternatively, the department could choose to conduct votes entirely by postal or electronic ballot. However the vote is conducted, the right of any member to call for a secret ballot must be honored.

While the department is free to choose the method of voting, no substantive restrictions on the right to vote (such as a requirement to read a file) may be imposed by departments. While such restrictions might seem reasonable, ASB 55 allows no eligibility criteria beyond the tenure, rank, and emeritus status requirements which it specifies. (6/22/2006)

Other Advice Provided

The following advice relates to matters which are of a one-time nature or of less general applicability than the formal advice listed above.

Graduate School of Management Bylaw Revisions: Advised the Graduate School of Management regarding proposed revisions to the School’s Bylaws, recommending minor changes. (10/12/2005)

Tenure of the Special Committee on Minimum Progress: The Special Committee on Minimum Progress was authorized by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2004, with no term being specified. CERJ advised that, under the terms of Davis Division Bylaw 31(C), the Special Committee had tenure only until the November 1, 2005 regular meeting of the Representative Assembly. (10/31/2005)

Drafting Bylaw Establishing the College of Biological Sciences: Drafted proposed Davis Division Bylaw 153 to constitute the College of Biological Sciences. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly at its meeting on November 1, 2005 and was effective immediately. (11/1/2005)

Bylaws and Regulations for the new College of Biological Sciences: Provided extensive comments on and suggested revisions to the proposed Bylaws and Regulations of the new College. (11/21/2005)
Distribution of Representative Assembly Meeting Calls: Advised the Academic Senate office that DDB 19 requires posting of RA meeting calls on the open web (such as on the public Academic Senate web site) and, where distribution is required, it must be in hardcopy. Provided suggestions for streamlining the process. (11/11/2005) Note: A procedure for electronic distribution is under development and enabling legislation will be proposed in 2006-2007.

Revision of Davis Division Bylaw 76 on Faculty Research Lecture Committee: Reviewed a proposed amendment to DDB 76 which allowed the Faculty Research Lecture Committee to comprise five members, at least two of whom would be previous Faculty Research Lecturers. (Previously, all committee members were required to be previous Lecturers, which had caused staffing problems.) Minor changes were recommended. The amendment was adopted by the Representative Assembly at its meeting on February 3, 2006. (11/14/2005)

Role of Deans on College Courses Committees: CERJ advised Arnold Sillman, Chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction, that it would not be permissible for an administrative officer, including an associate dean, to appoint the Courses Committee for the newly-formed College of Biological Sciences pending the approval of the CBS Bylaws. This would violate Standing Order of the Regents 105.1(b), which gives the Senate the authority to organize itself and to choose its own committees, and Standing Order 105.2(b), which provides that the Senate has sole responsibility for courses and curricula. We suggested alternative approaches. CERJ also advised COCI regarding the question of having an associate dean serve as chair of a college Courses Committee, discussing the considerations which would arise. (11/14/2005)

Posthumous Recognition: Reviewed a proposed revision of DDR 542 specifying the criteria for posthumous recognition. The amendment was adopted by the Representative Assembly at its meeting on February 3, 2006. (12/1/2005).

Request for UCRJ Ruling on the Validity of the Delegation of the Authority to Disquality Graduate Students to the Graduate Dean: CERJ’s October 1, 2004 request for a ruling from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction remains pending with UCRJ.

UCRJ Ruling on Voting on Nonsenate Instructional Faculty. Pursuant to CERJ’s November 12, 2004 request for a ruling from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, UCRJ ruled on July 22, 2006 that “only members of the Academic Senate may vote on the departmental recommendation in a merit action involving non-Senate instructional faculty. A department may solicit a recommendation or vote from non-Senate instructional faculty to be used in its deliberations.” (7/22/2006)

Drafting Revision of Subject A Requirement: Assisted with the drafting of legislation revising the Entry Level Writing Requirement (Subject A). (4/9/2006) The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly at its meeting on June 1, 2006.

Voting By Fax On Mail Ballots: Advised the Academic Senate office that DDB 17 currently requires that Mail Ballots be conducted by hardcopy. Allowing other methods of voting for individual Senate members on the Nonresident Tuition Ballot would compromise the equal administration of elections and is not permitted. (1/4/2006) Note: A procedure for electronic voting is under development and enabling legislation will be proposed in 2006-2007.
Inclusion of Pro and Con Arguments for Mail Ballot on Nonresident Tuition: Advised the Academic Senate office regarding the requirements for the inclusion of “con” arguments on mail ballots when none are supplied by opponents of the measure. (12/20/2005) Supervised the ballot on the systemwide Memorial on Nonresident Tuition. (4/25/2006)

Revision of Davis Division Bylaw 50 on Admissions Committee Structure: Reviewed a proposed amendment to DDB 50 reconstituting the Admissions Committee. Minor changes were recommended. The amendment was adopted by the Representative Assembly at its meeting on June 1, 2006. (2/22/2006)

Public Service Award: Advised on the proper procedure for securing Representative Assembly Approval of Public Service Award nominations. (4/11/2006)

Cooperative Extension Specialists and Senate Membership: Advised on issues relating to extending Senate membership to Cooperative Extension Specialists. (5/2/2006)

Nomination of Divisional Representatives: Advised regarding proper procedures for the nomination of Divisional Representatives to the University-wide Assembly of the Academic Senate when there are fewer nominations are received than there are vacancies. (3/28/2006)

Revision of Davis Division Bylaws 500-520 Relating To Thesis/Dissertation Committees: Reviewed a proposed amendment to DDB 500-520. The amendment was adopted by the Representative Assembly at its meeting on June 1, 2006. (4/11/2006)

Reversing Extension of ASB 55 Voting Rights: Advised a department chair regarding the process for reversing a previous extension of departmental voting rights under ASB 55. (4/27/2006)

Criteria for the Assignment of Incompletes: Advised a department that it is not within the instructor's discretion to limit the assignment of an Incomplete based on a stricter scholarship requirement than that the student's work be of “passing quality.” Requiring, e.g., that the work be of “A” quality would be in violation of DDR A540(C). (6/21/2006)

Rules For Removal of Incompletes: Advised the Office of the Registrar that web site language regarding the removal of incompletes was inconsistent with DDR A540(C). The language was corrected. (4/14/2006)

Catalog Language on the Return of Final Exams to Students: Advised the Undergraduate Council that existing Catalog language regarding the return of final exams to students at the end of the quarter was at odds with Davis Division Regulation 538(I) and should be changed. (2/21/2006)

Supervision of Routine Elections of the Division.

Respectfully Submitted,

L. Jay Helms, Chair
Kevin D. Hoover
William G. Davis
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
May 10, 2006

Legislative Ruling 5.06

Senate Appointments to Academic Departments. All Senate members must be appointed to academic departments (or their equivalent within the meaning of ASB 55). But, pursuant to DDB 141 and 143, a Senate member may not be appointed solely to a unit of the College of Letters and Science or of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences which does not offer a major, except by an explicit provision of the Bylaws.

Background and Rationale

This Ruling was issued on the basis of a request by Divisional Chair Dan Simmons for a formal Legislative Ruling on whether Senate faculty must hold appointments in academic departments, and whether they may be appointed to a position solely in the University Writing Program (UWP).

(1) Must Senate members be appointed to academic departments?

The Standing Orders of the Regents indicate that departments are the basic unit of the Senate:

SOR 105.2(C). The Academic Senate shall determine the membership of the several faculties and councils ... provided that the several departments of the University, with the approval of the President, shall determine their own form of administrative organization, and all Professors, Associate Professors, Acting Professors, Acting Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors, and all Instructors of at least two years' service shall have the right to vote in department meetings.

ASB 45 specifically defines Senate membership in Faculties with respect to departments:

ASB 45. In accordance with the provisions of this Bylaw, the membership of each Faculty is defined by the bylaws of the Division to which it is responsible, or by the Bylaws of the Senate for those Faculties directly responsible to the Assembly. Membership in a Faculty is limited to the following Senate members:

A. The President of the University;
B. The Chancellor;
C. The chief academic administrative officer of the school or college;
D. All members of the Academic Senate who are members of departments assigned to that school or college (Academic Senate members who have retired and transferred to emeritus/a status retain departmental membership.);
E. Such other Senate members as are specified in Divisional Bylaws or these Bylaws. [Emphasis added.]

Thus the Senate comprises Faculties, and Faculties are defined by membership in departments. All Senate members must therefore be appointed to academic departments. The use of the word “department” is not critical:

ASB 55(E). In Divisions or schools or colleges where the term “department” is not used, this Bylaw refers to those units from which academic appointments and promotions are recommended to administrative officers.
This language accommodates situations where alternative terms are in widespread use (e.g., “sections” in the College of Biological Sciences) or where a school is coextensive with a department (the Schools of Law, Management, and Education). It also accommodates the several programs in the College of Letters and Science – including the cultural studies programs – which function as the equivalent of departments for the purposes of ASB 55.

(2) May Senate members be appointed solely to an academic unit which does not offer a major (such as the University Writing Program)?

During extensive discussions on the formation of the University Writing Program differing opinions were offered on the nature of appointments to the UWP. However, the final consensus proposal remains unclear about whether the Senate faculty allocated to the UWP would all have joint appointments in academic departments:

Therefore, it is proposed that one Senate faculty FTE be allocated for a Director of the UWP, that a search for the Director begin as soon as possible, and that four additional Senate faculty FTE be allocated for the UWP. They may have joint appointments in departments and colleges across the campus.

[Final Proposal for a University Writing Program (May 31, 2004), page 5; http://www.physics.ucdavis.edu/kiskis/ug_council/uwp.html]

Membership in the Faculty of the College of Letters and Sciences at Davis is defined by DDB 141:

DDB 141. The Faculty of the College of Letters and Science shall consist of (1) the President of the University; (2) the Chief Campus Officer; (3) the Dean of the College; (4) the Librarian and the Registrar of the Davis campus; (5) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of departments in which students in the College of Letters and Science may elect their major work; (6) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the Department of Military Science... [Emphasis added.]

L&S Faculty (and thus Senate) membership therefore requires membership in a department (or its equivalent) “in which students ... may elect their major work.” DDB 143 (defining the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences) contains analogous language. Because the UWP does not offer a major, it does not satisfy this requirement, and it is for this reason that a Senate member could not be appointed solely to this program. A joint appointment (in any percentage allocation) with any qualifying department would, however, be permissible.

Conferring Senate membership on faculty in these colleges appointed solely to an academic unit not offering a major requires an explicit Bylaw provision, as is provided in DDB 141 for the Department of Military Science. It would also require a conforming change in the college bylaws.

We note that PPM 200-20(II)(B) (9/23/1991) defines an “academic program” as “a regularized sequence of courses leading to an undergraduate or graduate degree, including those programs sponsored by groups formed by faculty members for the purpose of presenting a graduate or undergraduate degree program that is interdepartmental in nature.” However, the draft Update to this PPM section (dated 4-20-2006) eliminates this language. Whether this Update is implemented or not, it is the Code of the Senate, rather than the specific terminology employed in the PPM, which determines Senate membership.
### Committee on Emeriti

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings:</th>
<th>Meeting frequency:</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Committee did not meet this year</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total courses, proposals, cases, etc. reviewed:</th>
<th>Total of courses, proposals, cases, etc. reviewed/deferred from the previous year:</th>
<th>Total courses, proposals, cases, etc. deferred to the coming academic year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:**

None

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:**

None

**Issues considered by the committee:**

None.

**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
Zunilda Gertel
Alan Jackman
John Reitan
Dean Simonton
John Whitaker
Richard Gable, Ex-Officio
Steven Doten, AF Representative
## Executive Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Meetings</td>
<td>Meeting frequency</td>
<td>Average hours of committee work each week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>69</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total proposals, issues, leg/policy and petitions Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</td>
<td>Total of reviewed 0 deferred from the previous year</td>
<td>Total 0 deferred to the coming academic year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
- DDBL 16.5; 28-C; 31; 32; 40; 50 as proposed by the Special Committee of Executive Council on Shared Governance

### Listing of committee policies established or revised:
- Regents Memorial—Non Resident Tuition
- Graduate Student Funding Resolution (prepared by task force of EC)
- Policy outlining the Senate’s process for reviewing ORUs

### Issues considered by the committee
- Faculty Off Scale Salaries
- Senate Appointments w/in Undergraduate Writing Program
- Process for formalizing the College of Biological Sciences
- Science and Math Initiative
- The Role of the Academic Department in the Hiring of Faculty
- Research Integrity Compliance policy and process
- Executive Compensation
- Public Information Requests
- Review and update of PPM 200-20: Establishment/Revision of Academic Units
- Review and update of PPM 200-25: Establishment/Review of Academic Programs
- CAP: Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series
- Cooperative Extension Specialists and Senate Membership
- Initiative Recruitment Guidelines – Senate feedback
- Pandemic/Emergency Planning
Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
Eliminate on-going agenda and produce a finalized agenda one week prior to meeting.

Committee's narrative:
Some select issues that were particularly time-consuming or of great interest to the Council are highlighted/expanded upon below:

Faculty Off Scale Salaries: The Academic Senate staff performed an analysis of the faculty hires made in 2004-05 and reported to the Executive Council that 100% of the salary offers were above/off scale. This analysis sparked a discussion between the Divisional leaders and the administration regarding adjustments to salaries to eliminate the so-called “loyalty tax” imposed on successful faculty who found their salary falling behind persons in junior positions. The administration adopted a UC Davis salary scale effective in 2004-05 to provide offscale salaries as an adjustment.

Initiative Recruitment and Guidelines: A large percentage of the funding allocated during the 2005-06 budget process was targeted for faculty FTE to facilitate college/school initiatives. Early in the academic year, members and committee chairs began voicing concerns about the handling of hiring processes to fill initiative positions. After initiating several discussions with members of the administration, faculty recruitment guidelines were updated to guide the process for filling faculty FTE assigned to initiatives. The Executive Council submitted its views to the Provost and others in a memo dated May 31, 2006. The Provost has not responded.

Cooperative Extension Specialists and Senate Membership: The Executive Council received a proposal from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences to change the appointments of several Cooperative Extension Specialists. The change proposed was to provide a split appointment as a Cooperative Extension Specialist and a Teacher. The Teacher title provides Senate membership to those appointed. After careful review and debate the
College rescinded the proposal indicating the issue deserved further review within the college.

Writing/Reviewing Policy & Procedure Manual Updates to 200-20 and 200-25: The administration and leadership of the Division jointly worked through the review process for revising or establishing academic units and programs. The process spanned more than one academic year and yielded a policy that is understandable accompanied by a flow chart of the process to enhance understanding.

CAP: Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series: The School of Medicine changed the procedure for reviewing the personnel actions for all members of the Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series mandating review by CAP. However, CAP and the School of Medicine Personnel Committee (which functions as a subcommittee of CAP) believed it most appropriate for review to remain under the management of the School of Medicine Personnel Committee. After review and consideration the Executive Council concurred with the CAP recommendation and advised the School of Medicine administration and Vice Provost: Academic Personnel that the process would not be changed.

Student Petitions Subcommittee of Executive Council:

Each year a subcommittee of the Executive Council is appointed to review student petitions to the Division. During 2005-06 the subcommittee membership was comprised of Faculty Executive Committee Chairs and the Divisional Chair (CA&ES FEC Chair: Richard Plant; L&S FEC Chair David Webb; Engineering FEC Chair Matt Farrens; Divisional Chair Daniel Simmons)

The subcommittee reviewed a total of 23 student petitions during its term.

