NOTICE – CHANGE OF MEETING LOCATION

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

To:          Representative Assembly Members of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate
From:      Davis Division of the Academic Senate Office
Re:          Change of Meeting Location

The location of the **October 25, 2011** Representative Assembly meetings has been changed to the UCD Conference Center, Ballrooms B&C. Directions to the conference center can be located at [http://conferencecenter.ucdavis.edu/UC_Davis_Conference_Center/Directions.html](http://conferencecenter.ucdavis.edu/UC_Davis_Conference_Center/Directions.html).

The meeting is scheduled to begin at **2:10pm**.
MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Tuesday, October 25, 2011
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
UCD Conference Center, Ballrooms B & C

1. Transcript of the June 3, 2011 Meeting 4
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 ASUCD President – Adam Thongsavat
   b. Remarks by GSA Chair - Katheryn Kolesar
   c. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel:
        i. Oversight Committee – Shirley Chiang 28
   d. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Linda Bisson
        i. 2020 Initiative
        ii. New campus budget model
   e. Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Personnel:
        i. Appellate Committee – Bryce Falk 41
   f. *Annual Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
      (not submitted)
   g. *Annual Report of the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment 46
   h. *Annual Report of the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity 62
   i. *Annual Report of the Committee on Committees 64
   j. *Annual Report of the Committee on Courses of Instruction 66
   k. *Annual Report of the Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards 70
   l. *Annual Report of the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction 72
   m. *Annual Report of the Emeriti Committee 111
   n. *Annual Report of the Faculty Research Lecture Award Committee 112
   o. *Annual Report of the Committee on Faculty Welfare 114
   p. *Annual Report of the Grade Changes Committee 121
   q. * Annual Report of the Graduate Council 125
   r. *Annual Report of the Committee on Information Technology 133
   s. *Annual Report of the Committee on International Education 135
   t. *Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel 146
   u. *Annual Report of the Library Committee 157
   v. *Annual Report of the Committee on Planning and Budget 160

*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.
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2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
UCD Conference Center, Ballrooms B & C

w. *Annual Report of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure 164
x. *Annual Report of the Committee on Public Service 166
y. *Annual Report of the Committee on Research 169
z. *Annual Report of the Undergraduate Council 174
   i. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on General Education 178
   ii. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Preparatory Education 181
   iii. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Special Academic Programs (not submitted)
   iv. Annual Report of the Subcommittee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review 182
aa. *Annual Report of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes 184

7. Reports of standing committees
   a. CERJ Bylaw Changes
      i. DDB 135: Faculty Voting Rights 188

8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business
   a. *College/School Bylaw and Regulation Update: School of Veterinary Medicine 189
   b. *College/School Bylaw and Regulation Update: School of Education 191
12. Informational Item

Ines Hernandez-Avila, 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.
MEETING SUMMARY  
(Draft until approved)  
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY  
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  

Friday, June 3, 2011  
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.  
Activities & Recreation Center (ARC), Ballroom A  

1. Summary of the February 24, 2011 Meeting  
ACTION: Motion to approve Summary of the February 24, 2001 Meeting. Motion seconded; no discussion. Motion passed by acclamation.  

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 Academic Federation Chair – Dan Wilson  
      Academic Federation (AF) Chair outlined activities of the year and emphasized the unique resource offered by the AF.  
   b. Remarks by the Divisional Chair – Bob Powell  
      Chair Powell announced he has accepted the position of Vice Chair of the systemwide Academic Senate for 2011-2012; he will then fill the systemwide Chair position the following year.  

Chair Powell also highlighted the following topics (talking points attached):  
*The importance of the Senate in championing departments and department chairs;  
*One outcome of last year’s forum regarding furloughs was the idea of increasing the number of out-of-state students whose higher tuition will off-set some budget cuts;  
*A strong relationship has been forged with the Chancellor and new Provost;  
*Faculty need to work to change the current culture of mistrust because it's a threat to academic excellence. Mistrust is evident in the course approval process and in the academic personnel process. Faculty need to feel supported. A task force will be proposed to review personnel processes.  

7. Reports of standing committees  
   a. Committee on Committees  
      i. Confirmation of 2011-2012 standing committee appointments  
ACTION: Motion to recognize and appreciate Academic Senate service by Robert Powell and John Oakley. Motion seconded; no discussion. Approved unanimously.  

*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.
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2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Activities & Recreation Center (ARC), Ballroom A

ACTION: Motion to confirm the 2011-2012 committee appointments. Motion seconded. Approved by acclamation.
Discussion: It was noted that Professor Linda Bisson has agreed to Chair the Senate for one year and Professor Bruno Nachtergaele has agreed to the position of Vice Chair. It was further noted that the handout reflects additional changes that were made to committee appointments after the agenda was sent out to members.

b. Committee on Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction
   i. Legislation Changes
      1. DDB 71: Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction –
         Davis Division Bylaw 71(B)(1) permits the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ) to make editorial changes to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Division. This proposed amendment would expand the scope of the kind of changes which are considered “editorial,” allowing changes in name (e.g. of a campus program) or title (e.g. of a position in the administration).

         ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion.
         Vote: 40 – 0. Approved

         2. DDB 80: Graduate Council
            The proposed amendment provides Graduate Council authority to approve or recommend to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) the transfer, consolidation, disestablishment and discontinuance of graduate programs and UC courses of study. Additionally, wording will better reflect current practices of Graduate Council.

            ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion.
            Vote: 40 – 0. Approved.

         3. DDB 99: Committee on Research
            The amendment would restructure Committee on Research to consolidate the two subcommittees.

            ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded. Upon discussion a Motion was made by Professor Samaniego for a friendly revision to the amendment:

            *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.
I move the approval of amendment of Bylaw 99, effective immediately upon adoption, with the exception that for the 2011-2012 academic year only, the membership of the committee be no more than 21, the initial 21 members being those who have been approved in this meeting for membership on the committee, and whose terms of service are to be determined by the Committee on Committees.

Motion seconded. Vote: 41 - 0. Approved

4. DDR 522: General Education
   The proposed revisions are the result of plans for the implementation of the General Education requirement in Fall, 2011. The handout (attached) has an updated version of the background and rationale for the proposed amendment.

   ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion. Vote: 41 – 0. Approved.

5. DDR A540: Grades
   The proposed revision allows graduate students repetition of up to three courses, rather than up to nine units.

   ACTION: Motion to accept the change. Motion seconded; no discussion. Vote: 41 – 0. Approved.

   c. Committee on Admissions & Enrollment
      i. Proposal for a UC Davis Freshman Admission Process Based on Holistic Review

   ACTION: Motion to accept the proposal. Motion seconded; discussion ensured. Vote: 36 – 0, 2 abstentions. Approved.

8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business -
12. Information Item

*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.
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a. Davis Division Committee on Academic Personnel Appeal and
Reconsideration Process

Chair Powell suggested the following:
“Specifically, I am asking that the RA form a Task Force that would investigate:
1. Provide a process to alleviate 50% of the faculty and staff time involved in merit actions for academic personnel
2. The first reform should be particularly aimed at eliminating FPCs
3. Eliminate CAP-Appellate
4. Develop a specific proposal for the resources needed to allow CAP members to fully engage with the work of the Committee.

This last point requires that the administration agrees with this initiative. I ask that you authorize the formation of this Task Force contingent upon an agreement by the administration that they will provide necessary release time and, as appropriate, salary, for an expanded CAP. There is no need to move forward otherwise.”

Motion: Resolution to form a task force in response to Chair Powell's request:

The Representative Assembly wishes to form a task force to determine the feasibility of potential simplifications of the academic personnel process that will result in reducing the amount of staff and faculty time invested in that process. This Task Force will report back to this Assembly one year hence.

Motion was seconded.
ACTION: Approved by a vote of 36 for, 0 against, and 0 abstentions.

Meeting Adjourned.

Ines Hernandez-Avila, Secretary
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.
This is my last Representative Assembly Meeting as Chair of the Davis Division. I am resigning a year early from my second two year term. On Sept. 1 I become Vice Chair of the Systemwide Senate. The following year, I assume the Systemwide Chair position. I am looking forward to lots of great things: the all cuts budget, differential tuition by campus, revisiting post-employment benefits... Perhaps since I’ll be in Oakland, I should start checking in with Harold Camping.

Let’s not waste your time by what I think has been accomplished during my three years as Chair. What I believe to be the most important things would likely be seen by my predecessors as, “not Senate stuff”.

I’ve championed the role of Departments and Department Chairs.
Clark Kerr considered these the “natural” unit of attachment for faculty and the “supreme organizational units of the
research university”. That’s good enough for me and for my spending a lot of my effort on this front.

With your support, I’ve opened up discussions of new revenue sources. In a Senate Forum almost exactly two years ago UC Davis faculty supported the idea of offsetting our budget cuts with additional enrollment of nonresident undergraduates. Today, this model has been embraced by the administration. For Fall 2011, the number of admitted nonresidents is up by 47% from 2,820 to 4,160. Enrollment is expected to increase to 600-700 up from 350 last year. Small numbers, perhaps, but let’s be clear, 350-400 nonresident students offset $10 million in budget cuts.

Lastly, I have worked with all of you to develop a strong working relationship with our new Chancellor and much more recently, our Provost and VCR. They have risen to the severe challenges posed by the state budget crisis and posited entirely new ways of handling these. Most importantly they are fostering a culture of transparency and trust like nothing I’ve seen in my 27 years here. I’d like to use my remaining time discussing this.
It’s probably not a surprise to many of you that there is systemic mistrust that pervades our UC Davis academic culture. It consumes our processes and thereby it consumes us. Why? Well there are some good reasons.

This first example isn’t a joke although it may start out sounding that way. Two deans are talking. One recounts work with faculty in the other dean’s unit. The latter dean asks which faculty are involved. The first dean is taken aback, but the second dean persists. That dean not only wants to know which faculty are involved but wants to be told about all future interactions. This dean wants to act as the validator of individual faculty and the gatekeeper to the unit.

On a different note, there is very consistent rhetoric among many administrators that the Senate is slow, it inhibits progress on the campus and it’s costly. Someone very prominent in the Senate was recently told in a meeting that “Shared governance costs a lot of money”.

What are people thinking? I personally believe that if anyone doesn’t want to operate according to the Standing Orders of
the Regents and the Academic Personnel Manual they should leave the UC.

It is up to us to stipulate that we will not allow ourselves to be guided by this culture of mistrust. We need to face our future assuming that we, as faculty, are pursuing our scholarship and fulfilling our duties according to the highest academic standards. We need to assert that we must have academic and administrative leaders whose statements do not violate our academic freedoms. We must have staff who fully support the goals of academic excellence.

But we need to set the tone. Let me give you two examples of where I think that distrust has gotten in our way and where this body can help make progress.

Course approvals. The first slide shows the current process for approving an undergraduate course. Just look at the number of steps and the number of opportunities for more and more hands to touch this process. Dozens of faculty and several staff are involved before it is all over. It treats all courses the same – new courses, changes in prerequisites, change in course
number. Why? We have a Task Force working on this. We will bring a proposal to you for change next year.

The process most based on mistrust is the academic personnel process. We just sent out this description of the appeals process (slide). It took well over a month to get all of the parties to agree on this. There are two CAPs, Deans, VP AA and FPCs mentioned. It gets even worse. Here’s a process diagram that essentially describes how a promotion package is put together. We must ask what is essential here? How is it that every other campus gets away without a CAP Appellate? Without FPCs? What has driven us to provide so much redundancy? In Engineering, we use redundancy when the reliability of the system is poor. Just how unreliable is it? We have about 40 Appeals each year. Of these, about a third get changed – that’s 13 out of over 600 cases per year. Yet we have this enormous complexity which in and of itself chews up faculty and staff time. Indeed, one of the biggest time sinks has been developing more and more complex by-laws and procedures governing CAP- Appellate to ensure that it is not abused. That has been one of the biggest threats to academic excellence that I have seen.
Over a year ago, CAP proposed a major restructuring of the personnel process that would have been a step towards simplification and workload reduction. That proposal was considered to be too complicated to implement. It wasn’t. It was a matter of changing processes at a very fundamental level. What finally resulted was a failure as a result of the lack of leadership in units outside the direct purview of the Senate.

Yet, we continue to be blamed for “costing a lot of money”. So today, I am asking you to endorse the formation of a Task Force that would start with CAP’s proposal from last year. It would entail sweeping changes in the personnel process. Specifically, I am asking that the RA form a Task Force that would:

1. Provide a process to alleviate, on average, 50% of the faculty and staff time involved in merit actions for academic personnel
2. The first reform should be particularly aimed at eliminating FPCs
3. Eliminate CAP-Appellate
4. Develop a specific proposal for the resources needed to allow CAP members to fully engage with the work of the Committee.
This last point requires that the administration agrees with this initiative. I ask that you authorize the formation of this Task Force contingent upon an agreement by the administration that they will provide necessary release time and, as appropriate, salary, for an expanded CAP. There is no need to move forward otherwise. This will be our point of demarcation for building trust from our end. We cannot set our faculty to task on a fools’ errand if we are only to be undermined.

This Task Force will report back to this Assembly one year hence.

As you will see, the CoC has found someone to complete my term and provide outstanding leadership. I actually think you will find with this individual is a true Senate leader.

For me it has been about you, the faculty, the environment in which you undertake scholarship, the future of the campus and a strong and positive relationship with the administration. I just want it to work. And as an engineer, I fully subscribe to adage that the enemy of good is best.
Before ending I must thank the staff. If any of you have had the good fortune with working with Senate staff, you know the level of professionalism coupled with the subtle personal touch that makes it truly outstanding. I may miss someone, but let me call out those present.

Finally, my decision to go to Oakland has been an agonizing one. But once I made it, I was reminded by my friend and colleague, Pablo Ortiz, of the quote in Frank Rich's last op-ed piece in the NYT. In his making a decision to end his career at the NYT, Rich quotes Stephan Sondheim’s lyrics from Sunday in the Afternoon in the Park with George, “Stop Worrying Where Your Going. Move on”.
MEETING HANDOUTS
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1. Academic Senate Review of Courses of Instruction
2. Committee on Academic Personnel Appeal and Reconsideration Process
3. Sample of an Academic Personnel Process Map (College of Engineering)
4. Updated Committee on Committees Standing Committee Appointment Roster
5. DDR 522 (Revised Rationale)
Davis Division Committee on Academic Personnel

**Appeal and Reconsideration Process**

**Candidate**

**Department Chair**

**Dean**

**Vice Provost – Academic Affairs**

**Committee on Academic Personnel Appellate Subcommittee**

**Reconsideration**

A reconsideration is when new information is supplied that is not the result of a personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure.

New information should be indicated as such by the candidate, or in supporting letters by the Dean or Dept. Chair. Such information needs to fall in the review period (per UCD-220-IV.F.9); e.g. by 12/31 of the year of consideration, and would be:

1. New publications or other creative works
2. Awards
3. New teaching evaluations
4. New grants
5. Original requested extramural letters that arrived late

**Original Review Committee: Committee on Academic Personnel – Oversight/Faculty Personnel Committee**

**Recommendation**

**Non-Redelegated**

**Vice Provost – Academic Affairs**

**Dean**

**Candidate**

**Dept. Chair**

**Redelegated Actions**

**Final Decision**

A Typical Academic Personnel Process Map
Committee on Committees
Standing Committee Appointment Report
Updated June 3, 2011
Changes noted by outline “change”

Divisional Officers –2011-2012
Chair: Linda Bisson (one-year term 2011-2012)
Vice Chair: Bruno Nachtergaele
Secretary: Ines Hernandez-Avila
Parliamentarian: G.J. Mattey

Academic Federation Excellence in Teaching Award:
Charles Walker

Academic Freedom and Responsibility
Gregory Miller, Chair, James Beaumont, Evelyn Lewis, Kwan-Liu Ma, Frank
Verstraete, Jane Ling-Wang
UCAF Davis Divisional Representative: Gregory Miller

Academic Personnel Appellate Committee
Bryce Falk, Chair, Jeannie Darby, Leslie Kurtz, Dean Simonton, Dennis Styne

Academic Personnel Oversight Committee
Shirley Chiang, Chair, Daniel Gusfield, John Hall, Kari Lokke, N. James
MacLachlan, Kyaw Tha Paw U, Martin Usrey, Andrew Vaughan, Richard White
UCAP Davis Divisional Representative: Kyaw Tha Paw U

Admissions and Enrollment
Ralph Aldredge, Chair, Prabir Burman, Orhan Orgun, Ning Pan, Joseph
Sorensen
BOARS Davis Divisional Representative: Ralph Aldredge

Affirmative Action and Diversity
Susan Rivera, Chair, Kyu Kim, Tina Jeoh, Courtney Joslin, Francis Lu, Cynthia
Pickett, Monica Vazirani
UCAAD Davis Divisional Representative: Monica Vazirani

Courses of Instruction
Ben Shaw, Chair, Marta Altisent, Richard Green, David Hawkins, Nelson Max,
Terence Murphy, David Webb, Becky Westerdahl

Distinguished Teaching Awards
John Harada, Chair, Ronald Olsson, Kent Pinkerton, Peter Wainwright, Charles
Walker

Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
G. J. Mattey, Chair, James Fadel, Mark Grismer

Submitted for Representative Assembly Confirmation on June 3, 2011
Committee on Committees
Standing Committee Appointment Report
Updated June 3, 2011
Changes noted by outline “change”

Emeriti
Charles Hess, Chair, Karen Bales, Joann Cannon, Joel Dobris, John Fetzer, J.
Paul Leigh, Rajinder Singh

Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers
Daniel Link, Chair, Y. Hossein Farzin, Mark Matthews, Joy Mench, Motohico
Mulase, Ian Kennedy, Walter Stone

Faculty Research Lecture Award
Randy Dahlgren, Chair, Bruce Gates, Qizhi Gong, Alan Hastings, Charles
Langley

Faculty Welfare
Stuart Hill, Chair, Michael Dahmus, Joel Hass, Alan Jackman, Bernard Levy, Lisa
M. Miller, Saul Schaefer
UCFW Davis Divisional Representative: Stuart Hill, Saul Schaefer-Alternate

Grade Changes
Jeffrey Williams, Chair, Liz Applegate, James Boggan, Benjamin Highton,
Thomas Munn

Graduate Council
Andre Knoesen, Chair, Alan Buckpitt, Vice Chair, Enoch Baldwin, Patrick Carroll,
Christiana Drake, David Fyhrie, Lev Kavvas, Ari Kelman, Peter Lichtenfels,
James Murray, Blake Stimson
CCGA Davis Divisional Representative: Alan Buckpitt

Graduate Student Privilege Advisor
Robert Bayley

Information Technology
Paul Gepts, Chair, Francois Gygi, Anupam Chander, Sue Stover, Felix Wu
UCCC Davis Divisional Representative: Vacant

International Studies and Exchanges
Jeannette Money, Chair, Leo Bernucci, Kentaro Inoue, Sheldon Lu, Julia
Menard-Warwick, Halifu Osumare, Gang Sun
UCIE Davis Divisional Representative: Jeannette Money

(A/F) Joint Federation/Senate Personnel
William Casey, Jack Hicks, Randal Southard

Submitted for Representative Assembly Confirmation on June 3, 2011
Committee on Committees
Standing Committee Appointment Report
Updated June 3, 2011
Changes noted by outline “change”

(A/F) Administrative Series Personnel Committee
Howard Schutz

Library
Brian Kolner, Chair and Timothy Morton
UCOL Davis Divisional Representative: Timothy Morton

Planning and Budget
Ann Orel, Chair, Gregory Clark, Tom Famula, John (Jack) Gunion, Jerold Last,
Jonna Mazet, Doug Nelson, David Simpson, Christopher van Kessel
UCPB Davis Divisional Representative: Chris van Kessel

Instructional Space Advisory Group (subcommittee of Planning and Budget)
Susan Keen and Kent Wilken (Chair and one other member is selected by Planning and Budget Committee from its membership)

Privilege and Tenure – Hearings
Floyd Feeney, Chair, David Biale, Angela Cheer, Al Conley, Katherine Florey,
Anna Kuhn, Albert Lin, Terence Nathan, Annabeth Rosen, Janet Shibamoto
Smith, Valley Stewart, Ebenezer Yamoah

Privilege and Tenure – Investigative
Philip Kass, Chair, Andrea Bjorklund, Prem Devanbu, Nancy Lane, Stephen
Lewis
UCPT Davis Divisional Representative: Philip Kass

Public Service
Marc Schenker, Chair, Trish Berger, Robin Erbacher, Philip Martin, Michael
O’Mahoney

Research – Grants
Kathryn Olmsted, Chair, Gino Cortopassi, David Hwang, Judy Jernstedt, Marjorie
Longo, Nelson Max, Sally McKee, John (Don) Ragland, Baki Tezcan, J. Edward
Taylor, Xiangdong Zhu

Research – Policy
Kathryn Olmsted, Chair, Zhaojun Bai, Sue Bodine, Kent Erickson, Oscar Jorda,
Michael Kleeman, Mark Matthews, Chris Miller, Martin Privalsky, Subhash
Risbud, Bella Merlin
CORP Davis Divisional Representative: Kathryn Olmsted

Submitted for Representative Assembly Confirmation on June 3, 2011
Committee on Committees
Standing Committee Appointment Report
Updated June 3, 2011
Changes noted by outline “change”

Undergraduate Council
Jon Rossini, Chair, Colin Carter, Christiana Drake, Gregory Dobbins, Patrick Farrell, Susan Keen, Maggie Morgan, Janet Roser, Diana Strazdes, Matthew Traxler, Carl Whithaus, Jeffrey Williams
UCEP Davis Divisional Representative: Vacant

UGC – General Education
Maggie Morgan, Chair, Steven Carlip, Ron Hess, John Smolenski, Craig Warden, Vacant

UGC – Preparatory Education
Christiana Drake, Chair, Julia Menard-Warwick, Liz Miller, Robert Newcomb, Ning Pan
UCEPE Davis Divisional Representative: Christiana Drake

UGC – Special Academic Programs
Diana Strazdes, Chair, Cynthia Ching, Thomas Lee, Keith Watenpaugh, Gina Werfel

UGC – Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review
Carl Whithaus, Chair, Tim Lewis, Stephen Wheeler

Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes
Rajiv Singh, Chair, Hussain Al-Asaad, Lawrence Bogad, Patricia Boeshar, R. Holland Cheng, Ian Falloona, John Gates, Joanna Groza, Bruce Haynes, Carlos Jackson, Matthias Koepppe, Kristin Lagatutta, Richard Levin, Christopher Loar, Kenneth Loh, Markus Luty, Cristina Martinez-Carazo, Marina Oshana, Teresa Steele, Pieter Stroeve

Davis Division Representative to the Assembly of the Academic Senate Alternates:
1st Alternate: Brian Morrissey, 2nd Alternate: Jeffrey Williams, 3rd Alternate: William Casey
PRESENT REVISIONS OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 522
BACCALAUREATE DEGREE REQUIREMENT IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Undergraduate Council, the General Education Committee, the Committee on Courses of Instruction, and the Executive Council

Three revisions of Regulation 522 are proposed. The proposed revisions are the result of plans for the implementation of the General Education requirement in Fall, 2011.