In addition, following the Committee on Elections Rules and Jurisdictions ruling regarding the handling of Student Petitions to the Representative Assembly, there were two (2) student petitions addressed to the Representative Assembly that were reviewed and reported upon by the subcommittee to the membership of Executive Council. Further, the subcommittee established that its role in reviewing student petitions to the Representative Assembly is: “The role of the Student Petitions Subcommittee in reviewing a student petition appealing the action of a standing committee is to assure that the standing committee did not act in an arbitrary or capricious manner in making its determination and that the decision of the standing committee is based on substantial evidence. The Student Petitions subcommittee does not believe that it should substitute its judgment on the substantive merits of the petition for the judgment of the reviewing committee that is more directly informed of the facts and issues of the case, and to which Senate bylaws assign primary responsibility in the matter.”
To the Members of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate


Dear Colleagues:

My two-year term as the chair of your Divisional Academic Senate comes to an end today. I attempt in this message to describe for you the state of your Senate and what we have done over the past couple of years.

It has been a long and difficult two years. I’m really looking forward to returning full time to my regular job as a professor, which is the best job in the world as far as I’m concerned. Nonetheless, there is a part of me that will miss serving as your chair. Being chair of the Davis Division has introduced me to a variety of interesting people coupled with difficult and interesting problems that are important to the institution, both the Davis campus and the University.

My two terms as the chair of the Davis Division, and my term as vice-chair and chair of the systemwide Academic Senate (1993-1995), convince me that the role of the Academic Senate in the University of California is not only unique, it is pivotal to the historic excellence of the institution. The faculty of the University of California are responsible for its accomplishments. There are few better opportunities for any of us to significantly contribute to the work of our campus and the University than through active participation in the work of the Academic Senate. I have spent time in the UC Office of the President and I have sat with the campus Council of Deans and Vice Chancellors. In neither of those places have I witnessed the quality of debate over major issues of educational and research quality that regularly occurs in the councils of the Senate. In the long run, the Academic Senate is the guiding light of the University of California. The Senate is responsible for insisting on principled policies. The Senate often takes the lead in insisting on the uniform application of policies adopted by the University. We also proved this year that when Senate leadership is not performing up to our high expectations, the Senate is capable of solving its own problems in an open and expeditious fashion.

I am happy to be able to report to you that I believe that the Davis Division is stronger and more effective today than when I started this job two years ago. We have accomplished a great deal, some of which I describe I this letter. I note here and throughout this letter that the work of the Senate these past two years has been accomplished with the support and assistance of the Provost, Deans, and Vice Chancellors, which I gladly acknowledge and for which I am grateful.

August 31, 2006
BUDGET PROCESS AND FTE ALLOCATION

The Senate’s most important accomplishment of the last two years follows on the recommendations of the Special Committee on Shared Governance, formed by my predecessor Bruce Madewell, which I chaired, and which included Professors Kevin Hoover, Alan Jackman, Charles Nash, and Judith Stern. The special committee’s recommendations lead to a revision of the FTE allocation process that enhances Senate participation. In my view, FTE allocation is the most important part of the budget process with respect to academic programs because the budget follows positions. The allocation of faculty positions to departments and programs controls the academic direction of the campus. The Committee on Planning and Budget, chaired by Randy Siverson in 2004-2005 and Ann Orel in 2005-2006, stepped up to examine allocation proposals and make strong recommendations to the Provost, most of which were followed. The proposal and review process were designed to engage the School and College Executive Committees in consultation with their respective Dean in the review of proposals and in making recommendations to the Committee on Planning and Budget. This process imposed a new responsibility on the college/school Faculty Executive Committee Chairs, particularly the chairs of the undergraduate colleges, which each assumed with dedication and success. The Committee on Planning and Budget engaged this past year in a review of the impact of the allocations.

The budget process produced some unintended consequences, which have been addressed by the Committee on Planning and Budget and the Provost. The allocation process adopted by the Provost resulted in a matching of FTE allocations intended as growth positions with allocations directed towards campus initiatives. The result under-cut position allocations to departments based on growth in enrollments and research programs. An additional difficulty of the campus initiative process is a move away from departmental academic planning towards a system more focused on top-down academic planning. I credit Jim Chalfant, chair of the Committee on Faculty Welfare, with bringing these important problems to the attention of the Davis Division. The Executive Council drafted a letter to Provost Hinshaw regarding the initiative process late in the spring of 2006, to which she has not yet responded. A copy of the letter is posted on the Senate web site at http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/pdf/exec_council_response_to_initiative_hires.pdf.

Departments remain the core unit through which members of the Senate exercise their basic delegated authorities, particularly with respect academic appointments. Senate members must remain diligent in the exercise of these responsibilities and stand fast against administrative designation of Senate voting rights to small groups of chosen faculty operating in administratively favored programs.

Overall, I commend the Provost, the Deans, and the Office of Resource Management and Planning for their cooperation with the Senate in developing and executing this new budget and allocation process.

SENATE OFFICE STAFFING

Before I became chair of the Division, the Committee on Shared Governance and former Divisional Chair Bruce Madewell, working with the Provost, upgraded the position of the Executive Director of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate following the retirement of Marcia Thomson who served the Senate with great and effective dedication for nearly 30 years. Gina Anderson was
hired as Executive Director and has undertaken an upgrade of staff expertise to increase the level of professional support provided to the membership. I believe that Provost Hinshaw appreciates the fact that a well-functioning Senate office is critical to the operation of campus academic programs, and I am grateful to her for her cooperation in upgrading positions held by Senate office staff. We are fortunate to have an excellent group of hard-working and dedicated individuals in the Senate office. My thanks go to Solomon Bekele, Marci Buell, Diana Howard, Kimberly Pulliam, and Kathy von Rummelhoff. I also thank Elle Lim and Shelly Broznick, both of whom were recruited away from the Senate to higher paying positions, and to Rebecca Parker who worked in the office as a temporary employee for many months. The Senate office was fortunate to have the assistance of two students, Deepak Koilvaram, and Kevin Lee. Gina Anderson deserves a great deal of credit for her hard work in bringing the Senate staff to a level of excellence that should serve as a model for all of the UC Senate offices. I am grateful to all of the staff for putting up with me these past two years.

With Gina Anderson’s leadership and the hard work of Marci Buell we have created the MySenate website with software developed by the Senate staff at UC Santa Barbara. Everyone who has used this system in the work of the Senate has recognized its value as a communication and workflow tool. The Office of the Provost assisted the Senate with the acquisition and implementation of this program, for which I am grateful.

I am also happy to report that Provost Hinshaw, with my support and encouragement, and with the support of the Executive Council, has approved the Senate office’s move back into Mrak Hall. We will occupy space on the fourth floor (recently vacated by Office of Research). I believe that it is important for the Senate in its role as a shared governor of the campus to be located within the seat of campus management structure. The advantage of proximity to the administration outweighs any disadvantage.

GRADUATE STUDENT SUPPORT

Early in my term, the Executive Council adopted the position that graduate student support was to be a top priority for the Divisional Senate. My personal view is that the University’s continued research depends on remaining competitive for top graduate students. Non-resident tuition and campus policies that charge external grants for graduate student tuition are major impediments to recruiting good graduate students. In fall 2005, the Representative Assembly adopted a resolution crafted by the Special Task Force on Graduate Student Support that urged a revision of the campus graduate student support formula. The campus administration was responsive to the concern of the Senate and provided an allocation of significant additional resources to graduate student support. Nonetheless, we have a long way to go. In addition, the Executive Council proposed a Memorial to the Regents asking for the complete elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students in doctoral programs. The Memorial was overwhelmingly endorsed by the members of the Davis Division of the Senate and forwarded to the other divisions and the University Assembly, which agreed to put the Memorial to a vote of the UC faculty. The NRT Memorial was adopted overwhelmingly by the UC faculty and reported to the Regents. Although University Administration is not supportive of the complete elimination of non-resident tuition for doctoral students, they are taking steps to eliminate non-resident tuition after the first year for academic graduate students, with a view towards the complete elimination of non-resident tuition for graduate students in two years. The Davis Division deserves a great deal of
credit for initiating this process. We must continue to advocate both increased support for graduate students and the elimination of barriers to recruiting the best graduate students from all parts of the world.

FACULTY SALARY SCALES

I believe that substitution of off-scale salaries, controlled by administrative discretion, for competitive compensation levels through the regular professorial salary scale is one of the major issues facing the Senate in the near term. One negative aspect is an inversion of salary where younger faculty are receiving higher compensation than their seniors because of the timing of their hiring. My paper on this issue presented to a joint meeting of the Academic Council and Chancellors is on the Senate website at http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/pdf/the_death_of_uc_salary_scales.pdf. Provost Hinshaw and Vice Provost Horwitz have been responsive to this issue and have developed a plan that has been reviewed by the Senate to augment most faculty salaries with an off-scale increment. The proposal is intended to mitigate in part the disparity between off-scale salaries and regular salaries for faculty who have received their regular merit advancement.

SENATE PROCESS ISSUES

Through special task forces created by the Executive Council, we have implemented important policy approaches to Senate review and exercise of its authorities.

I frequently heard the complaint that the Senate is more concerned with process than with the substantive issues. I accept the accolade. Process is the Senate’s entry into substantive decision making. In many instances process controls the outcome. The campus administration is well aware of this and is capable of using process to sideline Senate input from decision making when it fears an impediment to its own plans.

It is critically important to be clear on process and authority in a large organization with shared management authority such as the University of California. Nobody in the University knows that better than Chancellor Vanderhoef who fully understands the role of the Senate (in part, as he as stated many times, because he has studied my 1995 paper to the Board of Regents on the subject). He knows how to use Senate processes and authorities to achieve his goals, which is an important part of the Chancellor’s job and I admire his skill at it. Senate members also must understand and exercise their delegated authority in the dual management structure of the University’s unique system of shared governance. The Senate must jealously guard the authorities delegated to it.

The Administration, and various campus constituencies require continuous education regarding the role of the Senate. The Academic Senate is not simply one of many campus constituent groups. The Academic Senate is one of the two agencies of the University of California that is specifically delegated authority to manage the affairs of the University within defined spheres of responsibility. Shared governance is shared management authority between the Chancellor and the Academic Senate.
Program and Degree Approval

A special task force has drafted and implemented review procedures for the creation or revision of academic units and for approval or revision of undergraduate and graduate degree programs. The task force included Interim Vice Provost Fred Wood who made an enormous contribution to its work. Graduate Dean and former Senate Chair Jeff Gibeling and Associate Dean Dann Trask contributed valuable insights. The Senate side included Planning and Budget chairs Randy Siverson and Ann Orel, Graduate Council Chairs Trish Berger and Andrew Waterhouse, Undergraduate Council Chairs Matt Farrens and Dan Potter, Courses Committee chair Arnold Sillman, and Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction Chairs Bill Davis and Jay Helms. The resulting Policy and Procedure Manual sections 200-20 and 200-25 provide a clear and concise road map for campus review of proposals affecting academic units and degree programs. These policies should prove valuable in eliminating confusion over review practices that has plagued the approval process in the past. In addition, I am optimistic that clarity in the review process will expedite campus decision making.

ORU Approval

A similar two-year effort by a special task force with joint Senate/administration membership, drafted policies for the creation/review of ORU proposals. Again, Planning and Budget Committee Chairs Randy Siverson and Ann Orel, and Graduate Council Chair Andrew Waterhouse were instrumental in crafting this policy document. Associate Vice Provost Berndt Hamen worked hard with the task force to develop a workable approach to difficult issues.

One issue that continues to plague the ORU question is the University policy that a unit using the term “center” or any other specifically defined term be treated as an ORU. The campus has historically ignored the policy on the use of terms, and faculty involved with centers do not want their units subject to ORU review. (I understand a Universitywide task force is beginning a review of the existing policy.) The compromise position adopted by the Senate is to expect Deans to report the existence and budget of non-ORU centers or institutes within a school or college to the Vice Provost for Research, who in turn is expected to report the existence of these units to the Committee on Planning and Budget.

Unfortunately, and unlike the academic unit approval policy, we were not able to move this policy through the Office of Research into a formal campus policy, even though the Vice Chancellor for Research has reviewed and approved the approach. Nonetheless, the Executive Council adopted the ORU policy submitted by the task force as the Senate policy for ORU approval. As a result, the Senate has its own guideline for the review of ORU proposals that gives the proponents of an ORU a roadmap of the approval process. As is the case with academic unit and degree approval, the clarity of the Senate process should help to expedite campus decision making.

Course Approval

With the cooperation and input of Arnold Sillman, chair of the Committee on Courses of Instruction, the assistance of Registrar Frank Wada, Campus Information and Educational Technology staff and Offices of the Chancellor and Provost staff, as well as the hard work of Senate Executive
Director Gina Anderson and Senate Analyst Marci Buell, we have made major progress towards improving the course approval process. The course approval form (CAF) was cobbled together many years ago by some talented programmers with little investment of resource. The Committee on Courses of Instruction made substantial improvements by eliminating the need for an expanded course description that was published, and by insisting on such simple (in concept but not execution) items such as a spell checker and a utility to limit the number of words in a course description. In addition, Executive Director Anderson has been working with the Registrar, Campus Information and Educational Technology and the Offices of the Chancellor and Provost on a project to create a seamless course approval system in which all of the parts can communicate electronically. The course approval process affects the whole campus, from departments through the colleges, the Senate, the Registrar, and, most importantly the students. This is an extraordinarily complex project in which the whole campus has an ownership interest.

**Intercollegiate Athletics**

With the leadership of Divisional Senate Vice Chair Ted DeJong, the Senate has maintained a joint Senate/Administration task force to develop baseline indicators of the state of the intercollegiate athletics program as the campus moves from NCAA Division II status to Division I. Although the Chancellor approved the transition over the objection of the Senate, the Senate took the position that it has a responsibility to review the impact of the change and to annually review the campus’ adherence to the promises made regarding “student/athletes”. We focused on the development of statistical indicators that measure the status of the student athlete program at the end of the Division II years. Interim Vice Provost Fred Wood, Interim Director Elias Lopez of Student Affairs Research and Information (SARI), and William Kidder in Student Affairs were instrumental in developing a data set that the Senate can use to evaluate the campus’ commitment to the student part of student athlete. The current plan is to update this information annually and report to the Executive Council.

**Program Review**

One unfinished piece of business involves revision of the undergraduate program review process. Through the hard work of Dan Potter, Chair of the Undergraduate Council, Interim Vice Provost Fred Wood, Associate Deans Jim McClain and Dann Trask, among others, subject to approval by the Undergraduate Council and the Executive Council, a special task force is prepared to implement a major restructuring of the undergraduate program review process. Elias Lopez, Interim Director, and Gillian Butler of SARI, along with Kelly Ratliff, Bob Agee, and Dawn Casteel from the Office of Resource Management and Planning, have developed a collection of data that will permit a comparative analysis of undergraduate major programs based on evidence of performance. The data set will be available to major programs as part of their self-review. Publication of the data will vastly simplify the work involved in developing the self-review and will give reviewers a picture of similar programs on a comparative basis based on objective evidence.
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVISIONS

Minimum Progress

Spurred on by the spring 2004 resolution of the Representative Assembly crafted by Professor Quirino Paris, a special task force under the leadership of Professor Matt Farrens revised the minimum progress requirements for undergraduate students. The revised regulations were adopted by the Representative Assembly. The new requirements have forced the College Associate Deans to notify students who are subject to disqualification for not meeting minimum progress requirements. The Associate Deans are concerned with the work load burden of contacting a large number of students. However, that workload attests to the success of the regulation. Students who are failing to meet minimum progress are being advised of the necessity of increasing their units. The flexibility of the policy provides students an opportunity to improve performance through a notification process.

Undergraduate Preparatory Writing Requirement

With the leadership of Lorena Oropeza, Matt Farrens, and Dan Potter, a special task force successfully recommended revisions to the so-called “Subject A” requirement that eliminates the need for a special exam after students complete the Workload 50 writing course. Hopefully this change will make resources available to reduce the number of students in writing courses.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I’m done. There are so many Senate members who have done so much in the last two years to strengthen the role of the Academic Senate at Davis that I cannot possibly begin to express my thanks adequately to each of them. I trust that all of you know of your contribution and will reflect on the fact that the best gratitude for your work is the knowledge that we have all served UC Davis to make it a better place.