The first revision corrects an oversight in the formulation of the Regulation. As currently stated, the Regulation deems that any student who has completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is exempt from all General Education requirements. The amendment would exempt such students from all General Education requirements that can be met at the lower-division level. As a consequence, students who have completed the IGETC would be subject to upper-division requirements, which at present are college-level English composition requirements.

The second revision would make an exception to the prohibition of the use of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit toward satisfying the General Education requirements. Such credit would be applicable to the English Composition requirement.

The third revision would delegate to the deans of the colleges the authority to determine the suitability for satisfaction of General Education requirements of courses which are not UC Davis courses. The current Regulation delegates this authority to the deans for courses taken previous to matriculation by transfer students but is silent on courses taken by matriculated students. The third revision would allow the Committee on Courses of Instruction to delegate to the deans of the colleges the authority to determine the suitability for satisfaction of General Education requirements of courses which are not UC Davis courses. It would also allow prior delegation of authority to be rescinded. The current Regulation allows the delegation of this authority to the deans for courses taken previous to matriculation by transfer students but is silent on courses taken by matriculated students. The current Regulation does not contain any provision for the rescission of previous delegation.

It is proposed that the amendment to Regulation 522 be effective immediately.

Rationale.

The IGETC is based on an agreement between the University of California, California State University and the California Community Colleges. The agreement was intended to cover only lower-division courses. The original intention of DDR 522(D)(7), was not to exempt students completing the IGETC from all General Education requirements, but rather those General Education requirements that were intended to be satisfied by completion of the IGETC, i.e., only lower-division courses.
The English Composition component of the Literacy with Words and Images requirement is satisfied by meeting the English Composition requirement of the student’s college. The College of Engineering allows the use of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit to satisfy the lower-division component of its requirement. Since the intention of the English Composition requirement was that it be met by satisfying the college requirements, there is an inconsistency between the General Education and College of Engineering requirements. This inconsistency is resolved by allowing current college requirements to be satisfied as the colleges see fit, rather than creating a situation where the college requirement is satisfied by the General Education requirement is not.

The current Regulation allows the Committee on Courses of Instruction to delegates to the college deans the determination of the suitability for meeting the General Education requirement of all courses taken by transfer students prior to transfer. However, this is not the only way in which courses on other campuses may be taken, as matriculated students may still take courses on other campuses. For example, some students take community college courses to finish their degrees near to home, and some take courses in non-UC Davis study abroad programs. (Education Abroad Program courses are UC Davis courses and do not require evaluation.) Since there are a number of types of non-UC Davis courses taken by matriculated students, it is not advisable to attempt to specify in the Regulation which courses would and which would not satisfy the General Education requirements. It seems most suitable for this determination to be made by the deans, who already are authorized to make that determination for transfer students. However, if the Committee on Courses of Instruction were to find that the determinations made by the deans are unsuitable, it should have the authority to rescind the delegation, including those which have been made by the Committee in the past.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Regulation 522 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

522. Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education.

(A) Each candidate for a baccalaureate degree shall satisfy a General Education requirement comprising two components: Topical Breadth and Core Literacies. (Am. 6/6/2008)

   (1) The Topical Breadth component shall be separated into three subject matter areas: Arts and Humanities; Science and Engineering; and Social Sciences. (Am. 6/6/2008)

   (2) The Core Literacies component shall have four parts: Literacy with Words and Images; Civic and Cultural Literacy; Quantitative Literacy; and Scientific Literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)

(B) The Topical Breadth component shall be satisfied by passing between 12 and 20 units of courses in each subject matter area, for a total of 52 units from all three areas. (En. 6/6/2008)

(C) The Core Literacies component shall be satisfied by passing at least the specified number of units of coursework in the following four parts: (En. 6/6/2008)

   (1) Literacy with Words and Images shall be satisfied with: (En. 6/6/2008)

      • 8 units or the equivalent of English Composition coursework (as specified by the candidate’s college); (En. 6/6/2008)
• 6 units of designated writing experience coursework in the candidate’s major or elsewhere; (En. 6/6/2008)

• 3 units of additional designated coursework in either oral skills or writing experience; and (En. 6/6/2008)

• 3 units of designated coursework in visual literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)

• Civic and Cultural Literacy shall be satisfied with (En. 6/6/2008)

• 6 units of designated coursework in American cultures, governance and history, of which at least 3 units must be in domestic diversity; and (En. 6/6/2008)

• 3 units of designated coursework in world cultures. (En. 6/6/2008)

(2) Quantitative Literacy shall be satisfied with 3 units of designated coursework in quantitative literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)

(3) Scientific Literacy shall be satisfied with 3 units of designated coursework in scientific literacy. (En. 6/6/2008)

(D) In satisfying the General Education requirement: (Am. 6/6/2008)

(1) Course units that satisfy requirements in the candidate’s major or majors may also be counted toward satisfaction of General Education requirements.

(2) While some courses may be certified in more than one of the three subject matter areas for Topical Breadth, no student may count a given course in more than one subject matter area. (En. 6/6/2008)

(3) No course may be counted by a student toward the satisfaction of more than one of the four Core Literacies. (En. 6/6/2008)

(4) With the exception of the 8 units of designated English Composition coursework, a course offered toward the satisfaction of the Core Literacies component may also be offered in satisfaction of the Topical Breadth component. (En. 6/6/2008)

(5) No course passed prior to satisfaction of the Entry Level Writing Requirement shall be offered toward satisfaction of the General Education requirements for writing experience coursework. (Am. 6/6/2008)

(6) Candidates may not present Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate credit in satisfaction of General Education requirements, except insofar as it may be applied to the English Composition component of the Literacy with Words and Images requirement. (En. 6/6/2008)

(7) Transfer students who have successfully completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) are exempt from all General Education requirements that may be met with lower-division courses. (Am. 6/6/2008)

(8) Students transferring to UC Davis who have not completed the IGETC curriculum shall satisfy all General Education requirements as specified by this Regulation, but may offer
previously completed coursework toward their satisfaction. The Committee on Courses of Instruction may delegate to the Deans of the undergraduate colleges the authority to determine the suitability of previously completed coursework for satisfying General Education requirements. (Am. 6/6/2008)

(9) The Committee on Courses of Instruction has authority to delegate and to rescind prior delegation to the Deans of the undergraduate colleges the authority to determine the suitability of non-UC Davis courses presented by new and continuing undergraduate students in satisfaction of General Education requirements.

(10) Subject to the limits otherwise applicable, candidates may elect Passed/Not Passed grading for courses fulfilling General Education requirements. (En. 6/6/2008)
The Committee of Academic Personnel – Oversight Committee (CAP) advises the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel on matters that affect the personnel process. These include 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 on ad hoc committees and these are then appointed by the Vice Provost. The committee appoints and directs the Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) that advise the Deans on redelegated personnel actions (Appendix D). Appendix E provides a list of CAP’s principal tasks.

**Faculty Advancement Criteria:** CAP evaluates candidate files according to guidelines established in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM-210). 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.

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. The committee may also get input from a three-person ad hoc committee appointed by the Vice Provost--Academic Personnel following CAP’s recommendations.

CAP’s evaluation is 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. Except for deferrals, CAP does not use time in service 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. The 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.

**Academic Personnel Actions:** During the 2010-11 academic year (September through August), CAP met 39 times out of 52 weeks and considered over 500 agenda items. The committee provided advice on numerous issues related to academic personnel. These include 9 ‘Change-of-Title’ actions, 13 Endowed Chair actions, 9 Third-Year Deferrals, 12 Five-Year Reviews, 11 Emeritus Status actions, and 3 appointments or reappointments as Department Chair. CAP also reviewed files for Chancellor's Fellows recommendations and evaluated 8 Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers. Of the 438 academic personnel actions, the Vice Provost—Academic Personnel disagreed with CAP 14 times (about 3.2%). We note that in most of these cases, CAP’s recommendation was split, indicating that these were close cases, and often the Vice Provost’s final decision was based on information that arrived after CAP reviewed the case.

Overall, both CAP and the FPCs made negative recommendations in fewer than 12% of the cases. This reflects the high-quality research and teaching done by the vast majority of the faculty at UC Davis.

The agenda for CAP actions is determined by a priority list that treats appointments and tenure cases as high priorities and other actions variously less so (e.g., accelerations in the Above Scale ranks). Once an item is placed on the CAP agenda, the normal completion time was two weeks. Appendix A provides a summary of CAP's deliberations by category for the past academic year. Eight actions were referred to ad hoc committees.

**Promotions:** For promotions to Associate Professor (60) and Professor (57), CAP recommended promotion in 104 of 117 cases. Of these, 91 recommended the promotion proposed by the department and recommended by the Dean. Overall, 22 cases were modified recommendations from what had been proposed. Of these 22 modifications, 8 were recommended for merit increases to an overlapping step, 7 were recommended for lateral promotion, 2 were recommended for normal promotions instead of accelerated promotion, 3 were recommended for retroactive action, 1 was recommended for an accelerated promotion by CAP, and 1 was a split recommendation, where CAP made neither a positive or negative recommendation. Thus, CAP recommended no advancement in only 4 cases.
**Accelerated Actions:** Appendix B lists the cases for accelerations that came to CAP (accelerations involving a promotion, a merit increase to Professor, Step VI, and to Above Scale or within Above Scale, a merit increase for an FPC member, department chair or administrator, as well as all accelerations that entailed skipping a step at any level).

Faculty who received favorable recommendations for a multi-year acceleration generally had received some major recognition nationally or internationally, had superior scholarly achievements, and were excellent teachers and had meritorious service. At the upper levels of the professoriate the expectation of excellence in all areas grows with each step. In many cases where CAP did not recommend the full proposed acceleration, CAP instead recommended a smaller acceleration (e.g., a one-year retroactive acceleration instead of a two-year acceleration). CAP understands that pressure for multi-year accelerations is increasing, in part, due to pay cuts, furloughs and the absence of normal pay raises for several years. Salary and retention are beyond the current charge of CAP.

**Advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV:** Requests for advancement to Associate Professor, Step IV are seen by CAP because for faculty promoted to Associate Professor, Step I, such a merit would typically involve more than six years at rank. (However, if promotion or appointment was to a higher step, this is not the case). In addition, even if a faculty member has spent six years at rank, a merit advance rather than promotion may be appropriate if, for example, a submitted book manuscript only requires minor revision before it would be considered “in press.” These advancements to an overlapping step are unusual in the Associate ranks.

**Retroactive Merit Actions:** Retroactive merit actions may be requested by Deans and/or Faculty Personnel Committees. When a retroactive action is considered, the review period ends the year before the proposed merit date (e.g., for an action retroactive to July 1, 2010, the creative work/research publications are counted to December 31, 2009, and teaching/service until June 30, 2009). Thus, retroactive recommendations should specifically discuss the record for this review period, and detail why it supports the retroactive merit. CAP reviewed 16 retroactive requests and made favorable recommendations on 13.

**Career Equity Reviews:** *Career Equity Reviews* occur coincident with a merit or promotion action and only faculty who (1) have held an eligible title, and (2) have not been reviewed by CAP during the previous four academic years, can be considered for a career equity review. The purpose of career equity reviews is to address potential inequities at the point of hire and/or during a faculty member’s advancement. Career equity reviews consider the entire career
record of the individual to determine if the current placement on the academic ladder is consistent with faculty at equal and higher rank and step. In 2010-11 CAP conducted 7 career equity reviews that were initiated at a lower level of review and supported two of them. CAP also conducts a career review for every major advancement.

**Five-Year Reviews:** CAP conducted 12 five-year reviews, recommending “no advancement, performance satisfactory” in 10 cases and recommending “no advancement, performance unsatisfactory” in 2 cases.

**Initial Continuing Appointments for Lecturers:** CAP reviewed and made recommendations on 8 initial continuing non-Senate appointments in 2010-11. All received favorable recommendations. Teaching excellence is the overriding requirement for a continuing appointment.

**Accelerated Merits for Continuing Lecturers:** CAP considers accelerated merit requests for Continuing Lecturers, whereas normal merit advancements are redelegated to the deans. In recommending accelerations (one or two steps beyond the normal two-step advancement), CAP looks for evidence of teaching accomplishments that go beyond teaching excellence, which is the minimum standard for normal advancement. Such evidence may come in the form of prestigious teaching awards or publication of books (and other creative works) that have substantial pedagogical impact. In 2010-11, CAP considered 3 such requests and made a positive recommendation in each case.

**Ad Hoc Committees:** Review by an ad hoc committee may be required in cases of major advancements (promotions to the Associate Professor and full Professor rank, and merit advancements to Professor, Step VI and Above Scale) and for appointments with tenure. CAP’s membership reflects the variety of disciplines represented on campus and is guided by external reviewers’ evaluations, but the committee looks to campus ad hoc committees for highly specialized expertise. CAP proposed ad hoc committees in 8 cases and thanks the faculty members who served on these committees for giving so generously of their time and for the high quality and objectivity of their evaluations and reports.

**Faculty Personnel Committees:** Faculty Personnel Committees (FPCs) advise deans on personnel actions redelegated to them (except, in most cases, first actions after a promotion or appointment). In 2010-11, these actions included appointment of Assistant Professor, Steps I-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 and Above Scale); 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). Information on FPC actions is reported in Appendix C.

CAP appoints Faculty Personnel Committees based upon recommendations from Faculty Executive Committees. CAP appreciates the dedicated effort and hard work of all FPC members.

**Clarification of Appeals versus Reconsiderations:** There is information clarifying appeals versus reconsideration in the form of a flow chart, available at: [http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Senate-Chair-letter-and-flowchart-RE-CERJ-Advice-Merit-Appeal.pdf](http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/documents/Senate-Chair-letter-and-flowchart-RE-CERJ-Advice-Merit-Appeal.pdf). As described in the chart, appeals are applicable when the faculty member who wishes to appeal provides evidence of a personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure. Reconsiderations are applicable when new information is supplied that is not the result of a personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or procedure.

**Consideration of Academic Collegiality in the Merit and Promotion Process:** The Academic Senate Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) has examined the question of whether an individual’s collegiality, or lack thereof, may be considered in merit and promotion actions. If collegiality becomes an issue in a personnel action, P&T asserted that the record forwarded should be particularly clear and factually well-supported. To that end, P&T recommended the following:

- “If non-collegiality is raised as an issue at the department level, the chair’s letter to the dean must be specific about the nature of the allegations and should document examples of non-collegiality so that the individual under review can understand the allegations and respond accordingly. Specificity and substantiation in the chair’s letter will help [reviewers] judge the merits of the allegation.

- If the departmental letter raises the issue of non-collegiality, the dean should fully explore and comment upon the allegations in [his/her] letter.” “Academic collegiality (or academic “citizenship” as it is sometimes called) is not a separate or additional area of performance for which the individual is to be evaluated but rather, falls within the context of the individual’s record of teaching, research, professional competence and activity, and University and public service.

**Criteria of Scholarship:** In 2002, CAP solicited criteria of scholarship documents from campus departments. The intent of these documents was to provide disciplinary context CAP could utilize during review of cases from the
department. Thus the criteria can enhance the context already provided in the departmental letter. CAP received documents from some departments, but CAP does not approve such documents. They are viewed as a departmental document, and thus not within the jurisdiction of CAP. Departments are welcome to provide new or revised criteria of scholarship documents as they deem appropriate.

To ensure criteria of scholarship are considered at all levels during review, we suggest the following:

- Criteria of Scholarship are not a substitute for the APM and do not substitute for the peer review process. The criteria will be used to provide context to the review.

- The Criteria should be attached to the dossier, or at least referred to in the Department Chair letter. Doing so will call attention to their appropriate use during review by the Faculty Personnel Committee, Dean’s Office and/or CAP.

Departments that use a criteria of scholarship document should periodically review and (if appropriate) update them.

**University Committee On Academic Personnel (UCAP):** Kyaw Tha Paw U served as CAP’s representative to 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.
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## APPENDIX A: CAP ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended Positive</th>
<th>Modified Actions@</th>
<th>Recommended Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appointments (71)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (9)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (19)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Change in Title (9)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Continuing Non-Senate (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair Appointment/Reappointment (13)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chair Reappointment (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotions (117)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (60)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor (57)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merit Increases (163)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (28)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Step V to VI (47)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Step IX to Above Scale (23)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor, Above Scale (18)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Retroactive Actions (16)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~Other Merits (31)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miscellaneous Actions (87)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer, SOE (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Equity Reviews (7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus (11)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOE Screenings (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals (45)</td>
<td>27^</td>
<td>15^</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Reviews (12)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-Year Deferrals (9)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total = 438</strong></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*split (4:4, w/one absent); ~merit increase for FPC members, Deans, Assoc. Deans, and Dept. Chairs; +positive; ^Guarded; -Negative; @modified actions are those CAP recommendations that differed from what was proposed, i.e., instead of a promotion a merit increase was recommended.
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCELERATED ACTIONS (not including retroactive merits)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acceleration Proposed</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-yr</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C: REDELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Div/ School</th>
<th>FPC Recommendation</th>
<th>Dean’s Decision</th>
<th>Actions w/o FPC Input</th>
<th>Accelerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Split</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAES</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSM</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HArCS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VM</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D: REDELEGATED MERIT ACTIONS

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEES
2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE OF AG. &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Calvert (Animal Science) - Chair</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliska Rejmankova (Env. Sci &amp; Policy)</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Burger (Plant Sciences)</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kenney (H&amp;CD)</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Oteiza (Nutrition)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Goodhue (A&amp;RE)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Savageau (Biomedical Eng) - Chair</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Orel (Applied Sci)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Giles (Biol. &amp; Ag Eng)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Chai (Civil &amp; Env. Eng)</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieter Stroeve (Chem Eng &amp; Materials Sci)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhaojun Bai (Computer Sci)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khaled Abdel-Ghaffar (Electrical &amp; Computer Eng)</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLEGE OF LETTERS &amp; SCIENCE</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities, Arts &amp; Cultural Studies - HArCS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Stimson (Art &amp; Art History) - Chair</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Bauer (Music)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Shershow (English)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Isbell (Anthropology)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Carlson (Geology)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Sciences - SS</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaoquim Silvestre (Economics) - Chair</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynne Isbell (Anthropology)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeev Maoz (Political Science)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Shershow (English)</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiangdong Zhu (Physics)</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Mathematical & Physical Sciences - MPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motohico Mulase</td>
<td>Mathematics - Chair</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xiangdong Zhu</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Carlson</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Bauer</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeev Maoz</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Wainwright</td>
<td>Evolution &amp; Ecology - Chair</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Burgess</td>
<td>MCB</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Dehesh</td>
<td>Plant Biology</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Chapman</td>
<td>NPB</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Singer</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>TERM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martine Quinzii</td>
<td>Economics - Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chih-Ling Tsai</td>
<td>GSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasad Naik</td>
<td>GSM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOL OF LAW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gail Goodman</td>
<td>Psychology - Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Kurtz</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Aoki</td>
<td>2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Joo</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryken Grattet</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Tucker</td>
<td>Cell Biol. &amp; Human Anatomy - Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rocke</td>
<td>Public Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janine LaSalle</td>
<td>Medical Micro &amp; Immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Payne</td>
<td>Physiology &amp; Mem Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard White</td>
<td>Internal Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Fleming</td>
<td>Anesthesiology &amp; Pain Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Diercks</td>
<td>Emergency Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanna Park</td>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Wolinsky</td>
<td>Orthopedic Surgery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL OF VETERINARY MEDICINE

Lisa Tell - Medicine & Epidemiology - Chair 2007-2011
Bruno Pypendop - Surgical & Radiological Sciences 2009-2012
Jeffrey Stott - Pathology, Microbiology & Immunology 2009-2012
Mark Anderson - CAHFS/PMI 2010-2013
Birgit Puschner - Molecular Biosciences 2010-2013

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Robert Blake - (Spanish) - Chair 2007-2011
Cristina Gonzalez (Education) 2010-2012
***Peter Mundy*** temporary replacement in spring 2010 for C. Gonzalez
Thomas Timar (Education) 2007-2010
APPENDIX E:

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.
Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC)

Total Meetings: 9  Meeting frequency: upon receipt of appeal(s)  Average hours of committee work each week: 2-3 hours per committee member per appeal

Total appeals reviewed: 41  Total of reviewed appeals deferred from the previous year: 1  Total appeals deferred to the coming academic year: 10 (not included in this report)

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: In the performance of its charge, the 2010-11 CAPAC addressed the issue of the number of appeals of CAPOC decisions that it was recommending. In addressing this issue, CAPAC sought to clarify the classification of appeal materials to distinguish “new information” and to define procedural errors. These matters led to a review and clarification of the appeal process that involved consultations with the Vice Provost – Academic Personnel, CAPOC and CERJ and resulted an appeal and reconsideration process flow chart (see attached) which reinforced Davis Division Bylaw 45.

Committee’s narrative:

The 2010-11 Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC) received 43 actions on appeal during the 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 recommended granting 19 of 41 appeals reviewed. Table 4 shows the Vice-Provost’s or Dean’s 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>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Biological Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Management</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th># Cases</th>
<th>GRANT APPEAL</th>
<th>DENY APPEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER Appeals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment by Change in Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td># Cases</td>
<td>GRANT APPEAL</td>
<td>DENY APPEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3 Yr)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Non-Senate Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: CAPAC Recommendations to the Individual Deans (Redelegated Appeals)
Table 4: CAPAC Recommendation vs. Final Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>Non-Redel &amp; Redel</th>
<th>CAPAC Recommendation</th>
<th>FINAL DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># CASES</td>
<td>GRANT</td>
<td>DENY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decelerated Merit Advancement (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotion (1, 2, 3, 4 Yr)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merit, Above Scale</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CER Appeals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment by Change in Series</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Year Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Non-Senate Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two actions were returned to the previous review committee for reconsideration, and neither of these actions came back to CAPAC on appeal. One was a non-redelegated promotion that was denied after reconsideration. One was a redelegated decelerated merit that was approved on reconsideration. CAPAC therefore reviewed 41 of the 43 actions that it received for review.

Respectfully submitted,

Bryce Falk, Chair
Joseph Antognini, Jeannie Darby, Lynn Roller, Dean Simonton,
Bryan Rodman (Analyst, Academic Senate Office)
Appeal

The faculty member who wishes to appeal should provide evidence of the personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure.

Reconsideration

A reconsideration is when new information is supplied that is not the result of a personnel committee’s failure to apply established standards of merit or failure to follow established procedure.