There are important issues that the new leadership of the Davis Division and its committees will continue to work on. These include the FTE allocation process, crafting the proper balance between academic planning through initiatives and planning through departments, and insuring the appropriate role for departments in the recruitment and appointment of new faculty. The Senate and campus administration will have to work together as partners in our collective academic enterprise to resolve these and all of the other issues that will arise in the course of the coming years. As for the Senate, the Committee on Committees has done its work well. The Senate is in good hands.
Finally, I remind us all that we are the Academic Senate. Faculty who are privileged with membership in the Academic Senate of the University of California are entrusted by the Regents with a share of the University’s governance. We share the responsibility of governance through our participation in the work of the Senate, which is only as good as we make it.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Simmons
Professor of Law
Chair of the Division 2004-2006
Committee on Faculty Welfare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week - Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>As Needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

None

Issues considered by the committee

- The Cost of Graduate Education
- West Village Development
- Salary Adjustments
- Initiative Hiring
- Family Friendly Benefits
- Miscellaneous Items

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

None
Committee’s Narrative:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare is charged with considering issues relevant for the welfare of the faculty in two broad categories: economic welfare of University faculty and broader conditions of employment. The latter category often pertains to issues that involve other committees, and the role of this committee is to represent faculty interests. Issues vary over time. Most recently, topics of importance have included concerns over the high cost of graduate student support, and particularly, faculty research funds as a source of graduate student funding; emergency/pandemic planning; parking; and issues relating to summer instruction.

The former category, economic welfare of faculty, is generally the primary focus of the committee, with separate sets of concerns for recruitment, retention, and retirement. Accordingly, much of this committee’s work is centered on the activities of the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW). Under Academic Senate Bylaw 175, UCFW considers and reports on matters concerning the economic welfare of the faculty, including salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. UCFW relies on the activities of divisional committees, which review and advise on matters before that committee. Issues during the past year have included possible new, “family-friendly” benefits; low faculty salaries relative to comparison universities, leading to concerns such as difficulties with recruitment and retention; and various matters relating to health-care and retirement benefits. The committee also addressed issues such as long-term disability, medical separation and “presumptive resignation”, parking, and other topics.

Locally, the Committee on Faculty Welfare met twice last year, and conducted other business by email. One member of the committee served on a committee concerning policies for the West Village housing development. Another served on the Academic Senate’s Task Force on Personnel Issues and on the Task Force for Pandemic Planning. Faculty Welfare was also represented on an ad hoc task force on Graduate Student Support and on an ad hoc committee to consider appointments
in the Academic Senate for Specialists in Cooperative Extension in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

*The Cost of Graduate Education:* While not part of the more narrowly defined purview of our committee, the high cost of supporting Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs) remains an issue of critical importance for the welfare of UC faculty. A particular concern is the administration’s policy of defining non-resident tuition and student fees as benefits of employment as a GSR. This is a substantial burden for faculty research funds, impeding research productivity and ultimately, faculty advancement. Through the Task Force on Graduate Student Support, our committee’s support for reducing this burden on faculty helped shape the resolution that was passed by the Representative Assembly.

*West Village Development:* Through participation in the West Village steering committee, Faculty Welfare has provided feedback throughout the development of the proposed policy for allocating housing units within West Village. Our committee did not review any aspects of the development itself, but focused on matters concerning eligibility and priority for access, and focused mainly on two topic areas. One area concerns the difficult issues concerning separation from the University. These include resignation and retirement, but also death of the household member employed by the University or divorce. Our committee favored generous terms for family members over a loss of access. The committee expressed support for a policy that allowed retirees to remain residents of West Village. There was also support for a generous amount of time for relocation following the death of the family member employed by the University, and a view that resignations need not be treated as generously. In general, the committee felt that these were sensitive and difficult issues. For instance, there was no consensus concerning whether, in the event of divorce, the spouse not employed by the University should be allowed to remain indefinitely in West Village. These are complicated issues, and our committee looks forward to following the progress of all policies concerning access to West Village. While we did not see West Village as a panacea for the high cost of housing, we did feel that there might be a certain niche within the faculty who might be well served by this development.
The other area of concern related to the implications of faculty residing in West Village and not enjoying equity growth comparable to the experience of faculty owning homes in Davis or surrounding areas. It may be that some faculty will gladly accept the terms offered, and recognize that affordability up front requires some trade-offs. However, our committee felt that there may be morale problems in the future, if these faculty feel disadvantaged by having opted for residing in West Village. Our main recommendation was that any potential faculty recruits, or other faculty considering moving to West Village, be offered extensive financial advice concerning these issues.

Salary Adjustments: Faculty Welfare also advised the administration concerning recently proposed salary adjustments, aimed at reducing the inequities that have developed over time, based on off-scale salaries for recruitments and retentions in some disciplines. A longstanding concern within the committee is that UC salary scales are not competitive; the off-scale salaries currently paid are a symptom of this problem, not the problem itself. Nonetheless, there are problems that follow from the use of off-scale to respond to market conditions that differ across departments and disciplines, and an obvious one is inequity, where faculty members at any particular step might be paid significantly different salaries.

Early in the process, our committee reviewed the proposal for salary adjustments. Faculty Welfare is supportive of the administration’s attempt to address inequity, and supported the proposal to raise salaries at the lower end of the distribution, for each rank and step. Our committee also notes the difficulties with using off-scale salaries to achieve this outcome, and questioned the appropriateness of tying the continued receipt of an off-scale salary increment to continued advancement via normal merit reviews. The committee was unaware of the plan to add this condition to even high-level steps, and while this plan was not formally reviewed by the committee when announced recently, it would likely not meet with support from Faculty Welfare. Briefly put, if the salary adjustments are meant to address the fact that base salaries at any step are below market, then these adjustments should not require further advancement for faculty to retain them.
**Initiative Hiring:** Faculty Welfare also provided a set of comments concerning the administration’s proposed guidelines for multi-department faculty searches. Though commonly called “initiative hiring”, the proposed guidelines really pertain to any search involving more than one department, and whether the position was allocated by an initiative or some other means is irrelevant. Our committee voiced numerous, substantial concerns with the new guidelines, and provided input into the response from the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. The most significant of these are the introduction of perverse incentives for departments—settling for a mediocre candidate may be the best way to capture the position—and the absence of any guidelines for determining the candidate to be selected for appointment. It is imperative that these concerns be addressed.

**Family-Friendly Benefits:** Turning to salary and benefit issues, the committee responded to a request from UCFW for priority ranking of various proposed new benefits. One, an adoption benefit, was considered by our committee to be both equitable and worthy of further study by UCOP. There was also support for providing referrals for emergency child care when faculty needed to cover teaching and committee obligations. (Some faculty felt they could simply cancel class, in the event of emergency child care needs, or rely on colleagues to substitute, while others did not think they could do so without negative repercussions.) More generally, however, Faculty Welfare supports such benefits, but views addressing housing affordability and the competitiveness of total compensation (not just salaries, but health-care costs and retirement benefits) to be of much greater importance.

**Miscellaneous Items:** The committee also responded to information requests or concerns received from individual faculty. During the past year, these included an issue concerning the rescheduling of final exams, access to classrooms and assistance with moving around campus for faculty temporarily disabled, and inquiries about health plans or the purpose for information requested by one such plan. The committee also is in the early stage of providing feedback concerning retirement planning materials and workshops.
Agenda for 2006-07: Many of the issues before the committee are long-term. Continued concerns over the competitiveness of total compensation and the proposed resumption of contributions to UCRS seem likely to dominate in the coming year, as will issues concerning retirees.

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 sbkele@ucdavis.edu or directly to the committee chair at bkbryant@ucdavis.edu.
Committee on International Studies & Exchanges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 6</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Twice per quarter.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: Approximately 2-3 hours/month. The chair averages 3 hrs/week.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A total of 68 GE Petitions for EAP Coursework was reviewed; 61 were approved and 7 were denied.</td>
<td>No petitions were carried forward from the previous year.</td>
<td>No petitions were deferred to the coming academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: The committee proposed a bylaw revision to add the Director of Summer Abroad and the Director of Quarter Abroad as ex officio members as well as adding the charge of providing academic approval and oversight of the Campus Reciprocal Exchange Program. This proposal will be voted on at the October 12, 2006 Representative Assembly meeting.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: The GE Petitions for EAP coursework are now being posted to MySenate and a list is maintained by EAP and the Registrar, so requests for courses already approved can be expedited.

Issues considered by the committee: The primary topics of discussion were: 1) Ways to promote internationalizing the curriculum as suggested at the Chancellor’s Fall Conference and instituting a new GE requirement in Global Citizenship; 2) Proposal for an Academic Senate Award for Excellence in International Scholarship; 3) Campus based Reciprocal Exchange Program; and the 4) UOEAP Budget Deficit and Strategies for the future.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: No recommendations for changes this year were proposed.

Committee’s narrative:

The Committee on International Studies & Exchanges met six times in 2005-06 beginning on October 17th with its members discussing a broad range of issues pertaining to international studies and exchanges. The primary discussion topics and actions are listed below.
GE Requirement in Global Citizenship

It was a particularly critical year for this committee because the Chancellor charged the campus with finding ways to internationalize our students at the Chancellor’s Fall Conference. Discussions began immediately about how to formulate courses and experiences for students that would provide an international/global experience and satisfy GE requirements. This was also a year in which a GE Task Force was newly formed in early winter to respond to how UC Davis would revise their GE curriculum to satisfy the requirements of WASC. Chair Lesher met with the GE Task Force and continued to correspond with them thereafter in an effort to keep this notion at the forefront of their deliberations. At our April meeting, we invited Davis Honors Challenge students to present their project on “Global Citizenship as a Potential GE Component”. The presentation was timely and the committee applauded the students on the thorough study they conducted and the results they received culminating in their effective report. Many of their suggestions were incorporated into our final recommendations.

Our GE Global Citizenship recommendation is unit-based vs a course-based requirement. This allows creative course development that would allow partial credit towards this requirement. It also explains the difference between “Global Citizenship” vs “Domestic Diversity” (or “Diversity in America” i.e., diversity and cultural conflict within the United States). The proposal for the new GE requirement in Global Citizenship drafted by the committee (see Appendix I) was formally submitted to Academic Chair Dan Simmons in August 2006. Chair Simmons sent a formal request to GE Committee for review and comments as early as possible at the 2006-07 academic year.

Academic Senate Award for Excellence in International Scholarship

Committee members were enthusiastic about the idea of an award for excellence in international scholarship and agreed it would be appropriate for CISE to take the lead administering such an award; however, it was felt that the actual selection committee should have broader Academic Senate representation than just CISE members. The following questions were sent to the Academic Senate Chair for a response from VP Bill Lacy’s office.

1. Scholarship by its very nature is international. We are all trying to add to humanity's knowledge and culture. What distinguishes international discovery, learning and engagement from "national" discovery, learning and engagement?

2. If it is primarily discovery with international collaborators, how does the criteria differ from those of the Faculty Research Award?

3. If it is primarily assisting international learning, what criteria is to be used, e.g., some kind of EAP student evaluations, etc?

4. If it is primarily engagement in international programs, how does the criteria differ from those of the Distinguished Public Service Award?

5. How many faculty are viable candidates? After the first few awards will there be any deserving candidates

6. To help establish the selection criteria can examples be provided of individuals on other UC campuses or at comparable universities deserving of such an award? Why are these individuals deserving?
7. Will there be a cash award accompanying the distinction?

We are awaiting the answers to the above questions before proceeding further.

**UOEAP Budget Cuts/Strategies for the Future**

UOEAP’s budget was cut by 15%, 3.3 million dollars due to a deficit from the year before. They proposed a number of cuts as follows: 1) to the study centers themselves; 2) EAP central; 3) UC release funds for campus directors; 4) insurance subsidies in the UK, which is the only EAP program where those subsidies are provided; and 5) they are looking at countries that have duplicate programs, summer programs, and subject specific programs where they typically have low enrollments.

The committee felt that since they are charged with oversight of academic programs, as is UCIE, and if changes are made that affect the quality of the overall academic program, we should have a voice in the same. We allied with the Berkeley equivalent committee and passed the following motion to go forward to UCIE, UOEAP, and the DD Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons:

"The Committee on International Studies & Exchanges of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate strongly urges UOEAP to postpone budget cuts to academic programs until the 2007-08 school year; and for the budget cuts to be done in conjunction with the already planned re-evaluation of the whole program by UCIE."

As a result, UCIE was able to review and provide recommendations that were accepted with modifications.

The funding issue is quite complex. New ways of obtaining funding are being considered. Currently, the students pay their registration fees and go abroad. The $5,000/student education fees go directly to OP and those funds are supposed to come back to the campus to support EAP. 2005-06 EAP Director Peter Schiffman has been calculating the costs involved to our campus. He reported UC Davis is pretty well funded. The EAP directors met and compared their cost analyses. He presented this report to our P&B Chair, Ann Orel, and she is working with ORMP AVC Kelly Ratliff to see if funds can be traded to cover the costs. He added this apparently is a very difficult task. He has also been talking with Pat Conrad, our UCPB representative, and is trying to get this issue addressed at the system wide UCPB meetings.

An Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of International Education has been formed. UC Davis Vice Provost of International Relations Bill Lacy is serving on this committee. The purpose of this ad hoc committee is to conduct a comprehensive review of international educational activities throughout the university. The initial charge was to develop a mission statement, which VP Lacy felt was already vetted by this committee. It has officially been adopted by this campus. Representatives from Summer Abroad Programs, Extension, Quarter or Semester Abroad or third-party providers, and the internship program were brought in for an hour to an hour and a half to discuss what each are doing. Additionally, Study Directors from around the world have been contacted and interviewed. VP Lacy is making connections to hopefully build relationships for internships and other study abroad opportunities for our students. In response to Chair Lesher's question about what drivers are being used for the direction we are headed, VP Lacy responded the following questions are being asked. 1) Is in-depth academic emersion still viable in competition with popular short-term programs?
2) Should we seek greater cooperation and collaboration among the programs for the benefit of the students and the university as a whole? 3) What role do you think international educational opportunities ought to play in crafting an international strategy? The committee’s report is due by the end of 2006.

**Campus-Based Reciprocal Exchange Program**

This exchange program is the result of much effort on campus to provide undergraduate and graduate exchange programs with fee waivers. The concept is a student pays at his/her home campus and the fees are waived at the visiting campus. After about 5 years of discussions, UOEAP and UOIP have provided this agreement which gives authority to individual UC campuses to have the exchanges. It has been mandated by UOEAP that the exchange be under the auspices of EAP and everything that's involved in an exchange for academic credit must be handled by the campus itself. Many UCD departments will be involved including the faculty senate. The faculty senate, through 2005-06 Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons, requires that we have a P&P in place before the faculty senate would permit this to happen.

Associate Vice Provost for International Programs Dennis Dutschke assembled a group to discuss the central issues brought to light. The concerns were about academic integrity – to assure that it is UC level - and how to address the issue of health, safety, and welfare of the students while they are studying abroad. A workable UCD infrastructure had to be incorporated. They had to code the students in the Registrar’s records; assess the integrity of the academic program; and consult with the other offices who would be involved with this agreement. CISE endorsed the proposal and will be in charge of oversight for the academic integrity component.