New information should be indicated as such by the candidate, or in supporting letters by the Dean or Dept. Chair. Such information needs to fall in the review period (per UCD-220-IV.F.9); e.g. by 12/31 of the year of consideration, and would be:

1. New publications or other creative works
2. Awards
3. New teaching evaluations
4. New grants
5. Original requested extramural letters that arrived late

Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Total Meetings: 15
Meeting frequency: 2-3 meetings per quarter or as often as twice a month
Average hours of committee work each week: Variable

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
New UC Davis holistic-review policy

Issues considered by the committee:
Holistic Review
Non-Resident Admissions

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
Continued development of UC Davis holistic-review practices
Committee’s Charge

The Admissions & Enrollment Committee (A&E) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate and its charge is the stewardship of the admissions process that includes selection of undergraduate students. The Academic Senate has authority (delegated to it by the Regents) to determine the conditions for undergraduate admission, what the degree requirements are, and what the curriculum should be.

Committee Narrative (2010-11)

The Admissions & Enrollment Committee (A&E) met 15 times during the academic year 2010-11 and considered issues pertinent to undergraduate admissions. The major focus of the committee during the year was holistic review and nonresident admission.

Holistic Review:

The Admissions and Enrollment committee reviewed the models of holistic review used by UC Berkeley and UCLA. All members attended an all-day workshop on holistic review conducted by UCLA on the Davis campus to learn about the holistic-review process in practice at UCLA, including the use of a "read sheet" showing an applicant’s academic performance within the context of available opportunities.

The committee developed holistic-review policies for implementation at UC Davis beginning fall 2011, which were endorsed by the Executive Council of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate on 5/20/11 and approved by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate on 6/3/11. A copy of the approved holistic-review proposal is included as an attachment to this report. The A&E committee will continue the development and implementation of holistic-review procedures and practices during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Non-Resident Admission

Because the University and the State of California face an era of severe budget constraints, increases in the enrollment of international and domestic non-resident students may become a partial solution to UC’s fiscal crisis, and discussions about appropriate levels of non-resident enrollment will likely continue in the context of a broader discussion about how to return the University to a sound fiscal basis. UC must seek a balance between fiscal concerns, its goal of enrolling a broad range of undergraduates, and its commitment to serving California residents, particularly its role as an engine of social mobility to lift the state economy and serve underrepresented populations.
who continue to grow in number and who desire and deserve access to UC. A&E discussed these issues and anticipates an increase in the enrollment of undergraduate non-residents who compare favorably with California residents admitted to UC Davis, in accordance with the Principles of Non-resident Enrollment authored by the UC Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools (BOARS) and approved by the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/DS_MGY_LPBOARSNRPrinciple6.pdf).

Respectfully submitted,

Mark M. Rashid, Co-Chair
Ralph C. Aldredge, Co-Chair
Orhan C. Orgun
Ning Pan
Joseph Sorensen
Cynthia J. Bates (AF Rep)
Ryan Meyerhoff (ASUCD Rep)
Lora Jo Bossio (Ex-Officio)
Gillian Butler (Consultant)
Darlene Hunter (Consultant)
Solomon Bekele, Analyst
PROPOSAL FOR A UC DAVIS FRESHMAN ADMISSION PROCESS
BASED ON HOLISTIC REVIEW

Prepared by the 2010-2011
Admissions & Enrollment Committee
of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

R. C. Aldredge & M. M. Rashid (Co-Chairs), O. C. Orgun, N. Pan, J. Sorenson

Background

The Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions (Appendix A) adopted by the UC Regents on January, 19 2011 requires (a) that each applicant to the UC receive an individualized, comprehensive review in which trained readers examine the applicant’s full file to evaluate accomplishments in the context of opportunity and (b) that single-score holistic review be the explicit means of comprehensive review. Single-score holistic review (HR) involves the assignment of a single score to an applicant on the basis of an individualized comprehensive review involving a human read of the entire application. The comprehensive review considers a wide range of both academic and non-academic achievements evaluated within the context of available high-school and life opportunities, while accounting for how fully the applicant has taken advantage of opportunities and resources. Fourteen specific comprehensive criteria considered are listed in the attached Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions adopted by the Academic Senate in 2002 (Appendix B).

Currently, a two-stage, multiple-score implementation of comprehensive review is employed at UC Davis for evaluation of applicants and selection for admission. This process involves the combination of a purely computational evaluation which renders 87.7% of the final score and a reader’s evaluation which renders the remaining 12.3% of the final score. Applicants with sufficiently high scores based only on the computational evaluation, for a given major, are admitted without an individualized human read of their application. This group represents 25-30% of the entire applicant pool. It is recognized, however, that as admission to UC Davis becomes increasingly more selective, individualized evaluation involving a human read of all applications will be necessary in order to fairly delineate between even the most competitive applicants, in accordance with the Regents Resolution. It is recognized also that such delineation is facilitated by evaluation of each applicant’s achievement within the context of available opportunities, accounting for how fully the applicant has taken advantage of opportunities and resources, also in accordance with the Regents Resolution and the guiding principles of comprehensive review outlined in Section II of Appendix B.

This proposal outlines the guiding principles and design of a new freshman admissions process at UC Davis based on single-score holistic review. The proposal also describes how UC Davis will collaborate with other UC campuses employing similar holistic-review processes (such as UCLA) to reduce the local workload and cost of holistic review and thereby contribute toward an increase in the efficiency of holistic review system-wide. A comparison of the single-score holistic-review processes employed at UCLA and UC Berkeley, upon which the proposed process is based, with the two-stage, multiple-score implementation of comprehensive review currently employed at UC Davis is given in Appendix C.

Assumptions and Constraints

It is assumed that UC Davis will make use of holistic-review (HR) score information provided by other campuses for applicants we share in common with those campuses. In many cases, UC Davis will not re-read these shared applications. However, UC Davis will have to develop and maintain the ability
to read and score applicant files locally, both to accommodate applicants for whom we have no HR score from another campus, and for other reasons. Specifically, in-common applications will be read at UC Davis if they fall within a particular score range, based on the HR score from the other campus. Also, a modest number of in-common applications from across the entire score range will be read locally, in order to establish the correspondence between locally-generated scores and those from the other campus. These features of the proposed process are described more fully below.

Although HR scores from a number of other campuses may eventually be available to UC Davis, it is assumed that, for the Fall 2012 cycle at least, UCLA scores are likely to be the only scores available. Therefore, the balance of this document refers to “UCLA” and “UCLA scores” with the understanding that, eventually, other campuses may be added to the list of score sources used by UC Davis. The process described below is designed to incorporate scores from other sources as they become available.

It is explicitly assumed that the relative assessment and weighting of the various factors in the UC Davis HR process will be very similar to those of the UCLA process. This assumption implies that, although the UC Davis and UCLA applicant pools may differ in some respects, the processes of the two campuses would result in a very similar ordering of UC Davis applicants.

It is further assumed that UC Davis knows in advance which applications are shared in common with UCLA, but that UC Davis has no control over, nor influence on, the timing of the receipt of score information for the common files. The campus is nonetheless obliged to complete all admit/deny actions by the mid-March deadline.

Guiding Principles

This proposal was designed with the following principles, goals, and objectives in mind:

1. Admit/deny decisions should be based, to the greatest extent possible within the bounds of practicality and resource constraints, on holistic evaluation of each applicant's file. This means, in part, that the process should resort to an algorithmic mechanism for distinguishing between applicants for admit/deny purposes in only a small number of cases. This “tie-breaking” process should be limited to cases where holistic evaluation cannot reasonably distinguish the level of merit among these cases. This principle carries implications regarding the design of the HR scoring rubric.

2. The process should aspire to a high degree of fairness and uniformity in the way applicants are treated, regardless of where, in addition to UC Davis, they may have applied.

3. Although the new HR-based process is certain to be somewhat more labor-intensive than the current UC Davis CR process, it should nonetheless exhibit the highest level of efficiency and economy possible, consistent with the other principles stated herein.

4. In keeping with longstanding practice at UC Davis, the new process should accommodate variability in the admission rate across different majors.

5. The holistic read process should be designed in such a manner that the lessons learned and procedures developed by other campuses should be utilized to the greatest extent possible, in pursuit of the principles enumerated herein.

6. The read process should be designed so that a high degree of reliability and high reader morale are likely to be maintained. This means, in part, that readers should not be asked to partition files into an excessively large number of ranks.

Process Design

The basic structure of the proposed process is as follows. At the beginning of the application-processing period, applications that are not shared in common with UCLA are scheduled for local
Two reads of all such applications are performed, much like in the UCLA process. In addition to the non-shared files, some of the in-common files (i.e. those shared by UCLA) are scheduled for reading as well. This “local re-read” pool consists of (a) applications from students with UCLA HR scores that are potentially not well differentiated at UCLA (e.g., those receiving a score of 4 or 4.25 from UCLA) but who are expected to be still competitive for admission at UC Davis, together with (b) a modest number of files from across the UCLA score range. The files in category (b) will be used for calibrating the UCLA and UC Davis scores to a common scale. Because UCLA scores will not all be available before reading of the local-re-read pool must commence, a statistical model of the UCLA scoring process will be used to determine a preliminary composition of this pool. The great majority of the local-re-read pool will consist of files associated with category (a). These files are expected to constitute as many as 15-20% of all UCD applications.

An important element of the proposed process is that admit-deny decisions will be made by establishing a single score cut-off, determined irrespectively of where the file was read. This element is particularly motivated by principle 2 above, but it also is consistent with a number of the other principles as well. Specifically, it facilitates the assignment of different cut-offs to different majors.

The details of the proposed process are as follows.

1. Davis readers are to be trained using the same principles and strategies of evaluation as are UCLA readers. As with the UCLA process, readers have 7 score levels to select from in scoring files. However, the “bin sizes” – i.e. the approximate proportions of the applicant pool that should fall within each score level – are not the same as at UCLA. Instead, they are set to fit UC Davis's circumstances of selectivity. Specifically, the percentage of applicants within the top and bottom bins should be a multiple of 5 (e.g. the top 25% or the bottom 30%), with the other five bins of approximately equal size in between. The size of the top bin should be such that its lowest HR score is higher than the HR-score cut-off for the most selective major on campus, to accommodate admission of all applicants within the top bin. The size of the bottom bin should be such that its highest HR score is lower than that of all students accepted into the least selective major on campus, to accommodate potential denial of all applications within the bottom bin.

2. Consistent with UCLA's process, two independent, blind reads of each Davis-only file should be carried out, in which local and UC Davis context information is used. In cases where the two scores are neighboring or identical, the final score for the file is the average of the two read scores. The reported scores can thus take one of 13 values. In cases where the two scores are not neighboring (i.e. they differ by more than one), a third read is undertaken by a senior reader, whose score stands as the final reported score. This procedure is identical to the UCLA procedure.

3. Again consistent with UCLA's process, readers may recommend files for Supplemental review. The criteria and procedures governing Supplemental Review should be the same as in the UCLA process.

4. Applications in common with UCLA are subjected to an automated prediction of their eventual UCLA HR score using a multiple-linear-regression statistical model. The predictive model is necessarily calibrated on the previous year's UCLA applicant pool. The predictor variables in the model consist of the range of quantitative indicators from the UCLA read sheet. The model predictions are not used to influence the admit/deny decision for any student. Instead, they are used only to estimate which of the in-common files are likely to receive a UCLA HR score in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g., 4 or 4.25). These files constitute the bulk of the in-common files that are to be re-read locally. Were UC Davis to wait until the actual scores arrived from UCLA, insufficient time might remain to read them all locally, prior to the decision-release
deadline. By predicting UCLA score outcomes at the beginning of the reading period, UC Davis can get a head start on reading the in-common files that will, in all likelihood, have to be read. Should this prediction-driven process fail to mark for local reading a file whose actual score turns out to be in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g., 4 or 4.25), then that file must be read locally as soon as is practical. The predictive model is also used to randomly select a modest number of files for calibration (e.g., on the order of 1000) whose scores are likely to uniformly cover the UCLA score range.