The University Outreach and International Programs is the administrative office of the exchange program and has the ultimate liability and responsibility. All of these exchanges must be approved and administered by their office. It requires a working agreement with the reciprocal institution and a working agreement that stipulates the actual exchange. Once these are in place, it is the department's responsibility to select the students who will go to the partner institution and also to assist those students from the partner institution to come here - with a lot of cooperation and communication with risk management, registrar, and other appropriate offices at UCD. The Registrar would consider these to be similar to, but not the same as, EAP students. There will be a connection with the campus wide EAP department for keeping track of these students. These are exchanges where EAP does not have an exchange. Each exchange can only admit 3 fte students per year to their institution and theirs to ours. Overall there can only be 20 total ftes annually. This is a pilot program for 3 years. UC San Diego is currently considering implementation of a similar program.

**Review of General Education Petitions Pertaining to Courses Taken Abroad**

One of the Academic Senate bylaw-mandated responsibilities of CISE is to designate approved Education Abroad Program courses for General Education credit. During 2005-06 and with the support of our EAP Coordinator Joel Shriver and our committee analyst Kathy von Rummelhoff, CISE has reviewed and processed a total of 68 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 was revised this year to include
involving the Registrar’s office in maintaining a list of approved courses. This approved list alleviates the need for duplicating efforts of repeatedly reviewing the same courses. Once approved, those courses are automatically approved on future petitions for those same courses.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles (Chip) Lesher, Chair and UCIE DD Representative
Anne Britt
Beverly Bossler
Patrick Carroll
Fadi Fathallah
Art Krener
Chuck Walker
Peter Schiffman, ex officio
Wesley Young, ex officio
Kathryn Tyson, ex officio
Arthur Dublin, Academic Federation Representative
Kraig Kraft, Graduate Student Association (GSA) Representative
Erin Loury, Associated Students of UC Davis (ASUCD) Representative

Diane Adams, EAC Associate Director and Committee Guest
Joel Shriver, EAP Coordinator and Committee Guest
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Committee Resource Analyst
Proposal for a new GE Requirement in Global Citizenship

Working draft by the
UC Davis Academic Senate Committee on
International Studies and Exchanges (CISE)
August 16, 2006

"And what better place to prepare those world citizens, people who can see bridges instead of boundaries, than at our colleges and universities? I hope that a global perspective will eventually permeate our curriculum and our discussions and that the day will come when all of our students will be able to have an experience in another culture."

Chancellor Larry Vanderhoef (2004 Convocation speech, “Crossing Boundaries Imagined and Real”)

We propose changes to Baccalaureate Degree Requirements for General Education, as set forth in the U.C. Davis requirements for Higher Degrees, Section 522, to include course work, either abroad or on the Davis campus, in Global Citizenship. This proposal is a direct outgrowth of recommendations of the Academic Senate Committee on International Studies and Exchanges (CISE) in 2003 to establish an International Education GE requirement and subsequent support for these recommendations by the 2004 Task Force on Internationalizing the Curriculum.

Global Citizenship means being educated about other languages, cultures, religions, races, and political systems, and being able to interact in a respectful and knowledgeable way with people of other cultures. Global citizenship is increasingly important as the United States now more than ever misunderstands the world and the world misunderstanding the United States. UC Davis has a responsibility to educate its students - who eventually will live and work in all corners of the globe - as citizens not only of their home country, but also of the world. UC Davis students should develop the ability to understand other cultures and to see ourselves, and this country, as others see may view us. We believe that one of the best paths to becoming a better citizen of the world is to have an extended (at least one month) experience living outside the United States. Living abroad challenges one’s preconceptions and assumptions on virtually a daily basis, providing unparalleled opportunities to interact with peoples of diverse backgrounds and worldviews. Ideally, such experiences will lead to action towards equality and peace. Since not all students are able to incorporate a study abroad experience into their undergraduate program we propose that students unable to study abroad can fulfill the Global Citizenship GE requirement through various campus-based course work or local internships.
I. Proposed Bylaw

A GE course in Global Citizenship will be any course that develops the knowledge and skills for social justice, cross-cultural understanding, community building, and environmental awareness around the world. Courses fulfilling this GE requirement may increase students’ understanding of sustainable development, the environment, public health, peacekeeping and global security, nutrition and food supplies, human rights, foreign peoples and languages, or related topics that address the need for cooperation across cultural boundaries, whether geographic, ethnic, religious or economic.

This proposal would add one new 3-unit course to the GE requirements, which would be waived if the student participates in an approved study abroad program or internship. Moreover, if a new unit-based system is adopted for GE credit students could fulfill the requirement by taking either a single one 3-unit course on campus or perhaps 2-3 courses that allocate 1-2 units towards Global Citizenship. The Faculty Senate Committee on International Studies and Exchange will assume responsibility for reviewing and approving courses for Global Citizenship credit.

Students will fulfill this requirement by

(a) a study abroad experience, i.e., courses offered by the UC Education Abroad Program, UC Davis Summer Abroad, UC Davis Quarter Abroad, International Internships, or non-UC study abroad programs approved for course credit*. Students are encouraged to participate in study abroad programs that emphasize Global Citizenship, but any substantive and scholarly study abroad experience that provides a significant cross-cultural experience should fulfill the requirement.

or

(b) an approved course offered on campus (including distance learning) or internship. Courses that would qualify would be those that focus on international or transnational phenomena. This includes globalization and the movement of people and political and social movements beyond national borders. Particularly appropriate would be courses in human rights, international law, global economics, world health, world history, global politics, immigration, world agriculture, etc.

*An umbrella course could be created for study abroad participants in non-UC study abroad programs. In these cases students would be required to petition the Faculty Senate Committee on International Studies and Exchanges (CISE) for GE credit.
II. Interpretation

It is important in developing a new GE requirement in Global Citizenship to understand its relationship to the existing GE requirement in Diversity. As expressed in the By Laws for the GE Diversity requirement “The purpose of the diversity requirement is for students to gain a greater appreciation of the myriad of perspectives found in a multi-cultural society.” The emphasis here is placed on issues of diversity and cultural conflict within our society, although it did not exclude students from receiving credit for courses dealing with these issues beyond our boarders. While it is beyond the scope of this proposal to address specific changes to the current Diversity requirement, we do suggest that it might be more appropriately defined as “Domestic Diversity” or “Diversity in America”. Similarly, the GE requirement in Global Citizenship is intended to address these same fundamental issues beyond our immediate boarders. Of course, the two are often intimately related, particularly with respect to first generation immigrants, and the ties many minority groups maintain with their non-US cultural heritage. In this regard, we consider the GE requirement in Global Citizenship to be complementary to the current GE requirement in Diversity and it may often be the case that appropriate courses or experiences will fulfill both of requirements simultaneously. Likewise, courses in the conventional disciplines that fulfill either the Diversity or Global Citizenship criteria could also reasonably count towards the GE Topical Breadth discipline or may share credit in a unit-based system. For example, a course in African-American studies could simultaneously fulfill the Arts and Humanities and the “Diversity in America requirements. A course in “Global Economics” could simultaneously fulfill the Global Citizenship and the Social Science requirements. Likewise, a Chemistry class taken abroad would fulfill both the Global Citizenship and the Science and Engineering requirements.

III. Guiding questions

1. Does the course provide an experience in a culture outside the United States?

2. Does this course promote cross-cultural understanding?

3. Does this course enhance knowledge and skills for social justice, community building, public health, peacekeeping and global security, or environmental awareness around the world (recognizing that no one course can cover all of these issues)?

4. How does the class provide the opportunity for critically thinking and analysis of global issues?

5. How will you assess whether these goals have been achieved in the students’
academic performance (i.e., international experience, sample test questions, paper topics, etc.)?

IV. Examples of current courses fulfilling the GE Global Citizenship requirement

We are currently reviewing current course offerings that would fulfill the GE Global Citizenship criteria. This is a collaborative effort between CISE and an ad hoc committee of undergraduates chaired by ASUCD Senator Dwaimy Rosa-Romero and including Adin Castillo, Aime Castillo, Adrienne Reninga and Hayley Steffen (members of the DHC 3rd-year project “Citizens of the World: Global Citizenship as a potential GE requirement”). A list of recommended courses is expected to be ready for inclusion in this proposal by late-October, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Lesher, Chair and UCIE DD Representative
Anne Britt
Beverly Bossler
Patrick Carroll
Fadi Fathallah
Art Krener
Chuck Walker
Peter Schiffman, ex officio
Wesley Young, ex officio
Kathryn Tyson, ex officio
Arthur Dublin, Academic Federation Representative
Kraig Kraft, Graduate Student Association (GSA) Representative
Erin Loury, Associated Students of UC Davis (ASUCD) Representative

Diane Adams, EAC Associate Director and Committee Guest
Joel Shriver, EAP Coordinator and Committee Guest
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Committee Resource Analyst
September 25, 2006

CATHERINE VANDEVOORT, Chair  
Academic Federation

LINDA BISSON, Chair  
Academic Senate

BARBARA HORWITZ, Vice Provost  
Academic Personnel


Please find enclosed the 2005-2006 Annual Report submitted by the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC). The JPC finished another challenging and productive year. Besides reviewing 181 personnel actions, the JPC also reviewed 7 departmental voting group and peer review plans.

As Chair, I was honored to serve with outstanding colleagues, whose dedication made the JPC effective. I extend my sincere gratitude to the following members:

David Harris – Specialist (Vegetable Crops)  
Tim Hartz – Specialist in Cooperative Extension (Plant Sciences)  
John Hess – Associate Researcher (MED: Human Anatomy)  
Bob Gilbertson – Professor (Plant Pathology)  
Ken Giles – Professor (Biological and Agricultural Engineering)  
Adib Rowhani – Project Scientist (Plant Pathology)

I’m confident that the committee will continue to successfully serve the campus with John Hess as the 2006-2007 Chair.

Sincerely,

Stephen Grattan, Chair 2005-2006

Enclosure

cc: Jo-Anne Boorkman, Academic Personnel  
2005-2006 Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee Members  
Deans – Schools and Colleges
Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 27</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Bi-weekly (sometimes weekly)</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each meeting week: 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total: 181 Actions Reviewed</td>
<td>Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: 0</td>
<td>Total deferred to the coming academic year: 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
none

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
none

Issues considered by the committee

1) Proposed appointments were often at an inappropriate level, typically too low: the JPC did not support 39% of appointments as proposed (35 of 89). This was particularly true for the Project Scientist title. In 18 of the 35 appointments (51%), the JPC recommended a higher step than proposed.

2) The submitted position descriptions (PDs) are often inappropriate for the proposed title or not detailed enough. This has been a continuing problem. Most commonly, the PDs lack information, or contain inaccurate information regarding supervision, independent research and publishing requirements. Often there would be wording such as “write manuscripts” or “submit manuscripts” which differs from “must publish research in peer reviewed journals and other appropriate peer-reviewed outlets”. In addition, there needs to be better clarification regarding “Independent research”, which is required by all academic titles versus developing an “independent research program” which is required for the Professional Research Series. Improved education is required at the departmental level such that appropriate wording is used. Often sample PDs are provided by the JPC to the department when inappropriate PDs are written.

3) Appointment to serve in the JPC requires a significant time commitment (4-5 hours/week during a meeting week). This has significantly increased since the Project Scientist title has been introduced. Appropriate
compensation for committee service continues to be a concern for the JPC. Without an incentive to serve on the JPC, the committee fears it will be difficult recruiting suitable and objective members in the future perhaps jeopardizing the integrity of the review process.

4) The JPC also found, in many cases, that Category II publications were inappropriately listed under the Category I list. This added unnecessary confusion and additional time for committee members to sort out the differences. The committee believes that this needs to be addressed at the department level and/or analysts at the Dean's/Vice-Provost office before packets are forwarded to the JPC for review.

5) In several cases, the JPC found it difficult to evaluate a candidate’s research program where manuscripts listed in packets had multiple (20-50 authors). If it were just a couple publications in a handful of others, this issue was not a problem. It was only problematic when the majority of all publications listed contained multiple authors listed in alphabetical order. Perhaps candidates in these instances can make a better effort in the “author contribution” section to assist JPC members in their research contribution.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
none

Committee’s narrative:

(Period covering September 1, 2005 – August 31, 2006)

The Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC) met 27 times during this period to review packets. Of the 181 personnel actions reviewed, information on the corresponding final decision was available for 146 actions. The JPC also reviewed 7 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 (181) is 10 more than the caseload from the previous year (171). 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 | 43 | 33 | 1 | 77 |
APPOINTMENTS and APPOINTMENTS VIA CHANGE IN TITLE
(referred to as "appointments" collectively in this section)

Once again, most of the actions reviewed were for the relatively new Project Scientist series (effective July 1, 2004) – with 50 proposed appointments plus 8 appointments via change in title. The combined appointments to this new series accounted for 75% of all appointments reviewed by the JPC.

The JPC supported 43 of 77 (56%) of all proposed appointments as submitted. Table 3 below shows the percentage of proposed appointments on which the JPC and the final authority agreed on the appointment level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Series/ JPC Recommendation</th>
<th>FINAL DECISION</th>
<th>Percent Agreement between JPC &amp; Final Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree w/ JPC</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including Conferral of Emeritus Status to two Specialists in CE and a Clinical Professor
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 38% of these cases. (Data was unavailable for 55% of these actions.)
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 50% of these cases. (Data was unavailable for 25% of these actions.)

This academic year marked the second full year for the Project Scientist series. The JPC has worked closely with the Office of the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel in establishing consistency in the appointment process for this title series. In regards to appointments in the Project Scientist title series, the JPC and the final authority agreed on 63% of the cases.

MERITS (including Accelerated Merits)

The JPC supported 40 of 54 (74%) proposed merits. Table 4 below shows the breakdown of the JPC’s recommendations regarding these merits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL MERITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title Series/ JPC Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agronomist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Appointment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Scientist</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One merit was sent back because the request was incomplete. Of the 14 merits which the JPC did not support, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 86% of the cases. (Data was unavailable for 8% of these actions.)

**PROMOTIONS (including Accelerated Promotions)**

The JPC supported 26 of 31 (84%) proposed promotions; the final authority agreed with the JPC on all of these promotions. In the 5 cases where the JPC voted against the promotion, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 60% of the actions. Table 5 below summarizes the JPC's recommendations on these promotions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5: ACCELERATED AND NORMAL PROMOTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINAL DECISION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title Series/ JPC Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree w/ JPC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree with Original Proposal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent Agreement between JPC &amp; Final Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 3 3 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 1 1 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 2 2 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 0 0 0 0 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes 15 15 0 0 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 4 2 1 1 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AD HOC COMMITTEE REVIEW

Ad hoc review was required in 61 of the 181 actions reviewed by the JPC. The JPC voted as a Committee of the Whole to waive ad hoc review for all of these actions.

CONFERRAL OF EMERITUS STATUS

The JPC received 3 requests for conferral of Emeritus status to two Specialists in Cooperative Extension and a Clinical Professor. The JPC supported all requests; the final authority approved two of the requests. The third is pending.

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

The development of appropriate position descriptions (PD) continues to be a concern, judging from the JPC’s recommendations for revisions in 62 of 182 (34%) cases reviewed. Table 6 below shows the breakdown of recommended position description revisions per title. Note that nearly 3 out of 4 PDs in both the Professional Researcher and Specialist titles were unsatisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Series</th>
<th>Revisions Recommended</th>
<th>% of Total Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists in CE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg Percent Agreement 93%
VOTING GROUP & PEER REVIEW PLANS

The JPC reviewed a total of 7 voting group and peer review plans. The JPC’s recommendations are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted with Recommended Revisions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected; requiring revisions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JPC found that 4 of 7 (57%) submitted plans were acceptable without the need for revision. Most of these had already been through multiple revisions. While departments are still having difficulty with the composition of the voting and peer groups, significant progress has been made.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Grattan, Chair
Members: John Hess, David Harris, Tim Hartz, Adib Rowhani, Bob Gilbertson, Ken Giles, Adib Rowhani
## APPENDIX - TABLE 1: Committee Recommendations per Title and Action 2005-2006

| Action Type                         | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total | Yes | No | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|-----|----|-------|
| Appointment (Agronomist)            | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 8   | 6  | 15    | 28  | 22 | 50    | 0   | 0  | 0     | 7   | 5  | 12    | 77  |
| Appointment via Change in Title     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 2   | 1  | 3     | 6   | 1  | 8     | 1   | 0  | 1     | 1   | 0  | 1     | 13  |
| Appeals                             | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 2  | 2     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 1  | 1     | 2   | 0  | 0     | 4   |
| Conferral of Emeritus Status**      | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 2   | 0  | 2     | 2*  |
| Accelerated Merits                  | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 1  | 1     | 0   | 1  | 1     | 3   | 1  | 4     | 2   | 0  | 2     | 8   |
| Normal Merits                       | 1   | 0  | 1     | 4   | 0  | 4     | 8   | 9  | 17    | 3   | 0  | 3     | 15  | 2  | 17    | 4   | 0  | 4     | 46  |
| Accelerated Promotions              | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   | 0  | 0     | 0   |
| Promotions                          | 0   | 0  | 0     | 2   | 1  | 3     | 15  | 4  | 19    | 2   | 0  | 2     | 4   | 0  | 4     | 3   | 0  | 3     | 31  |
| **TOTAL**                           | 1   | 0  | 1     | 6   | 1  | 7     | 33  | 23 | 57    | 39  | 24 | 64    | 23  | 4  | 28    | 19  | 5  | 24    | 181 |

**The JPC also reviewed a proposal for conferral of Emeritus status to a Clinical Professors. The JPC supported all proposals.**
Total Meetings: 4  
Meeting frequency: Quarterly and as otherwise needed.  
Average hours of committee work each quarter: 8 hours per quarter.

Total of 2 proposals reviewed.  
Total of reviewed ------------ deferred from the previous year: Nothing was deferred.  
Total ------------- deferred to the coming academic year: Nothing was deferred.

No new bylaw changes were proposed.

No new committee policies were established or revised.

Issues considered by the committee:  
1) White papers on scholarly communication;  
2) California Digital Library; and  
3) Library fees for overdue books

No procedural or policy changes were recommended for this year.

Committee’s narrative:

The focus of the Library Committee during the 2005-2006 was on issues of scholarly communication, in particular, the white papers on scholarly communication prepared by the Special Committee on Scholarly Communication (SCSC) and which have been forwarded to other senate committees at UC Davis. As intimated by Ben Crow, Chair of the University Committee on Libraries, the issues involved are “not only complex, but also quite broad.” The UCD Library Committee concurs with UCOL on the need for long-term faculty oversight over scholarly communication, although it must be understood that “oversight” is not intended here in the sense of “control,” but more in line with an advisory function. The Library Committee endorsed the proposed UCOL Bylaw 185 Amendments, namely, that the Bylaw “be expanded to include oversight over scholarly communication,” and that the name of the UCOL be changed from “University Committee on Library” to the “University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication.”
The Library Committee hosted a visit on December 13th, 2005 from John Ober, Director of Policy, Planning, and Outreach in the Office of Scholarly Communication, California Digital Library, who presented a report on Scholarly Communication.

The Library Committee reviewed a proposal to establish a new graduate program in Horticulture and Agronomy and determined that the library facilities were adequate to meet the core research and teaching needs of the new program, with one cautionary note: Support for more specialized research may be necessary as new areas of interest and research develop on the part of the faculty, in which case new funding may be required as the program evolves.

The Library Committee reviewed a proposal to establish a new graduate group and M.S. Degree Program in Environmental Policy and Management. Librarians on the Committee describe the book and journal collections as particularly strong in the environmental sciences. The policy aspects also are well supported. There is, however, one key resource missing from the Library’s collection: the electronic database titled *Environmental Issues & Policy Index*. The estimated subscription fee for one year is $8,000. A permanent augmentation to the Library’s collection budget in the amount of $8,000 will be needed to subscribe to his database.

The Library Committee discussed a request from a post-doctoral scholar to re-examine the Library’s recall policy and fining structure for overdue books, particularly those instances in which the borrower is out of the country. The Committee re-affirmed its support of the Library’s current policy and agreed that adequate notice is provided to all borrowers regarding the consequences of not returning materials that are recalled in a timely manner and that the prompt return of recalled items is a general benefit to campus research and instruction.

Respectfully submitted,

Winder McConnell, Chair  
Doug Conklin, Ex Officio  
Kenny Huang, GSA Rep  
Arthur Huntley, Ex Officio  
Judy Janes, Academic Federation Rep  
Sashi Kunnath, Ex Officio  
Norma Landau  
Marilyn Sharrow, Ex Officio  
Sharon Shoemaker, Ex Officio  
Kathleen Stuart, Ex Officio  
John Tanno, Regular Guest  
Gail Yokote, Regular Guest  
Kathy von Rummelhoff, Analyst
### Committee on Privilege & Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8</th>
<th>As needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Meetings</td>
<td>Meeting frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average hours of committee work each week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total of 6 grievances/disciplinary actions reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.) | Total of 2 actions deferred from the previous year | Total 3 cases deferred (awaiting determination based on P&T Invest Rpt) and 3 cases for potential hearing to the coming academic year |

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

- 

### Listing of committee policies established or revised:

- 

### Issues considered by the committee:

A variety of issues were examined by the committees as related to the grievances or disciplinary actions reviewed. Details follow in the narrative.

### Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

The Representative Assembly forwarded a declaration to the Administration following the June 2006 meeting asking the Administration to work cooperatively with P&T in expediting action.
Committee's narrative:

Grievance Cases

Though a number of inquiries were made by prospective grievants to the Chair of the Investigative Subcommittee, no new grievance cases were filed during the 2005-2006 academic year. However, the committee was kept busy with carryover cases from previous years.

1. A case involved a faculty member in the School of Medicine (SOM), who alleged that the department Chair misappropriated funds intended for the faculty member's state supported FTE and otherwise improperly adjusted the faculty member's salary, denied the faculty's right of shared governance, and inequitably allocated academic time for research. The latter formed the core of the grievance, with the faculty member complaining that all FTE faculty in his department had been reduced from 40% research time to 20%, while campus expectations for merit and promotion actions remained the same.

The Investigative Subcommittee had found sufficient evidence on all four allegations to warrant a hearing, and suggested that the administration offer a remedy. The administration disagreed, and the Investigative Subcommittee referred this case to hearing. However, negotiations between the grievant and administration continued, including at the UC systemwide level. The Investigative Subcommittee continued to play some role, per the by-laws' mandate that the committee "promote a resolution." Systemwide administration made an offer that the grievant be given more research time in exchange for his promise to retire within the next few years. This was not acceptable to the grievant. As of September 2006, the case is scheduled to go to hearing in October.

2. An SOM faculty member alleged that the Dean improperly relocated the faculty member's academic office and clinical practice, and placed severe restrictions on his access to surgical time at the University Medical Center, and alleged that this action was in retaliation against the faculty member's complaints about funds appropriations issues. The investigation found sufficient evidence on both allegations to warrant a hearing. The Subcommittee recommended reversal of the relocation, but this was rejected by the administration. The case went to hearing,
and the Hearings Subcommittee again found that the grievant's complaints were sustained. The administration did not offer remedies acceptable to the grievant. The Chancellor invited the Chair of the Investigative Subcommittee to discuss the case. A meeting took place, with the Chair accompanied by the new 2006-2007 committee Chair, and a discussion was held which seemed to produce some progress. However, by that time the grievant had brought litigation against the Chancellor and the Dean.

Then-Senate Chair Simmons placed the grievant's legal complaint, including the Investigative and Hearings Subcommittee reports and the administration's responses, on the Senate Web page, at: http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/pdf/szabo_complaint.pdf

Though this case is not necessarily typical, it does provide a rare opportunity for Senate faculty to view the inner workings of the grievance process.

3. A faculty member alleged that she had been improperly denied her promotion to Professor I, claiming that she had been subjected to criteria not applied to similar candidates, and that key figures in the promotion process had been personally biased against her. The investigation found sufficient evidence on the allegations to warrant a hearing. The administration offered to have a re-review conducted of the promotion case, but this was not acceptable to the grievant. A settlement meeting was held between the grievant and the administration, with the Chair of the Investigative Subcommittee acting as mediator, with the result that the administration agreed to immediate advancement of the grievant to Professor II (not I), essentially without re-review.

4. A faculty member alleged that CAP and the administration had improperly used collegiality as a criterion in his merit case, and that he had been improperly denied an opportunity to appeal the negative result of a contemporaneous Career Equity Review. The Investigative Subcommittee found considerable evidence to support his claims. The administration disagreed, and as of September 2006 the case is scheduled to go to hearing in October.

5. A faculty member alleged improper denial of a merit increase due to inconsistent standards, improper actions by the
department, personal bias against the grievant, etc. The Investigative Subcommittee found considerable evidence to support his claims. As of September 2006, the administration is considering the committee's report.

6. A faculty member alleged that the department Vice Chair and the college Associate Dean had improperly pressured him into changing the course grade of a student who believed that her grade was too low. The faculty member also charges that the Senate Grade Change Committee and the Senate Student Faculty Relations Committee erred by allowing a grade change to be based on re-assessment of the quality of the student's work, which is forbidden by Regulation A540(E), and erred in other procedural senses. The faculty member made related charges concerning the processing of an Incomplete grade for the same student in a second course taught by this same faculty member. The Investigative Subcommittee found strong evidence that the grievant's rights or privileges were violated in numerous senses. As of September 2006, the administration is considering the committee's report.

Disciplinary Cases:

A carryover disciplinary case, in which the administration had proposed revocation of a faculty member's Emeritus status, was considered by the Investigative Subcommittee, and recommendations were made to the administration. As of September 2006, the case is still pending.
## Committee on Public Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 2</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: The full committee met twice in the Winter quarter. The subcommittee met during the summer to complete their review of the UCDE courses.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: There is not a weekly workload. Review of UCD Extension programs and Academic Senate issues is done by e-mail. Relatively little time is required to serve on this committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Nominations Reviewed: See below.</td>
<td>Total reviewed deferred from the previous year: None</td>
<td>Total deferred to the coming academic year: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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. Review of UCD Extension programs and courses.

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

### Committee’s narrative:

The Committee, after reviewing nominations for the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award, selected four recipients for 2005-2006: Kenneth Brown, Professor of Nutrition and Director of the Program in International Nutrition, Carol Joffe, Professor of Sociology, Bradley Shaffer, Professor of Evolution and Ecology, and Garen Wintemute, Professor of Emergency Medicine and Director of the Violence Prevention Research Program. The awards were announced at the June 1, 2006 meeting of the Representative Assembly. A luncheon in honor of the recipients was held at the Chancellor’s Residence on May 1, 2006.

The brochure, *Faculty in Public Service*, was updated with information on the most recent DSPSA awardees and was distributed widely to UCD administrators, deans, directors, and chairpersons. The Senate public service website is in the process of being updated and is on line at [www.marak.ucdavis.edu/senate/award/default/html](http://www.marak.ucdavis.edu/senate/award/default/html).

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

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, Analyst
### Annual Report: Academic Year 2005-06
#### Davis Division: Academic Senate

#### Committee on Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy: 7
Grants: 4     | Policy: Approx. 3 meetings/quarter
Grants: Approx. 1 meeting/quarter as needed | 1 hour                                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Grant Proposals Reviewed:</th>
<th>Total of reviewed grant proposals deferred from the previous year: 0</th>
<th>Total grant proposals deferred to the coming academic year: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Small Grants: 151
Large Grants: 57
Travel Grants: 313           |                                                 |                                                  |

Research Grant Proposals Accepted for Funding in 2006-07:
Small Grants (2K): 125
Large Grants (10-50K): 11
Travel Grants: 313

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

**Travel Grants:** CoR is considering implementing new travel grant policies because of the increasing number of applicants and the potential for a disproportionate amount of COR funding going into travel at the expense of other programs. Some of the policies considered are to prioritize awarding of travel grants to junior faculty, awarding travel grants every other year, or asking faculty members that apply to provide information on other support or other grants on the application. Emeritus faculty members are not eligible for any CoR awards. The CoR Grants committee will consider these options and disseminate the new policy in the next call for applications.

**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 the
Committee so letting them know if the project was successful.  
**Small Grants:** Next year the small grant form will contain a box for the faculty members to fill in and explain how many courses they routinely teach and the number of units associated with each course.

**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 as appropriate:

1. Common Campus Quarter Calendar
2. UCAAD Diversity Report
3. Academic Council Report
4. Graduate Student Funding Task Force
5. International Award Proposal
6. Effort Reporting Recommendations and presentation
7. Accounting Manual Update
8. Joint Working Group between Senate and Federation Committee on Research
9. ORU Approval Process
10. Engineering Accounts Payable Restrictions
11. Initiative Recruitment Hiring
12. Academic Earmarking
13. Organized Research Unit (ORU) Policy
14. Animal Issues
15. Cost and facilities
16. Science and Math Initiative
17. Multicampus Research Unit (MRU) Policy
18. National laboratories
19. Contracts and Grants (Sponsored Programs)

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

**Committee’s narrative:**
The Committee on Research Policy subcommittee dealt with a number of issues of great importance to the campus during the 2005-2006 academic year. The Committee on Research Chair participated in the ORU Task Force. This task force was charged with looking at the ORU approval policy. The committee discussed and approved a Joint Working Group between the Senate and Federation Committee on Research committees. The proposal requests that the Office of Research form a single Research Policy Advisory Committee that would consist of the members of both the Academic Senate and the Academic Federation Research Committees to provide advice on research issues. Also, the Committee on Research has elevated its involvement and influence as a Senate committee. This has occurred through more active committee members meeting regularly and through more involvement with the Office of Research. The Vice Chancellor for Research regularly attends the Committee on Research
Policy meetings. There are other representatives from the Office of Research that are ex-officio members of the committee as well. During the year, the committee routinely invited various faculty members and officials from the campus to come and discuss certain issues such as animal health care, AAALAC, IACUC, office of research issues, and ORU approval.

The Committee on Research Grants subcommittee successfully awarded 125 (2K) Small Grants in Aid and 11 (10-50K) Large Grants to Promote Extramural Funding. The committee also awarded 313 Research Travel Grants during the 2005-2006 academic year. There are some policies that the Grants subcommittee is considering revising for the 2007-2008 year due to budgetary constraints. The committee considered several different ways to change the travel grant program mainly because of the increasing number of applicants and the potential for a disproportionate amount of COR funding going into travel at the expense of other programs. Overall, the Committee on Research grants program stayed within budget and the system of awarding the grants has become much more efficient. There has been positive feedback on the new system from faculty, staff, and administration.

Respectfully submitted,

CoR Grants Subcommittee
Marion Miller, Chair
Frances Dolan
Niels Gronbech Jensen
Neil Larsen
Dianne Macleod
Sharman O’Neill
Kathryn Olmsted
Jacob Olupona
Ning Pan
Michael Toney
Xiangdong Zhu

CoR Policy Subcommittee
Marion Miller, Chair
James Carey
Nipavan Chiamvimonvat
Thomas Holloway
James Murray
Cheuk-Yiu Ng
Jon Jay Ramsey
Alice Tarantal
Stefano Varese
Anthony Wexler
Keith Widaman
Frances Dolan, Ex-officio
Committee on Student-Faculty Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 2</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: as needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 4-5 hrs/wk on difficult case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Petitions Reviewed: 4</td>
<td>1 total reviewed petition deferred from the previous year</td>
<td>0 total petitions deferred to the coming academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Petitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

As recommended in 2004-05, the fact finding investigations were distributed more amongst the committee members. Historically, the Chair did most of the fact finding investigations. Distributing the investigations amongst the Committee members helped reduce the workload of the Chair.