5. Because in-common files receiving a score from UCLA in the range selected for re-evaluation have already been read twice, these files should receive only a single local read. The “calibration” files (taken from throughout the score range), however, receive two local reads, in order to maximize the resolution of the calibration process.

6. All applicants, including those with UCLA-averaged scores and those with UC Davis-averaged scores, are ranked on a common scale. The UCLA-to-common-scale conversion is calibrated using the local read outcomes for the 1000 “calibration files.” The conversion also facilitates the assignment of a single common-scale score to each application with “mixed” HR scores (e.g., a 4 or 4.25 from UCLA and a separate, independent single read score from UC Davis).

7. At the end of the reading period, the integration of all applicant HR scores (whether derived at UCLA or UC Davis) into a common-scale is achieved using a fast, entirely algorithmic procedure. Recommended-admit cut-offs are then established on the common scale for each major. Applicants who fall near the cut-off on the common scale will be subject to an automated tie-breaking process. The tie-breaking process should not involve any additional reading by a human reader; instead, it should algorithmically combine multiple criteria to render a quantitative result.
Office of the President

TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY:

ACTION ITEM

For Meeting of January 19, 2011

RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC EVALUATION IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends that the Committee on Educational Policy recommend to the Regents that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, the University of California is committed to achieving excellence and inclusiveness in its undergraduate student body; and

WHEREAS, in May 1988, the Regents adopted a Policy on Undergraduate Admissions that states in part that “Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California…seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity of...backgrounds characteristic of California;” and

WHEREAS, in 2002, the University, acting on the recommendation of the Academic Senate, implemented an application evaluation procedure that calls for campuses to utilize a broad range of criteria to assess each applicant’s academic and personal achievement in the context of opportunities; and

WHEREAS, proper evaluation of applicants’ achievements in the context of opportunity requires that information about their schools and community be available in a uniform manner, and several campuses have made considerable progress in accomplishing this through the use of extensive school-based information; and

WHEREAS, evaluation of applicants’ achievement in the context of opportunities and challenges requires that a trained reader examine the entire application in considering personal achievements, challenges, leadership, and contributions to applicants’ communities alongside context information; and
WHEREAS, a form of Comprehensive Review in which the reader produces a single holistic score based on all information in the applicant’s file has been shown to thoroughly evaluate each applicant’s achievement in relation to opportunities and challenges; and

WHEREAS, the Regents expect the Office of the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and local admissions committees, to exercise leadership in the realization of best practices in undergraduate admissions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to ensure that all applicants receive an individualized review that ensures trained readers examine applicants’ full files to evaluate their accomplishments in the context of opportunity;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to continue to research and develop a database to be used with the human read of every application that provides background on the available opportunities and challenges faced by the applicant within his or her school and community;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, to affirm that single-score holistic evaluation is the expected implementation of Comprehensive Review, while allowing flexibility for campuses that can demonstrate that alternate approaches employed by their campuses are equally effective in achieving campus and University goals;

BE IT RESOLVED that University of California campuses must remain committed to recruiting students from the full range of California high schools and regions in order to achieve the potential of the University’s admission policy for California’s students;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President to annually report to the Board on the progress of these initiatives on each campus.

BACKGROUND

At the July 14, 2010, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Chair Sylvia Hurtado presented the BOARS report on Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions at the University of California, 2003 - 2009. Educational Policy Chair Regent Island requested an update on the progress of the recommendations in the report.

This resolution establishes the Regents’ expectations of the President, faculty and campuses with respect to the admissions process.

Following the adoption of the resolution, annual reports will be presented to the Committee on Educational Policy, starting in May 2011. The purpose of these reports is to highlight specific efforts towards achieving the University’s comprehensive review objectives.
GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVERSITY POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

I. OVERVIEW

On May 20, 1988, The Regents of the University of California adopted a University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. The Policy states in part that:

"Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University's eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California."

In December 1995, following passage the previous July of Regents Resolution SP-1, a task force convened by the President of the University reviewed existing Guidelines for the Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and recommended substantive changes. The revised Guidelines were issued in July 1996 and revised in May 2000 to reflect the University's newly adopted Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) policy.

In May 2001, The Regents adopted Resolution RE-28, which rescinded Resolution SP-1 and reaffirmed the goals of the 1988 Policy as follows:

"the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California."

Following the passage of RE-28, the President asked the Academic Senate to consider the adoption of evaluation procedures that would look at applicants in a comprehensive manner and would utilize a variety of measures of achievement.

The present revision of the Guidelines follows extensive deliberation on the part of the Academic Senate, its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), and its individual campus divisions and faculty admissions committees undertaken during the summer of 2001. The work of the Academic Senate built on themes already developed by the 1995 Task Force. For example, the report of the Task Force commented on the "need for a comprehensive review of the methods used for assessing academic performance, beyond utilizing criteria such as GPA and standardized test scores" and suggested that "the selection process could be altered in the future to include a more comprehensive approach to reviewing students' academic accomplishments and personal backgrounds." The work of the Academic Senate should be considered as yet another step in the continuing evolution of undergraduate admissions practices and policies.

Effective with applicants seeking admission for the fall 2002 term and thereafter, the following revised guidelines and procedures shall be followed for implementation of the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and RE-28, adopted in May 2001.

These selection guidelines apply to campuses that have to select from a pool of eligible applicants, and to students who have met the established UC eligibility requirements for admission. These eligibility requirements are established by the University in conformance with the specifications outlined in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which specifies that the top one-eighth of the State's public high school graduates, as well as those community college transfer students who have successfully completed specified college work, be eligible for admission to the University of California.

These guidelines provide the framework within which campuses shall establish specific criteria and procedures for the selection of undergraduate applicants to be admitted when the number of eligible applicants exceeds the places
II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications. BOARS defines comprehensive review as:

_The process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment._

In designing campus procedures, campus admissions committees should adhere to the following guiding principles:

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant's academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.

2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.

3. No fixed proportion of applicants should be admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.

4. Campus policies should reflect continued commitment to the goal of enrolling classes that exhibit academic excellence as well as diversity of talents and abilities, personal experience, and backgrounds.

5. Faculty on individual campuses should be given flexibility to create admission policies and practices that, while consistent with Universitywide criteria and policies, are also sensitive to local campus values and academic priorities.

6. The admission process should select students of whom the campus will be proud, and who give evidence that they will use their education to make contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the State and the Nation.

7. The admissions process should select those students who demonstrate a strong likelihood that they will persist to graduation.

8. Campus selection policies should ensure that no applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review of his or her file.

Faculty takes their responsibilities for admission and selection very seriously. BOARS anticipates that campuses will act autonomously in designing campus-specific policies and processes that are consistent with Universitywide policies and guidelines. BOARS will continue to monitor campus policies and work with faculty to continuously improve the processes and outcomes.

III. SELECTION CRITERIA

Campuses receiving applications in excess of the number required to achieve their enrollment target for a specific term shall select students for admission as follows:

**A. Freshman Applicants**

The following criteria provide a comprehensive list of factors campuses may use to select their admitted class. Based on campus-specific institutional goals and needs, admissions decisions will be based on a broad variety of factors to ensure attainment of the goals set forth in the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and
1. Academic Grade Point Average (GPA) calculated on all academic courses completed in the subject areas specified by the University's eligibility requirements (the a-f subjects), including additional points for completion of University certified honors courses (see 4, below). It is recommended that the maximum value allowed for the GPA shall be 4.0.

2. Scores on the following tests: the Scholastic Assessment Test I or the American College Test, and the College Board Scholastic Assessment Test II: Subject Tests.

3. The number, content of, and performance in courses completed in academic subjects beyond the minimum specified by the University's eligibility requirements.

4. The number of and performance in University approved honors courses, College Board Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, and transferable college courses completed. It is recommended that caution be exercised in order not to assign excessive weight to these courses, especially if considerable weight already has been given in the context of 1, above. Additionally, in recognition of existing differences in availability of these courses among high schools, it is recommended that reviewers assess completion of this coursework against the availability of these courses at the candidate's secondary school.

5. Being identified as eligible in the local context, by being ranked in the top 4% of the class at the end of the junior year, as determined by academic criteria established by the University of California.

6. The quality of the senior year program, as measured by type and number of academic courses (see 3 and 4, above) in progress or planned.

7. The quality of academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school.

8. Outstanding performance in one or more specific academic subject areas.

9. Outstanding work in one or more special projects in any academic field of study.

10. Recent, marked improvement in academic performance, as demonstrated by academic grade point average and quality of coursework (see 3 and 4, above) completed and in progress, with particular attention being given to the last two years of high school.

11. Special talents, achievements, and awards in a particular field, such as in the visual and performing arts, in communication, or in athletic endeavors; special skills, such as demonstrated written and oral proficiency in other languages; special interests, such as intensive study and exploration of other cultures; or experiences that demonstrate unusual promise for leadership, such as significant community service or significant participation in student government; or other significant experiences or achievements that demonstrate the applicant's promise for contributing to the intellectual vitality of a campus.

12. Completion of special projects undertaken either in the context of the high school curriculum or in conjunction with special school events, projects or programs co-sponsored by the school, community organizations, postsecondary educational institutions, other agencies, or private firms, that offer significant evidence of an applicant's special effort and determination or that may indicate special suitability to an academic program on a specific campus.

13. Academic accomplishments in light of the applicant's life experiences and special circumstances. These experiences and circumstances may include, but are not limited to, disabilities, low family income, first generation to attend college, need to work, disadvantaged social or educational environment, difficult personal and family situations or circumstances, refugee status, or veteran status.

14. Location of the applicant's secondary school and residence. These factors shall be considered in order to provide for geographic diversity in the student population and also to account for the wide variety of educational environments.
existing in California.

**B. Advanced Standing Applicants**

Advanced standing applicants shall be selected by each campus using the criteria listed below as well as criteria 11-14 listed above. Priority consideration for admission of advanced standing applicants shall be given to upper division junior transfers from California Community Colleges.

Criteria to Select Advanced Standing Applicants

1. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that meet breadth or general education requirements.
2. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that provide continuity with upper division courses in the major.
3. Grade point average in all transferable courses, and, in particular, grade point average in lower division courses required for the applicant's intended major.
4. Participation in academically selective honors courses or programs.

(Refer to items 2 through 6 in Section A above for additional criteria to consider.)

**IV. APPLICATION PROCEDURES**

A common filing period for submission of applications shall be established by the Office of the President in consultation with the campuses. These dates shall be observed by all campuses and may be extended only if a campus determines that additional applications are required to meet enrollment targets. All applications submitted during the prescribed dates shall receive equal consideration for admission.

Applicants shall file one application on which they shall indicate all the campuses where they wish to be considered for admission.

Campuses shall observe and publish a common notification period for notifying applicants of their admission status.

**V. ACCOMMODATION OF UC ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

UC eligible resident applicants, who have not been admitted at any of the campuses of their choice shall be offered a space at other UC campuses where space is available. This process, called referral, reaffirms the long-standing University commitment to provide a place for every eligible California applicant who wishes to enroll.

In addition to the referral process, campuses may choose to offer other enrollment alternatives to UC eligible applicants. Examples of such alternatives may include:

1. Fall term admission to a different major,
2. Deferred admission to another term; or,
3. Enrollment at a community college with provision for admission at a later time, if a stated level of academic achievement is maintained (for freshman applicants only).