Issues considered by the committee:

The Committee utilized MySenate to conduct the majority of their business online through the web portal, MySenate. The actions/review items were scanned and posted for Committee review/comment; which saved both the Committee and analyst resources and time. Meetings were scheduled and agendas/minutes were posted on MySenate as well.

The Committee considered the best method (form, bylaw, or waiver) to implement a release statement that would protect faculty members when providing a reference to a student. The idea/need developed from faculty in the Engineering department who felt uncomfortable or unsure if they had the right under HIPA requirements to discuss a student’s performance in a class or
classes that are relevant to a perspective job position. This discussion may continue into the 2006-2007 academic year and center on information gathered from SJA/Campus Counsel if the Academic Senate brings this situation to the Committee again.

Reviewed Items (specifically requested of SFR):

1. The Administration of Student Discipline revised draft from Student Judicial Affairs was reviewed per the request of the Divisional Academic Senate Chair. The Committee found the changes to be overall beneficial and an improvement in policy/procedure. There were three comments/suggestions made: 1) Define the term “advisor” if not already defined in the information 2) Create a simplistic flow chart of actions in order to highlight the main points 3) appreciates the simplified changes and organization of the Student Discipline manual.

2. The proposed amendments from the UC Systemwide Policy on Registered Student Organizations were reviewed by the Committee. The members did not have any comments on these amendments.

3. Reviewed the Universitywide Committee on Academic Freedom Proposal of Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles The Student-Faculty Relationships Committee has reviewed the information and notes that the footnotes clearly give examples comparing what is and is not scholarly inquiry. One question was raised: “My only comment is the independence of the student instructor. Does the student instructor have the independence to present content that is contrary to the wishes or goals of the faculty member?”

4. Reviewed the final draft of DDR 141 for Chair Simmons, submitted by CERJ. Student-Faculty Relationships, had no issues with the changes in the bylaws.

5. The SFR analyst was contacted by 12 students requesting assistance with their situation. Four situations were investigated further after the Chair spoke with the students further:
   a. Investigated and reviewed a petition and denied the grade change. The student stated that he/she will appeal the Committee’s decision; the petition will be reviewed by the Executive Council, Student Petitions Subcommittee in 2006-07 if the student continues with the appeal.
   b. A textbook situation investigated due to students being required to purchase a textbook new, which was authored by the instructor. Resolved since special accommodations are made for those students who cannot either afford or do not want to buy the textbook.
   c. A student had a grade changed from an F to a NS.
   d. Reviewed a student’s grade dispute with the Grade Change Committee and SJA. An agreement was previously made to change the student’s grade and Grade Changes updated...
his/her grade correctly.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:

1. Continue distributing the investigation work amongst Committee members who may specialize or be familiar with the area of the student’s petition.

2. Suggested that Student Judicial Affairs (SJA) write a cover letter/memo to the Grade Change Committee (GCC) as their process in order to have a summary of SFR’s recommendation(s). Historically, information has been lost when transitioning from one group to the other group. Presenting a cover letter for each case will help avoid miscommunication and create a more effective process.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jack Goldberg (Chair)

Yuri Druzhnikov (member), Ronald Hedrick (member), Keith Williams (member), Gregory Miller (ex-officio), Sheila Harrington (ex-officio), Carissa Adams (AF Rep), Oliver Hsu (ASUCD), Stephanie Jordan (ASUCD), Michael Rivera (ASUCD), Erin Harrington (ASUCD), Jennifer Warren (Grad ASUCD), and Diana Howard (Academic Senate Analyst)

Committee’s narrative: See above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 12</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Meetings are scheduled once or twice a month during the quarter.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total --------------</td>
<td>Total projects deferred from the previous year: None</td>
<td>Total projects deferred/continued to the coming academic year: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:**
- DDR 529 The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (Formerly Subject A)
- DDR 542B: Posthumous recognition of student achievement

**Listing of committee policies established or revised:** None.

**Issues considered by the committee:**
- 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; 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 “[Name of College] Writing Requirement” and “Advanced Writing Examination”; Minimum Progress/Time-to-Degree Task Force report on Davis Division Regulation A552; Common quarter calendar; Posthumous recognition of student achievements (DDR-542B); 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; UCAAD Statement on Diversity; The Decline of UC as a Great International University; Future Science Teachers Program (CalTeach); Extracurricular Activities; College of Biological Sciences Bylaw and Regulations
review; General Education Task Force; International Scholarship Award Proposal; Effort Reporting; PPM 200-25 Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs; PPM 200-20 Establishment or Revision of Academic Units; Statement on assignments due during final exam period; Dollar Guidelines for Naming Academic and Non-Academic Properties, Programs and Facilities in Honor of Donors; Electronic Materials Engineering Catalog Copy Revisions; Engineering Honors Proposal; UC Systemwide Policy on Compulsory Campus-Based Student Fees; UC Systemwide Policy on Registered Student Organizations; Review of Systemwide Academic Senate Regulations; Proposal to Disestablish the Department of Exercise Science; Review of general campus catalog galleys (Independent study, GE, American History, Courses, Breadth, and GE themes); Naming opportunities; DDR141 Faculty of the College of Letters and Science; Administration of Student Discipline; Initiative Hiring; University Honors Program Proposal; Increased Teaching Workload Policy; Faculty Salary Scales; Task Force on Compensation, Accountability, and Transparency Report; Summer Instruction Guidelines Draft; Proposed Student Freedom of Scholarly Inquiry Principles; Chemical Engineering and Biochemical Engineering Honors Proposal; Class Schedule and Registration Guide (Winter 2007); and Graduate Students as Instructors of Record

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: DDR-542B relating to Posthumous recognition of student achievements and DDR529 (Subject A) introducing a regulation regarding English proficiency requirements (now referred to as UC Entry Level Requirement and Analytical Writing Placement Exam).

**Committee’s narrative:**

The Chair of the Undergraduate Council attends the Provost/Senate Chairs meetings, and the Senate Executive Council meetings. In addition, the Chair served on the Undergraduate Advising Council, the Program Review Task Force, the NCAA D-1 Task Force, the Summer Sessions Task Force, and the Student Transition and Retention (STAR) Committee.

Keith Williams, the Vice Chair of the Undergraduate Council regularly attended the University of California Educational Policy meetings in Oakland and also served on the Science and Math Initiative (SMI) committee as well as the Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC) committee. Matthew Bishop served as the representative from the Undergraduate Council on the Campus Council for Information Technology (CCFIT). Thomas Famula served as the representative from the Undergraduate Council on the Pandemic Planning Task Force.

The Undergraduate Council dealt with a number of issues of great importance to the campus during the 2005-2006 academic year. One of the most important
issues was the proposed legislation regarding The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (Formerly Subject A). The proposed legislation for the English proficiency requirement was passed by the Representative Assembly at the June meeting. Please see below for the proposed regulation (DDR 529).

529. **University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement.**

A. The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement is a reading and writing proficiency requirement governed by Senate Regulation 636 and this Divisional Regulation.

B. Prior to enrollment at the University of California, each student may satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement as specified by Senate Regulation 636.

C. A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement prior to enrollment in the University of California, Davis must satisfy the requirement either

- 1. by passing the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam administered Systemwide or on the Davis campus, or
- 2. by passing Workload 57, offered by Sacramento City College, with a grade of C or better.

D. The final examination for Workload 57 shall be the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam, which shall be evaluated by instructors from both UC Davis and Sacramento City College.

E. A student must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement as early as possible during the first year in residence at the University of California. A student who has not done so after three quarters of enrollment will not be eligible to enroll for a fourth quarter. Students placed into Linguistics 21, 22 and/or 23 will have three quarters plus one quarter for each required Linguistics course to meet the requirement.

The Undergraduate Council also recommended changing DDR-542B relating to Posthumous recognition of student achievement as well as recommended new names for the University Writing requirement and the University Writing Examination. The Council also discussed and approved the common campus quarter calendar, which is already being used on two UC campuses, and the Bylaws and Regulations of the recently established College of Biological Sciences.

The University Honors Program Proposal was unanimously approved by the Undergraduate Council and the Undergraduate Council. The main characteristics of the new University Honors Program are outlined below:

1. The UHP would be the overarching Program of the present campus-wide honors programs. This would potentially enhance understanding and support on campus.
2. The UHP would be more easily presented to external constituencies (e.g., prospective students and parents, recruiters, professional school admission officers, and potential donors).
3. The program would be composed of our present honors programs to allow for a diversity of interests and backgrounds.

4. The Program would have three tracks: Davis Honors Challenge, Integrated Studies, and approved extensive multi-year college or departmentally based honors programs.

5. For clarity in describing the UHP, the website and literature would emphasize that Davis Honors Challenge is a track providing for the development of professional skills through collaborative multi-disciplinary team projects, whereas Integrated Studies is a track involving individual research and creative project activities. The college or departmentally based honors programs would be described as is appropriate based on their activities.

6. Extensive multi-year college and departmental based honors programs would petition to become part of the University Honors Program and would be included if certain selection and continuance criteria are in agreement with other aspects of the Program. (Established shorter-term college or departmentally based honors programs such as the quarterly Dean's Honors List and the graduation honors programs would not become part of the University Honors Program. Their existence, however, would be cross-referenced on the UHP website and literature so that both prospective and continuing students would be aware of these additional opportunities.)

7. Admission and continuance criteria for the various honors programs within the UHP would have some similarities, such as GPA, but they would not be identical. The similarities would reduce confusion and allow similar benefits for students in all programs (e.g., priority enrollment and transcript notation).

8. Continuing students and new transfer students in the UHP would have the option of living in the West Village complex in the aforementioned "Honors House". This allows for the creation of a customized facility that would be especially attractive to high achieving students. In addition, we anticipate that additional honors activities will become part of this living-learning community as it becomes established.

9. All students in the UHP would be eligible to receive certain perquisites. A partial list of perquisites available to all UHP students might include: priority registration, transcript notation, tutoring and study groups with other high achieving students, scholarship and fellowship opportunities, extended library privileges, the option of living in the "Honors House" with other high achieving students, and diploma notation, where appropriate, upon graduation. In addition, some tracks might include other perquisites such as: access to mentorship programs with faculty and students, additional academic advising, access to reserved computer laboratories, special internships, community service, education abroad, research opportunities, and professional development.

10. The University Honors Program would serve as the home for enhanced efforts to steward successful undergraduate student applications for prestigious awards, scholarships and fellowships.

11. Funds from donors would allow the creation of additional enhancements to the Program and the student experience. For example, a substantial donation could be a naming opportunity and other donations could be used for academic enhancements for students in the University Honors Program.

The proposal to form a joint task force between the faculty and the administration on General Education was also unanimously approved. This task force was charged with thoroughly examining and restructuring the UC Davis General Education (GE) program. The Task Force will develop a specific GE proposal to
be discussed with the GE committee and the Undergraduate Council and then formally proposed to the Undergraduate Council by Dec 1, 2006. The proposal should be acted on by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division, Academic Senate, by June 1, 2007. While developing the proposal, the Task Force will facilitate campus-wide input and acceptance through appropriate outreach and will ensure administrative commitment of the resources needed to implement the proposal.

Some other important items the Undergraduate Council discussed were the Science and Math Initiative (SMI) and the Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC). The purpose of the Science and Math Initiative is to increase the number and quality of math and science teachers. The following is a list of some of the ways that campuses will try to increase the quality of math and science teachers:

- Enriching student experience in math and science classrooms
- Offering academic opportunities to work in K-12 classrooms
- Giving effective and useful academic advice
- Creating multiple pathways for K-12 teacher preparation
- Meeting the needs of under-represented students
- Reducing the attrition of math and science majors
- Increasing articulation and outreach to high school and community college students

SCIGETC is a series of programs for transfer from a two-year college to a four-year college. It is designed for high unit majors, especially those in science and engineering. It calls for starting technical courses immediately and postponing some of the general education requirements. Basically, it provides a path to meeting the major lower-division transfer requirements for technical majors while at the same time retaining many of the features of IGETC.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Potter, Chair
Keith Williams, Vice Chair
Matthew Bishop
Elizabeth Constable
Thomas Famula
Matt Farrens
Mont Hubbard
Alessa Johns
Philip Kass
Jay Lund
Jay Mechling
Lorena Oropeza
Kathryn Radke
**Annual Report: Academic Year 2005-06**  
**Davis Division: Academic Senate**  
**Committee on General Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 meetings, 2 hrs. each</td>
<td>1 time per quarter, depending on workload</td>
<td>&lt;1 hr for members, 3-5 hrs for co-chairs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| >4 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:** None.

**Issues considered by the committee:**

- Need for UC Davis to respond to WASC criticisms of GE, interim report due 11/06 (later changed to 3/08)
- Reviewed existing GE program, discussed deficiencies and opportunities for change, reasons why changes should be made
- Reviewed report: General Education Coursework, Chatman and Estes, August 2004, SARI report 331
- Refined working proposal for GE revision begun by GE committee during 04-05
- Asked Undergraduate Council to request establishment of a joint Senate-Administration GE Task Force
- Developed charge and recommended composition of GE Task Force
- Co-sponsored Davis Honors Challenge 3rd year Project: Assessment of Global Citizenship as a Potential GE Component
- Provided information on the UC Davis GE program to the Systemwide Commission on GE in the 21st Century
- Discussed informal information provided about a potential global citizenship GE requirement
- Engineering General Education: college-specific limitations on GE courses that may be used to fulfill GE requirements

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:**

Plan to submit proposal for a revised GE program to the Representative Assembly for consideration during the June 07 meeting.
Committee's narrative:

The General Education committee dealt with several issues of great importance to the campus during the 2005-2006 academic year. The charge of the General Education (GE) committee is to supervise the General Education program. This year, the committee focused on the following items:

- **Why Change the GE Requirements?**
  - UC Davis must address criticisms of the GE program by WASC during the 02-03 accreditation review. An interim report to WASC from the campus is due 11/06 (later changed to 3/08).
  - Students in many majors with extensive prerequisites and requirements need a greater variety of graded courses to count towards GE. Flexibility will improve if appropriate freshman seminars and other 1-2 unit courses can be incorporated into the GE program. This encourages use of a unit-based GE accounting system, rather than the current course-based system.
  - Widespread recognition of the need to improve student writing. Greater attention to writing and communication is desirable in the GE program.
  - Revision provides the opportunity to integrate GE functions and objectives into a range of courses, including those required as part of multi-disciplinary majors.

- **Working Proposal for GE Revision**
  - A working proposal to serve as a starting point for discussions was finalized by the committee.
  - The proposal incorporated unit-based accounting, substantially expanded the writing experience component, modestly expanded breadth and diversity unit requirements, eliminated dilution of breadth content in the current course-based accounting system, eliminated classification of majors into breadth areas, required that students fulfill requirements in all breadth areas, and was designed not to increase time-to-degree. With some adjustments, it could incorporate a global citizenship requirement.

- **Guiding Principles for GE Revision**
  - Time to degree should not increase.
  - Types of courses used to meet requirements should be more flexible.
  - Writing experience should increase in units as well as in effectiveness of delivery.
  - Resources required for implementation should be identified and the Administration must make the commitment to provide them.

- **Request for appointment of a GE Task Force**
  - The committee formulated a charge and suggested the composition of a joint Academic Senate-Administration Task Force on GE to develop a detailed proposal for a restructured GE program, facilitate...
campus-wide acceptance, and ensure that resources are committed to implement the proposal.

- **Charge:** the GE Task Force will develop a specific GE proposal to be discussed with the GE committee and the Undergraduate Council and then formally proposed to the Undergraduate Council by Dec 1, 2006. The proposal should be acted on by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division, Academic Senate, by June 1, 2007.

- **Recommended Composition:** 7-9 members including faculty from all colleges granting undergraduate degrees, the student representative to the GE committee, the VP for Undergraduate Affairs, and an experienced staff advisor.

- The GE Task Force is expected to consult with the whole GE committee.