Last updated February 15, 2002.
UC Berkeley had been using comprehensive “holistic” review since 2001, and has refined the process over the intervening years. In 2006, UC Los Angeles became the second UC campus to implement a holistic evaluation process, basing its model on Berkeley’s process but also incorporating some locally developed measures regarding school context. UCLA trains readers to review files and assign a single score to candidates on the basis of a review of the entire application. No single attribute or characteristic guarantees the admission of any applicant. The review is based on a wide range of both academic and non-academic achievements, which are considered in the context of the available high school and life opportunities, and how fully the student has taken advantage of those opportunities and resources. UCLA considers all Comprehensive Review factors except for location of the applicant’s secondary school and residence (#14). Both Berkeley and UCLA devote a significant amount of time to norming student ratings and crosschecking the ratings of readers (see section on reader training). At UCLA, at least two readers review each file; whereas at Berkeley, students with the highest read score (less than 5% of applicants) and the lowest read scores are read once. Additional reads are used in the case of discrepant scores or if readers flag the student’s file for additional attention (called “augmented” review at UCB and “supplemental” review at UCLA). These third reviews sometimes require obtaining additional information from the student to clarify their case. Third reads can also “break ties” on cases where there are similar ratings and fewer places for students in score ranges that are near the boundary of normally admissible ratings. Details about the process and criteria are clearly described on campus websites.\(^{20}\) Finally, all UCLA and UCB applicants receive a review regardless of eligibility, which allows both campuses to make use of admissions by exception for unusual cases.

At the end of the process, several post-decision reviews determine if any decisions need to be reconsidered before admission offers are extended. This includes a By High School review, in which senior readers view an array of quantifiable academic data from applicants from the same high school to either validate decisions or identify apparent anomalies. Berkeley also undertakes a Weighted Index review that takes into account academic measures, socio-economic factors, and contextual factors weighted more heavily based on a scale of predicted outcomes derived from regression analyses of previous admissions cycles. This prompts a further review by the Director of Undergraduate Admissions for a final decision based upon criteria specified by the faculty admissions committee. At Berkeley, the faculty admissions committee also reviews the 100 admits with the lowest scores on the eligibility index to confirm the decisions.

Single score holistic processes, based on the judgments of trained readers, also undergo many cross checks based on quantifiable information on each file and indices. For example, in 2005-06, Berkeley also introduced a High Index Review as quality control that selects for further review applicants who have high test scores and/or grade point averages but received low reader

\(^{20}\) 
"http://students.berkeley.edu/admissions/freshmen.asp?id=56&navid=N; http://www.admissions.ucla.edu/Prospect/Adm_fr/FrSel.htm"
ratings. Senior readers look for any evidence that the original decision to deny admission should be reversed. Consequently, considerable deference is still given to “traditional” measures of achievement at the same time that they place great value on the expert judgments of readers to take into account multiple criteria in their ratings of applicants.

Assessment of Single Score Holistic Processes

The Berkeley and UCLA processes are distinctive for the single rating that is based on the large range of indicators that readers review. This includes approximately 28 school profile characteristics (Appendix G); a student’s ranking in terms of GPA (weighted and unweighted); and coursework and test scores relative to other applicants within the school, the pool of applicants to the campus, and the school’s applicants in the entire UC applicant pool. There is also a high degree of individualized student review to determine the merits of each case. Readers are instructed to review the student’s coursework and consider the strength of the senior year load, identify improvement in performance, and other indicators of striving for excellence that include honors and awards for academic accomplishments. Readers also consider extracurricular activities that demonstrate sustained involvement, awards, and commitment to service as evidence of potential contributions to the vitality of the campus, as well as life challenges and employment that might restrict engagement in activities. Readers are provided with a training manual to help identify significant student organizations, activities, awards, and seasonal sports. Finally, readers are provided copies of the Regents May 2001 resolution, the campus philosophy to guide selection developed by faculty, and instructions that they “may not under any circumstances use any information regarding race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin that may be surmised from a reading of the application” in accordance with Proposition 209.

While the single score holistic method has many good features, the process has several limitations that one needs to bear in mind. First, it is extremely labor intensive and expensive because it relies on oversight and expertise of an experienced staff and external readers. Some may consider individualized attention to each file inefficient and less cost effective in the context of increasing applications and the short time frame for review. At the same time, it assures quality by using substantial information to make fine distinctions among applicants in a very competitive pool. Second, the single holistic score does not allow the campus to identify and provide additional consideration for students with extraordinary talents, leadership, and achievements outside of the academic criteria. Most private selective universities that employ an extensive individualized student review have a dual scoring system to favor the selection of “well rounded” students, or a small number of students with extraordinary personal accomplishments and more moderate academic scores. Considerable weight is given to “traditional” academic indicators in single score holistic processes. This was confirmed by the Hout Study\(^\text{21}\) of Berkeley’s holistic process in 2005, identifying grades were the most important determinant of readers’ scores. Third, this method is less transparent because students cannot know which criteria are valued most, nor calculate their own scores to assess the probability of admission. One can also reason, however, that this prevents students from “gaming” the system by focusing on only those areas that give them the most points and neglect other areas of excellence. The issue of transparency is addressed in a separate section (III-3).

Two Stage or Multiple Score Processes

Two-Stage or Multiple Score methods are also “holistic” in the sense that they consider many factors and employ the use of human reviewers to make judgments about non-quantitative information taken from the file that must be scored. Together, the multiple scores obtained through an individualized review constitute a comprehensive view of a students’ background and accomplishments. The main distinction from the Berkeley and UCLA processes is the assignment of specific points and weights to academic and personal accomplishment criteria based on principles and values as determined by faculty committees on the campus. Readers are then trained to read files and assign values in scoring in a way that is consistent with this philosophy. Otherwise, the read process is similar to the individualized student review used at Berkeley and UCLA.

UC Davis employs a two stage process that combines an electronic evaluation (87.7% of the final score) and a reader evaluation (12.3% of the final score) of academic and personal accomplishment criteria to determine an applicant’s final score. While the electronic evaluation score is generated from data based mainly on traditional academic indicators (criteria #1-3), it also incorporates ELC status (#5), EOP qualification, non-traditional student status, first generation college status, veteran status, (#13), individual initiative (#12), and evidence of marked improvement (#10). Although maximum weight is given to HS-GPA and the Sum of Standardized Tests, additional weight is given to ELC status in the point system—roughly equivalent to the maximum for the number of a-g courses (1000 points). The first score places the greatest weight on academic criteria, achievement in the local context, and also student background characteristics that influence achievement (12,500 point maximum). Thus, the first score gives somewhat more weight to students who have achieved in spite of disparities of circumstance. Using a sophisticated algorithm based on previous admissions results, students with the highest scores will be admitted without a second score based on a reviewer’s read. ELC students are actively recruited and also now receive a “fast track” pathway in admissions at Davis.

For all other Davis applicants, a second score (1,750 point maximum) is based on the reader evaluation that considers factors such as leadership promise and special talents/skills (criteria #11), participation in academic preparation programs, and evidence of educational perseverance in the face of difficult circumstances or disability (#13). Davis also implemented an Augmented Review process in November 2007 in order to conduct a more contextual review for certain unusual cases. The campus anticipates that as it becomes more selective, however, reader evaluations based on an individualized student review will be more necessary to make finer distinctions among all applicants.

At UC Santa Barbara, the Senate Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS) annually sets criteria that will enable the campus to achieve its goals of improving the quality and diversity of the incoming class and achieving specified enrollment targets. After assigning each applicant an academic index score called the Admissions Decision Model (ADM) based on high school GPA and test scores, the Comprehensive Review consists of an Academic Preparation Review (APR) and an Academic Promise Review (PPR). Applicants receive an APR score based on the academic factors comprising the ADM. The PPR score is based on a socio-economic status assessment and a read of the applicant’s personal statement,
Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 6</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: As needed – average 2/quarter</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: fluctuates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total proposals Reviewed: (courses, proposals, cases, etc.) Responded to three Requests for Consultation</td>
<td>Total of reviewed proposals deferred from the previous year -- None</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year -- None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing of bylaw changes proposed:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing of committee policies established or revised:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues considered by the committee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mentoring task force for underrepresented minority students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Modifying &quot;My Info Vault&quot; to allow input of information related to diversity for use by CAP when evaluating for appointments and promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hate free campus initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2009-10 Diversity data in conjunction with UCAAD findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online training for Living Principles of Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty in Residence program for developing GE courses to meet diversity requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UC Faculty Salary Equity Study in conjunction with UCAAD findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affirmative Action Recruitment &amp; Retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee Narrative:

The Affirmative Action & Diversity Committee continues to discuss and consider ways to implement mentoring programs for underrepresented students as well as create repositories of information both for students seeking mentorship and for faculty members seeking opportunities to mentor.

Committee members worked with CAP to find a way to consider diversity service when evaluating faculty for merits and promotions. Data from other UC campuses is being collected to assess how they evaluate diversity. The committee will continue to explore the possibility of adding a field in My Info Vault where such activities could be listed.
Committee members were integral in providing feedback for the Online Training for Living Principles of Community (which all committee members completed) as well as the new Faculty-in-Residence course development which are both part of the Hate Free Campus Initiative. All faculty and staff will be asked to complete the online training for Living the Principles of Community by the end of the 2011 calendar year. A student version of the course is also being developed. The committee reviewed and provided extensive feedback on The Faculty-in-Residence program, and it is expected to go forward to the chancellor for consideration.

The Affirmative Action & Diversity committee will continue to review diversity data from the Davis campus as well as other UC campuses for both students and faculty. The committee will also continue to review recruitment and retention in regards to Affirmative Action.

The Affirmative Action & Diversity committee will continue to consider issues of gender inequity in pay UC-wide, but especially at the UCD campus, working particularly with those units for which such discrepancies are prominent.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Rivera (chair), Kyu Kim (member), Francis Lu (member), Cynthia Pickett (member), Sharon Strauss (member), Monica Vazirani (member), Tina Jeoh Zicar (member), Ana Corbacho (AF Rep), Emir Hodzic (AF Rep), Anna Kato (AF Rep), Rahim Reed (Ex-Officio), Everett Wilson (Consultant)
**Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-2011**  
**Davis Division: Academic Senate**  
**Committee on Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: <strong>24</strong></th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Bi-Weekly &amp; Weekly</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: <strong>4-6</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Appts/Nominations:</th>
<th>Total requests deferred from the previous year <strong>0</strong></th>
<th>Total requests deferred to the coming academic year <strong>2</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Acad. Senate: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Comm: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Appointments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Replacement: 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10-11 Chairs/Members: 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Universitywide Reps: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:

Listing of committee policies established or revised:

Issues considered by the committee:

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
Committee’s narrative:

The Committee on Committees (COC) traditionally meets bi-weekly during fall quarter and weekly during winter and spring quarters.

During the past year COC was asked to provide a variety of nominees or appointments to system-wide Academic Senate and administration committees/task forces, campus administrative committees and task forces as well as provide membership for Davis Divisional Academic Senate task forces and special committees. There were 28 requests of this type received this year.

CoC meets each year with several selected committee chairs to assess committee effectiveness and discuss any issues concerning committee role and function. In addition, the committee meets with various administrators who routinely interact with Senate committees. During this past year, COC interviewed:

   Committee on Academic Personnel Oversight co-Chairs, N. James McLachlan and Charles “Chip” Martel
   Davis Division Chair, Robert Powell
   Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, Ralph Hexter

The Committee’s main responsibility is to fill over 200 standing committee positions annually. In carrying out this responsibility, members contact current members and chair (all current members/chairs are considered for continuing service) to assess committee and membership effectiveness and willingness to continue serving. The outcome of these contacts along with the length of service (the committee strives to rotate members and chairs after 3 consecutive years of service) determines the positions to be filled each year.

Once the vacancies are determined for each committee, COC members seek out replacements with consideration for the list of faculty that expressed interest in serving and committee balance with respect to college/school, gender, and ethnicity representation.