- Recommended to the Undergraduate Council that the faculty thoroughly examine and restructure the UC Davis General Education (GE) program via formation of a GE Task Force.

**Appointment of GE Task Force**

- The Undergraduate Council requested on 11/14/05 that the Committee on Committees appoint a GE Task Force.
- COC appointed a GE Task Force during Winter 06.
- The GE committee co-chairs are members of the Task Force.
- The Task Force met 8 times during Winter and Spring 06, beginning on 3/6/06. As chair, Jay Mechling led the group in development of a working draft of a GE program.

**GE Task Force membership, W06-S06**

The task force, appointed by the Committee on Committees is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAY E MECHLING (Chair)</td>
<td>HART INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM (530-752-9043)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jemechling@ucdavis.edu">jemechling@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH E KISKIS</td>
<td>PHYSICS ((530) 752-7752)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jekiskis@ucdavis.edu">jekiskis@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAY R LUND</td>
<td>CIVIL &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL ENGR (530-752-5671)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrlund@ucdavis.edu">jrlund@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHRYN RADKE</td>
<td>ANIMAL SCIENCE (530-752-9025)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kradke@ucdavis.edu">kradke@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS L ROST</td>
<td>PLANT BIOLOGY</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trost@ucdavis.edu">trost@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANN TRASK</td>
<td>L&amp;S DEANS OFC - ADMIN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dctrask@ucdavis.edu">dctrask@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GINA S WERFEL</td>
<td>ART</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gswerfel@ucdavis.edu">gswerfel@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRED E. WOOD</td>
<td>OFFICES OF CHANCELLOR/PROVOST (530-752-6265)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fewood@ucdavis.edu">fewood@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARL F ZENDER</td>
<td>ENGLISH, Interim Director of University Writing Program</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kzender@ucdavis.edu">kzender@ucdavis.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATHERINE JOHNSON</td>
<td>Student representative, GE committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Davis Honors Challenge (DHC) GE Project**
  - Assessment of Global Citizenship as a Potential GE Component
  - Co-sponsored by GE committee and Gail Martinez, Asst. Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and Academic Federation member of the GE committee.
  - Students were charged with conducting an analysis of the arguments that support and/or hinder instituting a global citizenship GE component, including the extent to which such a requirement overlaps the present social-cultural diversity requirement.
  - The students solicited and compiled student feedback along with the concerns of implementing such a requirement, including impact on time-to-degree. They presented an oral report in March 2006 at the DHC Colloquium. Their presentation is available in electronic format.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay Lund (Chair)
Kathryn Radke (Chair)
Elizabeth Constable
Gail Finney
William Lucas
Roger McDonald
Gail Martinez (AF Representative)
Katherine Johnson (ASUCD Representative)
## Committee on Preparatory Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 2</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Upon demand.</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposals Reviewed: One</td>
<td>Total of reviewed -------- deferred from the previous year: None</td>
<td>Total agenda items carried forward to the coming academic year: None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
The University of California Entry level Writing Requirement legislation (DDR529) has been approved by our committee and Undergraduate Council. The legislation was presented and approved at the June 2006 Representative Assembly meeting.

### Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None.

### Issues considered by the committee:
Formulating bylaw (DDR529) language for satisfying the University of California Entry level Writing Requirement (formerly Subject A).

### Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
Monitor the impact of the new University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly Subject A). The Prep Ed committee will be looking at whether changing the ways of meeting the Entry-level Writing Requirement negatively affects student performance.
Committee's narrative:

The Preparatory Education committee focused on 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. The legislation (DDR529) was finalized and approved by the Preparatory Education committee, the Undergraduate Council, and the Senate Executive Council. The Davis Division Representative Assembly approved the new legislation at the June 2006 meeting. The Preparatory Education committee will be in charge of monitoring the new program. Please see below for the final approved University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement legislation.

PROPOSED DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 529:
The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (Formerly Subject A)

Submitted by: __________________________.
April __________, 2006

529. University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement.

A. The University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement is a reading and writing proficiency requirement governed by Senate Regulation 636 and this Divisional Regulation.

B. Prior to enrollment at the University of California, each student may satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement as specified by Senate Regulation 636.

C. A student who has not satisfied the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement prior to enrollment in the University of California, Davis must satisfy the requirement either

1. 1. by passing the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam administered Systemwide or on the Davis campus, or
2. 2. by passing Workload 57, offered by Sacramento City College, with a
grade of C or better.

D. The final examination for Workload 57 shall be the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Exam, which shall be evaluated by instructors from both UC Davis and Sacramento City College.

E. A student must satisfy the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement as early as possible during the first year in residence at the University of California. A student who has not done so after three quarters of enrollment will not be eligible to enroll for a fourth quarter. Students placed into Linguistics 21, 22 and/or 23 will have three quarters plus one quarter for each required Linguistics course to meet the requirement.

**Background and Rationale**

**The Current Requirement:**

The rules for fulfilling the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR, formerly known as the Subject A requirement) before enrolling at Davis are specified in the systemwide regulation SR 636 (attached). But there is currently no Davis Division Regulation specifying how the requirement must be satisfied while on this campus. Instead, the requirement is described in the Catalog and more completely on the Subject A website:

UC Davis students who have not satisfied the ELWR prior to enrollment must take Sacramento City College’s Workload 57, a course in basic writing taught on the Davis campus that carries 4.5 units of UCD workload credit. To meet the Subject A requirement, students must then pass the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Examination (AWPE, formerly known as the Subject A exam), offered as the final examination for Workload 57.

Students who pass Workload 57 but do not pass the AWPE as the final examination may take the Orientation Week AWPE at the beginning of the following quarter. If they again fail the exam, they must retake Workload 57.

Students who pass Workload 57 a second time but do not pass the AWPE may request a portfolio review of their coursework. First-time Workload 57 students who fail the final examination but who earned an A or A- in the course or have received a B or higher in Linguistics 23 and Workload 57 may request a portfolio review before enrolling in Workload 57 a second quarter. [Source: http://wwwenglish.ucdavis.edu/suba]
The Proposed Change:

This proposal changes the current practice in two ways:

1) Section C (2) states that Workload 57, passed with a grade of C or better, should itself satisfy the ELWR.

2) Portfolio review is omitted as an option for meeting the requirement.

The remainder of the proposal provides the necessary codification of current practice as a Davis Regulation.

Rationale For the Proposed Change:

The University of California requires that all undergraduate students (including international students) satisfy the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) by demonstrating a minimum proficiency in English composition. There are a variety of ways to meet this requirement, which are outlined in SR636. Two common ways of satisfying the ELWR are: 1) to submit proof of completion of a transfer-level college course of four quarter-units or three semester-units in English composition with a grade of C or better; or 2) to take and pass the AWPE (the Analytical Writing Placement Exam, formerly known as the Subject A exam). Systemwide, a student who does not pass the AWPE is placed in the appropriate pre-English 1 class based on the score (s)he received.

Prior to 1993, UC Davis students who did not satisfy the requirement before matriculation would be placed either in one of the Linguistics series of classes or in the English A class taught here on campus by English department lecturers (Unit 18 members) and advanced graduate students. At that time, taking English A and receiving a "C" or better as a course grade fulfilled the ELWR requirement. This class met for 4 hours a week (40 hours a term), and provided 2 units of workload credit and 2 units of baccalaureate credit. During the serious budget situation in the early 1990's, the decision was made to outsource this class. Cynthia Bates, director of the campus Subject A program, was asked to develop a version of the class that could be taught here on campus by Sacramento City College instructors. The resulting class (Workload 57) is in essence a superset of the English A class - it requires the same amount of writing, both in-class and out of class, and is graded similarly. However, it meets for 50 hours a term instead of 40 (a 25% increase), and requires 3 textbooks (the two used in English A, plus an additional one).

There is one other major difference - the final exam in English A was a "Subject A-like essay" that SCC and Davis Unit 18 faculty jointly graded, while in Workload 57 the final
is the AWPE exam, which the student must pass in order to move on to introductory English composition courses. Using the AWPE exam in this way and having it graded by both SCC and Davis Unit 18 faculty was apparently done to attempt to ensure that outsourcing the course would not lead to a reduction in the quality of instruction. However, two different reviews of the program (one in 1998, and another in 2003) have concluded that requiring students to pass the AWPE in order to meet the ELWR requirement is not an effective use of resources. Students who receive a passing grade in Workload 57 yet fail the exam are forced to retake the class, sometimes several times.

Several years ago, the option of portfolio review was added: Under certain carefully defined circumstances (outlined above under current practice) students may request a portfolio review of their work in Workload 57. The pass rate on this portfolio review is approximately 90%, indicating that failing to pass the AWPE final exam does not appear to correlate strongly to the student's ability to write adequately.

Based on the reports from 1998 and 2003, and the fact that each year students are disenrolled for failure to meet the ELWR requirement who are otherwise in good academic standing, the Preparatory Education committee has recommended changing the way the ELWR can be met. Their recommendation is to modify the current practice by discontinuing the portfolio review process, and by allowing a class grade of "C" or better in the Workload 57 class to be sufficient to meet the ELWR.

Both the Preparatory Education committee and the Undergraduate Council have discussed this proposal extensively over the last three years, and the UGC wholeheartedly supports the recommendation and the proposed regulation for many reasons:

* The regulation would bring this course in line with all others on the UCD campus. As far as we know, this is the only example in which a course grade is not sufficient to meet a requirement.
* The regulation would bring us in line with the approach used by 6 of our sister campuses
* The regulation would prevent students from being required to repeat a class they have already passed (and in fact received a grade of "C" or better).
* Since in-class writing accounts for 40-45% of the Workload 57 grade, and a student cannot receive a "C" or better as a class grade unless they are able to maintain a minimum "C" average on the in-class writing assignments, the UGC feels the change proposed by the Prep Ed committee will not lead to large numbers of unqualified students circumventing the ELWR requirement.
* The regulation will allow a more effective use of financial resources. Before it was outsourced, class sizes in English A were 22 for regular classes, and 14 for ESL, EOP and STEP sections. Currently, Workload 57 class sizes are 30 for regular classes, and 18 for ESL, EOP and STEP sections. The administration will use the money saved by implementation of this regulation to buy down class sizes (which is particularly important for ESL students).
* The regulation would clarify what is in essence a double-message sent to students and
to our community college colleagues. On the one hand, the existing approach includes an aura of elitism that implies that the course grade in a class taught by our Unit 18 members is acceptable, but if the class is taught by someone else we need to stand over their shoulders and check their work. On the other hand, approximately 33% of our new students have met the EWLR by taking a course elsewhere. Why do we only check the work of "others" when it involves the Workload 57 issue?

[attachment: Senate Regulation 636]

Respectfully submitted,

Lorena Oropeza, Chair
John Bolander
Alyson Mitchell
Jon Rossini
G. Thomas Sallee
Gina Holland, AF Representative
Christine Pham, ASUCD Representative
### 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 Proposals Reviewed: 3 | Total of reviewed proposals 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:**
1. University Honors Program Proposal
2. Engineering Honors Proposal
3. Chemical Engineering Honors Proposal
4. Academic Misconduct (This item will be carried forward to 2006-2007)

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

### Committee’s narrative:

The Special Academic Programs committee dealt with a number of issues of great importance to the campus during the 2005-2006 academic year. The committee began discussing the issues related to student and academic misconduct. We suspect that many faculty are not aware of the problem and the committee will explore ways that term papers can be structured that challenge students to provide their own synthesis, or analysis, and make it virtually impossible to download text from the internet. 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. The Special Academic Programs committee will continue to work on developing processes to cope with increasing problems of cheating and plagiarism during the 2006-2007 academic year.

The committee also reviewed and approved the Chemical Engineering Honors Proposal, the Engineering Honors Proposal, and the University Honors Program Proposal. All of the proposals were then sent to the Undergraduate Council for review and approval. The creation of a University Honors Program will have numerous benefits, if implemented properly, while also providing an opportunity to enhance our present honors programs. Coordinating all the various campus-wide honors programs under a single title, The University Honors Program, would reduce confusion and help avoid what appears to be an uncoordinated or even competitive situation. The campus could also offer enhanced benefits to all University Honors Program students if each of our present programs have similar aspects of selection and continuation criteria.

Respectfully submitted,

Jay Mechling, Chair
Will Benware
Chia-Ning Chang
Ning Pan
Mike Stieff
Martin Smith, AF Representative
Michael Wang, ASUCD Representative
### Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Once or twice a quarter.</td>
<td>Highly variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of 7 Programs Reviewed</th>
<th>Total of reviewed 0 Programs deferred from the previous year</th>
<th>Total of 3 deferred to the coming academic year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None.

### Listing of committee policies established or revised:

### Issues considered by the committee
**New Guidelines for Undergraduate Program Review Reports** (See accompanying narrative).

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

### Committee’s narrative:
During spring quarter of 2006, the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review of the Undergraduate Council completed its reports on the reviews of the following 4 majors:

**College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (A&ES):**
- Animal Science and Management
- Clinical Nutrition
- Environmental Biology and Management
- Environmental Policy Analysis and Planning
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. The committee provided specific comments on each of the program reviews. The committee accepted all of the reports by the relevant college review committees.

In response to some of the concerns raised above, Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons 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 Dawn Sumner participated in meetings of the Task Force as well as Undergraduate Chair Dan Potter. The Program Review task force includes representatives from the Senate, the Administration, and representatives from the colleges. The task force met several times and came up with the following draft Guidelines for Program Review Reports:

DRAFT
Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review Committee:
GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW REPORTS

List the materials reviewed and their dates. Normally, these will include the following: the departmental self-review, the report on the review by the relevant college committee (TPPRC or UPRC), and the responses from the department, the dean, and the college executive committee.

If reviews of majors are coordinated by subject matter (e.g., all majors in Environmental Science, Social Science, or Foreign Languages), a report by one or more external reviewers with expertise in that area should also be available for review.

The committee’s reporting is a two-step process:

1) For each major: summarize the major conclusions and recommendations of the reviews, reports and responses, noting any significant discrepancies. Describe any concerns or questions the UIPRC may have about these materials, commenting on any significant negative and/or positive aspects of their content and/or the timing of the review process. State whether or not the committee endorses acceptance of the report by the college committee.

2) After the reports on individual majors have been approved by the entire committee, the chair should write a summary listing the programs reviewed, the number of programs for which the committee endorses acceptance of the college committee reports and the number for which it does not, and any significant and/or recurring themes in the reports.

If reviews of majors are coordinated by subject matter (e.g., all majors in Environmental Science, Social Science, or Foreign Languages), also provide the following:

   a) a copy of the report by the external reviewer(s)
b) a comparison of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the different majors within the general subject area, any overlap in subject area coverage, and recommendations about any changes that should be considered in the number and nature of majors offered in that area.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Sumner, Chair
Lynn Kimsey
Aaron Smith
Jon Wagner
Bassam Younis
Daniel Goldstein, AF Representative
N. Talesa Patra, GSA Representative
Kristen Birdsall, ASUCD Representative
The Committee first met on November 3, 2005, during the Fall Quarter to organize for the year. At this meeting, committee members reviewed the 2004-2005 Annual Report and the calendar for 2005-2006. They were also given a presentation/demonstration of the online scholarship application. Additionally, Committee members signed up to participate on the University Medallist Sub-Committee and volunteered to host a Bonnheim Scholar event.

A Winter Quarter meeting was held on January 18, 2006 to discuss the reading procedures for application evaluation. The Committee then began receiving and reviewing applications. For the 2006-2007 academic year, 32,837 students applied for scholarships: 937 continuing UC Davis students, 4,369 new transfers, and 27,531 high school seniors. The Committee subjectively evaluated all complete continuing student applications (730), applications from eligible transfers who submitted a letter of recommendation (137), and eligible freshmen EOP (529) applications. High school applicants were evaluated on the basis of their grades and test scores alone. Members individually evaluating scholarship candidates’ applications carry out most of the Committee’s work. All applications were read with scores entered on March 17, 2006.

The University Medallist Sub-Committee reviewed the nomination packets of and interviewed six finalists on May 4, 2006; the group decided upon Yoel Stuart from Evolution, Ecology and Biodiversity as the 2005-2006 University Medal recipient.

The Committee met again on June 6, 2006 to review the year’s activities and make recommendations for any needed changes. The attached table outlines the distribution of recipients and funds allocated to undergraduate scholarships through the CUSHP process for the previous academic year, 2005-2006; these figures do not include the Regents, National Merit or NCAA Scholarships.

There were no additional policy issues of significance addressed by the Committee during the year. However, next year’s committee will have to address the issue of restricted scholarships for students with Biological Sciences majors who maintain their status within the College of Agricultural & Environmental or Letters and Science.

Respectfully submitted,

Silas Hung, Chair
Abdul Barakat
Zhe Chen
Christyann Darwent
Ting Guo
Alexander Harcourt
Anthony Jerant
Alessa Johns
Leslie Lyons
Rajiv Singh
Nancy True
Jean Vandergheynst

Bryan Weare
David Wilson
Rena Zieve

Academic Federation Members
William Maze
Jeffrey Walton

Student Representatives
Erin Harrington
Avi Singh
### SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3433</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>9652</td>
<td>14125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>3229</td>
<td>5677</td>
<td>10691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5238</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>15420</td>
<td>24944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Freshmen</td>
<td>4921</td>
<td>4183</td>
<td>14954</td>
<td>24058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5238</td>
<td>4286</td>
<td>15420</td>
<td>24944</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Status</th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entering Freshmen</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEED-BASED ACCEPTED & PAID (Students must show financial need)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Awards</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award $</td>
<td>$163,806</td>
<td>$103,400</td>
<td>$302,151</td>
<td>$569,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NON-NEED BASED ACCEPTED & PAID (Financial need not required)

|                                | CA&ES | ENG | L&S | TOTAL |
|                                | 1105  | 91  | 224 | 1420  |
| Award $                        | $1,286,354 | $126,023 | $552,547 | $1,964,924 |

### AWARD TOTALS PAID*

|                                | CA&ES | ENG | L&S | TOTAL |
|                                | 1195  | 230 | 378 | 1803  |
| Award $                        | $1,450,160 | $229,423 | $854,698 | $2,534,281 |

### ENROLLMENT

**FALL 2005**

|                                | CA&ES | ENG | L&S | TOTAL |
|                                | 6,724 | 3,003| 14,741| 24,468 |

| TOTAL $                        | $215.67 | $76.40 | $57.98 | $103.58 |

* Totals may represent multiple awards to individual student recipients
TO: The Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

The Committee met on November 4, 2004, during the Fall Quarter to organize for the year. At this meeting, committee members reviewed the 2003-2004 Annual Report and the calendar for 2004-2005. Committee members signed up to participate on the University Medallist Sub-Committee and volunteered to host Bonnheim Scholar events.

A Winter Quarter meeting was held on January 20, 2005, to discuss the reading procedures for application evaluation. The Committee will meet again on May 31, 2005, to review the year’s activities and make recommendations for any needed changes. Members individually evaluating scholarship candidates’ applications carry out most of the Committee’s work.

The attached table outlines the distribution of recipients and funds allocated to undergraduate scholarships for the 2004-2005 academic year.

For the 2005-2006 award cycle, 28,859 students applied for scholarships: 1270 continuing UCD students, 7,037 transfers, and 20,552 high school seniors. The Committee subjectively evaluated all complete continuing (841), transfers who submitted a letter of recommendation (126), and freshmen EOP (301) applicants. High school applicants were evaluated on the basis of their grades and test scores alone.

There were no additional policy issues of significance addressed by the Committee during the year. However, next year’s committee may have to address the issue of scholarships for students in the Division of Biological Sciences should it become a College.

Respectfully submitted,

Silas Hung, Chair

Zhe Chen
Christyann Darwent
Ting Guo
Sandy Harcourt
Anthony Jerant
Jiming Jiang
Alessa Johns
Kee D. Kim
Leslie Lyons
Rajiv Singh

Kathryn Sylva
Jean Vanderghynst
Louis Warren
David Wilson
Kazue Yamazaki

Academic Federation Members

Richard Evans
Jeffery Walton

Student Representatives

None Appointed
## COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS, HONORS AND PRIZES
### 2004-2005 ANNUAL REPORT
*(May 2005)*

### CA&ES  |  CENGR  |  CL&S  |  TOTAL
---|---|---|---
**GENDER**
Female | 706 | 78 | 355 | 1139
Male | 300 | 189 | 189 | 678
Total | 1006 | 267 | 544 | 1817

### STUDENT STATUS
Entering | 727 | 149 | 247 | 1123
Continuing | 233 | 114 | 263 | 610
Transfer | 46 | 4 | 34 | 84
Total | 1006 | 267 | 544 | 1817

### NEED-BASED ACCEPTED *(Students must show financial need)*
- No. of Awards | 122 | 176 | 247 | 545
- Award $ | $438,183 | $364,653 | $720,263 | $1,523,099

### NON-NEED BASED ACCEPTED *(Financial need not required)*
- No. of Awards | 1001 | 120 | 349 | 1470
- Award $ | $1,559,291 | $341,191 | $1,079,328 | $2,979,810

### AWARD TOTALS*
- No. of Awards Made | 1223 (100) | 335 (39) | 660 (64) | 2218 (203)
- No. of Awards Accepted | 1123 | 296 | 596 | 2015
- Award $ | $1,997,474 | $705,844 | $1,799,591 | $4,502,909

### ENROLLMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL 2003</th>
<th>TOTAL $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA&amp;ES</td>
<td>CENGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,307</td>
<td>3,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$316.71</td>
<td>$233.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Totals may represent multiple awards for some recipients.
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Introduction

This report provides an analysis and evaluation of the activities and business conducted by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate during the 2004-2005 academic year. This includes bylaw changes (divisional and system-wide) as well as committee business items and recommendations from standing committees and priorities and issues for the next academic year.

Academic Senate Office Committee Staffing Data
Davis Division, 2004-2005

| Total Senate FTE Staffing Committees | 8.50 |
| Number of Committees staffed by Senate staff | 30 |
| Total Senate Meetings (2004-2005) | 243 |
| Total Senate-staffed meeting hours (2004-2005) | 203 |
| Percentage of Meetings Staffed | 84% |

UC Systemwide (2004-2005) Senate Business

During the 2004-2005 academic year there were several bylaw changes as well as business items, recommendations, and policy changes. The bylaw changes include systemwide, divisional, college/school, and departmental. All of these items were first reviewed by the appropriate committees of the Academic Senate.

The following is a listing of policies established or revised by UC systemwide committees and other issues considered:

- Passing the Step VI Barrier
- Extension of Agreement on Oversight of ORU Actions
- Proposed Cap on Entry-Level Writing Class Size
- MRU Funding and Proposed Joint Task Force
- Policy on Management of Health, Safety and the Environment
- Electronic Communication Policy
- Human Subjects Policy and Guidelines
- Merced Division Established
- SciGETC – Amendment to SR 478
- Restriction on Funding Sources
- Restrictive Clauses in Contracts, Grants and Gifts for Research
- Proposed Policy on Use of Recordings of Course Presentations
- Admission Selection Criteria (BOARS)
- Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education
- Amendment of Senate Bylaw 336.B.4 – Pre-hearing Procedure in Disciplinary Cases
Common Campus Calendar
Amendment of SR 544 – Student Registration
Final Report on National Laboratories
Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions, University wide Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD)

The following are UC systemwide Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Revisions reviewed and approved during the 2004-2005 academic year:

- APM 220-18, Proposed Modifications – Criteria for Advancement to Step VI and Above Scale
- APM 760, Related to Work and Family
- APM 120, Emeritus Titles
- APM 200-22, Recall Appointments for Academic Appointees
- APM 210, 240, and 245, Appointment and Promotion

**Davis Division (2004-2005) Senate Business**

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the Davis Division of the Academic Senate reviewed and approved several business items. They were sent to the appropriate divisional Senate committees for review and approval and then sent to the Davis Division Senate Executive Council for review and approval. After Executive Council approval the items were sent to the Davis Division Representative Assembly for a vote and final approval. The Shared Governance Special Committee continued to work during the 2004-2005 academic year and submitted their findings and recommendations in a report titled *Mending the Wall*.

At the request of the Divisional Chair, the Senate Executive Council established special committees to address policies for the establishment, modification, and termination of academic units and certain degree programs, the review of Organized Research Units (ORUs), intercollegiate athletics, and program reviews. The work of these special committees will continue into the 2005-2006 academic year.

The Senate Executive Council also established a Council of School and College Faculty Chairs as a special committee and a special committee to address faculty personnel issues. This special committee’s membership includes the Chairs of the committees on Academic Personnel, Academic Personnel Appeals, Privilege and Tenure, Faculty Welfare, Affirmative Action and Diversity, and Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

The following is a list of committee policies established or revised and other issues considered by the Davis Division Academic Senate:
• SR 636 – University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (Subject A)
• SR 477 – Streamlining UC course articulation system wide policy
• DDR A544 – Relating to intercampus credit transfers
• DDR A552 – Minimum Progress requirements
• PPM 210-25 – Integrity in Research
• Procedural change to TOE and POP proposals – they will be received electronically as opposed to campus mail
• New SAT exam
• Admission by Exception
• Expanded Course Descriptions
• Consolidated Award Ceremony
• Revised Admission Formula
• Academic Participation in the Annual Campus Budget Process
• Non-Senate Faculty Voting Rights
• Course Approval System
• Student Petitions
• Shared Governance Report
• Parking Costs
• West Village Housing Project
• Internationalizing the UC Davis curriculum
• Air Quality Research Center (AQRC) ORU Proposal
• CA&ES Proposal to Consolidate four Departments into the Department of Plant Sciences
• Discontinuance of Civil Engineering/Materials Science Undergraduate Program
• Resolution on Scholarly Communication
• Animal Research
• ORU Name Change – Program in International Nutrition (PIN)
• Cost Sharing and Effort Reporting
• Proposed Math/Science Initiative
• Guidelines for Interpretation of Davis Division Regulations on General Education
• Davis Honors Challenge
• Social-Cultural Diversity GE requirement
• NCAA Division IAA
• Program Review Requirements
• Design Program – Proposal to Transfer from CA&ES to HArCS
• Environmental and Occupational Health
• Ophthalmology, School of Medicine – request for name change
• Proposed Calendar for Summer Instruction
• TOEFL, Established a Minimum Scoring Scale for the Campus for the New Internet-Based Test for Academic Year 2005-2006
The following is a listing of UC Davis campus-wide bylaw changes proposed during the 2004-2005 academic year:

- Davis Division Bylaws 28.D – Posting Senate Committee Reports on the Web
- Davis Division Bylaws 34, 35, and 160.B – Representative Assembly Membership
- Davis Division Bylaw 60 – Changing Name of Distinguished Teaching Award Committee
- Davis Division Bylaw 50 – Restructuring of Admissions and Enrollment Committee
- Davis Division Bylaws 29, 135, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 150, and 151 – Roles of Senate and non-Senate departmental personnel
- Davis Division Bylaw 80 – allows Graduate Council to delegate administrative implementation of their regulations and policies to the Dean of Graduate Studies
- Proposed new bylaws and amendments to bylaws 10, 11, 11.5, 12, 13, 16.5, 17, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 48, and 73
- Davis Division Bylaw 16 – CoC members elected for the shorter term shall be the candidate receiving the fourth largest number of votes
- Davis Division Bylaw 44 – Faculty Privilege and Personnel Advisers

**Davis Division (2004-2005) Standing Committee Business Items**

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the Davis Division of the Academic Senate reviewed and approved/denied several business items. The appropriate Senate committees conducted reviews on the business items and consulted with other Senate committees as needed.

The following is a list of business items categorized by Senate committee:

### Committee on Courses of Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Cancel</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>172</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committee on Privilege and Tenure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry Over Grievances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Grievances</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Actions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Committee on Academic Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointments</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Accelerations</th>
<th>Ad Hoc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of Opportunity (TOE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Opportunity (POP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Change in Title</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Continuing Non-Senate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chair (reappointment only)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appointments</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Promotions</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merit Increases</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Lecturer, SOE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Merit Increases</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Actions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retroactive Merits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Deferrals</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Reviews</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOE Screenings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP Screenings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Actions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Miscellaneous Actions</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Personnel Actions</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>427</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Academic Personnel Appellate Subcommittee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/School</th>
<th>Number of Appeals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agricultural &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment via Change in Title</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferral of Emeritus Status</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merits</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee on Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Grants</th>
<th>Proposals Reviewed</th>
<th>Proposals Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants (2K)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Grants (10-50K)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Grants ($800)</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Repeated Procedural or Policy Changes for the Coming Year (2005-2006)

- Have all Standing Committee Chairs sit on Senate Executive Council. (Recommendation from Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, Committee on Research, and Committee on Admissions and Enrollment)
- Seek Executive Council input on only controversial business items with the Chair responding on behalf of the Division when there is consensus among those responding.
- Eliminate the administrative updates at Executive Council meetings to allow more time for business.
• The Committee on Research will only pay for May and June travel grants that overlap fiscal years. They will set aside “carry forward” funds for these grants.
• Write a new policy regarding Web-based courses.
• Develop a prominent diversity web site and links to related web sites.
• Post current and historical faculty demographics on an easily accessible web site.
• Review Distinguished Teaching Award dossier guidelines.
• Conduct an annual review of the NCAA Division I Athletic Program.
• Committee on Grade Changes – include a member from the School of Medicine.
• Endorsement of creative restructuring of study abroad programs including short term programs abroad.
• Student Faculty Relationships – 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.
• Parkers should be charged a reasonable fee and should not be responsible for all the costs associated with parking.

Issues and Priorities for 2005-2006

• 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 is also pursuing integration of international education into the curriculum.
• The General Education committee is working on revising the campus general education requirements.
• 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 will 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 Academic 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 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.
- Discussion of whether Emeritus Faculty should be eligible for Committee on Research Faculty Research Grants.

**Conclusion**

In the 2004-2005 academic year, the Davis Division of the Academic Senate debated a number of issues important to the faculty members and the campus. One of the most important issues discussed during the 2004-2005 academic year was the shared governance report. This 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. Additionally, the special committee recommended more than 20 bylaw and regulation additions, modifications, and amendments to improve the function and efficiency of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. After careful review of the report by all standing committees of the Academic Senate and the entire Senate membership, the Davis Division seems to be moving in a direction that will allow them to better participate in shared governance at the University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meetings Staffed</th>
<th># Items reviewed (includes personnel actions, grant proposals, appeals, grievances, courses, dossiers, and award nominations)</th>
<th>Bylaw Changes Proposed</th>
<th>Policy or Procedural Changes Recommended</th>
<th>Business Items Deferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom &amp; Responsibility (CAFR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel Appellate Committee (CAPAC)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel Oversight Committee (CAP)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Budget Review (CAPB)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions &amp; Enrollment (A&amp;E)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action &amp; Diversity (AA&amp;D)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Committees (COC)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses of Instruction (COCI)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Teaching Awards (DTA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction (CERJ)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeriti</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Changes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies &amp; Exchanges (CISE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilege and Tenure (P&amp;T)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (COR) Policy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (COR) Grants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Faculty Relations (SFR)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Council (UGC)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Academic Programs (SAP)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Instruction &amp; Program Review (UIPR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>2658</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Meetings Staffed: 84%
## ACADEMIC FEDERATION Standing Committees 2004-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Meetings Staffed</th>
<th># Items reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Series Personnel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative Action &amp; Diversity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Council</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Personnel</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Elections</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 60 359