Submitted by:

Francisco J. Samaniego, Chair
2010-2011 Committee on Committees
Matthew K. Farrens, Engineering, Computer Science
Sharon K. Hietala, Veterinary Medicine, CA Animal Health & Food Safety Lab
Suad Joseph, Anthropology
Pablo Ortiz, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies Division, Music
Rex Perschbacher, Law/GSM/Education Cluster, Law School
Richard J. Sexton, Ag. & Environmental Sciences, Ag & Resource Economics
Mitchell L. Sutter, Biological Sciences, Neurobiology, Physiology & Behavior
Richard P. Tucker, Medicine, Human Anatomy & Cell Biology
### Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 2</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: As needed. Most of the work was done online via ICMS and GETS</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 4 (when courses were being reviewed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total: 766 Courses Reviewed in ICMS</th>
<th>Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: All GE3 courses reviewed in GETS</th>
<th>Total deferred to the coming academic year: In ICMS: 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3112 Courses were processed through GETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issues considered by the committee

1. **GE Implementation:** This past year, COCI was tasked with the review of all the proposed new GE (GE3) courses. Working with College courses committees the committee reviewed sample batches of courses in each GE topic and eventually approved 3112 courses through the GETS system. Departments that were delayed in requesting GE credit for courses were assisted throughout the year so that the maximum number of courses was processed prior to the deadline for the Course Catalog Supplement. Multiple memos were sent to campus informing them of progress and deadlines during the year.

2. **Integrated Curriculum Management System (ICMS – Curriculum):** The introduction of the new ICMS Curriculum course review system in July 2010 led to COCI requesting improvements to the system’s speed in December 2010 and various bug fixes/enhancements and added functionality through the year.

3. **Online course approval** was considered both for UC-Davis courses and the System-wide pilot. Concerns over the UC-wide pilot program were voiced to the organizers and COCI submitted comments via the division.

4. The committee gave feedback on documents circulated for feedback by Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Council and others, including the following: Update on Policies for Graduate Student Appointments; types of course offering by UC-Davis Extension; Workload Course Review Procedures; The right to delegate to colleges the ability to evaluate non UC-courses with respect to their GE equivalency; Instruction of “student-led” courses; need for an ICMS working group; streamlining curriculum review; GE guidelines for departmental advisors; a proposal to reshape Graduate Studies at UC Davis; and a proposal for Online Student Teaching Evaluations from the Special Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching.
Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
COCI will be reviewing and amending its policies and procedures in 2011-12.

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 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With General Education Impact</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected/Deny</td>
<td>233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Version</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With General Education Impact</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></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 143 Associate Instructors from 30 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 16 requests from 4 departments.

**Undergraduate Teaching Assistants**
The Committee is required to approve/reject petitions for the use of undergraduates as teaching assistants (this is an exception to policy). The Committee received and approved 2 petitions from 2 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 35 classes.
Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI)
Committee Membership 2010-2011

At-large Members
Marcel Holyoak, Chair
Robert Bell
YeuYue Fan
Yvette Flores
Richard Green
Terence M. Murphy
Lesilee Rose
Benjamin Shaw

Ex-officio Members
Matthew Augustine
Kenneth Beck
Chris M. Drake
Angelique Y. Louie
Lee Michael Martin
Jeanette Natzle
Kenneth Schackel
Frank Wada
Robert Yetman

Academic Federation Representative
Sean McDonnell

GSA Representative
John Peterson

Staff Consultant (Registrars Office)
Randall Larson-Maynard, Senior Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

Academic Senate Analyst
Edwin M. Arevalo, Associate Director of the Davis Division
Committee on Distinguished Teaching Awards

<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>Two 2-hour meetings.</td>
<td>Two times a year</td>
<td>Approximately 4-8 hours for review of the nominations for each meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 22 initial nominations were received and reviewed. 13 finalists were identified. Of those, 4 undergraduate and 2 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:
Based on a recommendation from the previous year, the timeline for nominations and selection was adjusted so that Representative Assembly confirmation of recipients may occur during the winter quarter, rather than the spring quarter. This allows recipients to be included in the combined Academic Senate and Academic Federation Awards Ceremony held in spring quarter.

Issues considered by the committee: None submitted.

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year: The Committee strongly recommends streamlining the review process by requiring electronic submission of nomination materials in pdf format, if at all possible.

Committee's narrative:
The primary charge to this committee is to select up to six members of the Academic Senate for a Distinguished Teaching Award in either the category of Undergraduate Teaching or Graduate and Professional Teaching.

A Call for Nominations for the 2011 Awards was sent out on November 1, 2010. The committee received a total of twenty-two nomination packets for review; eleven in the Undergraduate Teaching category and eleven in the Graduate/Professional Teaching category. A total of thirteen finalists were selected at a meeting on January 26, 2011. Finalists were asked to submit dossiers by February 28. Upon deliberation and discussion at a meeting on March 17, 2011 six recipients were selected. Their names were submitted to the Representative Assembly and were unanimously confirmed via a ballot.
The 2011 recipients were presented Distinguished Teaching Awards at the combined Academic Senate and Academic Federation Award Ceremony on May 11, 2011:

**Undergraduate Category:**
- Jay Rosenheim, Entomology
- Dean Tantillo, Chemistry
- Charles Walker, History
- Gergely Zimanyi, Physics

**Graduate/Professional Category:**
- Carol Erickson, Molecular & Cellular Biology
- John Scott, Political Science

Respectfully submitted,

John Harada, Chair  
Norman Matloff  
Kent Pinkerton  
Brenda Schildgen  
Peter Wainwright  
Matthew Blair (ASUCD Representative)  
Sona Hosseini (GSA Representative)  
Nancy Kilpatrick, Analyst, Academic Senate Office
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
Annual Report 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 13</th>
<th>Meeting Frequency: 4-5 per quarter</th>
<th>Average Hours of Committee Work Per Week: 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bylaw and Regulation proposals, advice, and elections supervised: 72</td>
<td>Total matters deferred from previous year: 13</td>
<td>Total matters deferred to coming academic year: 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CERJ took the following actions during 2010-2011.

**Systemwide UC R&J Legislative Rulings Issued**

The UC Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction issued the following Legislative Ruling during the 2010-2011 academic year at the request of the Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction. Legislative Rulings are binding unless modified by subsequent legislative or Regental action.

**Legislative Ruling 6.11.E Relationship of the Academic Senate with the Faculties of schools and colleges offering post baccalaureate, first professional degree programs leading to the award of M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., D.Pharm., and J.D. degrees:**

1. The statement by the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, approved by the Academic Council on July 23, 2008, that CCGA “is reinstating its plenary role in the approval of new M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. programs” while “leav[ing] the discretion of oversight of established degree programs to their campus Graduate Councils or their desigenees” is consistent with SOR 105.2(a) and (b) and defines the exceptional nature of the Academic Senate authority for these degree programs only. Under normal circumstances, the academic oversight of these degree programs is delegated to the Faculty of the Schools wherein the programs are located, consistent again with the cited CCGA statement (“…CCGA concurs that ongoing oversight is best left to professional schools offering these five degree titles pursuant to Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b)…”).

2. Academic oversight of all other graduate and undergraduate degree programs and courses is governed through the Faculties, Divisions (Graduate and Undergraduate Councils) and Senate by means of the regular Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate as per SOR 105.2(a).

3. In circumstances where a School or academic unit operates degree programs included in both Legislative Rulings 6.11.E.1 and 2 above, M.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., Pharm.D., and J.D. degree programs will be governed pursuant to Legislative Ruling 6.11.E.1 and all other degree programs and courses of the School or academic unit will be governed pursuant to Legislative Ruling 6.11.E.2.

The complete request for the ruling from the Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.
Proposed Amendments to Bylaws and Regulations

The Committee is authorized “To prepare and report for action by the Representative Assembly such changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations as it may deem advisable.” (Davis Division Bylaw 71(B)(1)). The following changes were recommended during the academic year 2010-2011:

(1) Davis Division Bylaw 48: Committee on Planning and Budget. The amendment changes the title of one of the ex officio members of the Instructional Space Advisory Committee. The title of the ex officio member is changed from the Director of the Teaching Resources Center to the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on February 24, 2011.

(2) Davis Division Bylaws 80: Graduate Council. The amendment reduces the total number of members on the Graduate Council to 12 and the number of voting members to 11. This proposal is part of an ongoing effort by the Committee on Committees to reduce the size of standing committees where feasible. This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on February 24, 2011.

(3) Davis Division Bylaw 121: Undergraduate Council. The amendment changes the title of one of the ex officio members of the Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review. The title of the ex officio member is changed from the Director of the Teaching Resources Center to the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. This proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on February 24, 2011.

(4) Davis Division Regulation A540: Grades. The amendment clarifies policies governing the grade Incomplete, which were amended at the June 10, 2010 Representative Assembly meeting. The major change at that time was to place a three-year limit for completion on students who are not “in residence.” If the Incomplete is not made up during this period, it remains permanently on the student’s record unless the student re-takes the course. The revisions would make clear how the policy applies to students who have graduated and to students to have not graduated but have returned to residence after a period out of residence. The three-year limit is restricted by the revision to students who have not yet graduated. Students who have graduated are subject to a three-term limit as with the 2010 policy. The new language also restricts the three-year limit to students who have not returned to residency during the three-year period. For students who have returned to residence at any time during that period, the limit of three terms in residence applies, as with the 2010 policy. There is also a new reference to the definition of ‘residence’ that appears in Regulation C610. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on February 24, 2011.

(5) Davis Division Bylaw 71: Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction. The amendment expands the scope of the kind of changes which are considered “editorial,” allowing changes in name (e.g., of a campus program) or title (e.g., of a position in the administration). The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2011.
(6) **Davis Division Bylaw 80: Graduate Council.** The amendment changes a clause in Davis Division Bylaw 80(C), by specifying that the Graduate Council has the authority to approve or recommend to the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) the following kinds of changes in graduate programs: transfer, consolidation, disestablishment, and discontinuance. The clause is also re-worded to reflect better the current practices of the Graduate Council. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2011.

(7) **Davis Division Bylaw 99: Committee on Research.** The amendment changes the structure of the Committee on Research. In the past, the Committee consisted of two subcommittees: Research Policy and Faculty Grants. The primary duty of the Faculty Grants subcommittee has been to review research grant applications. The proposal consolidates the two subcommittees into a single, smaller, committee, a subcommittee of which would review grant applications. The subcommittee will consist of the voting Senate members of the parent committee. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2011, with the proviso that the number of committee members will not be reduced until September 1, 2012.

(8) **Davis Division Regulation 522: Baccalaureate Degree Requirement in General Education.** The amendment is the result of plans for the implementation of the General Education requirement in Fall 2011. It corrects an oversight in the formulation of the Regulation. Previously, the Regulation deemed that any student who completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) was exempt from all General Education requirements. The first revision exempts such students from all General Education requirements that can be met at the lower-division level. It also makes an exception to the prohibition of the use of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit towards satisfying the General Education requirements. Finally, it allows the Committee on Courses of Instruction to delegate to the deans of the colleges the authority to determine suitability for satisfaction of General Education requirements of courses which are not UC Davis courses. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2011.

(9) **Davis Division Regulation A540: Grades.** The amendment changes the policy on the repetition of courses by graduate students. Previously, a graduate student could repeat up to nine units of courses in which he or she had received a grade below B. The revision would allow the repetition of up to three courses. The proposal was adopted by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2011.

**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 in CERJ’s on-line Archive of Advice.*

(1) **Graduate Program Bylaws Approval.** An issue regarding voting margins required for the approval of new bylaws in a graduate program without any existing bylaws was referred by
the Graduate Council to CERJ. The complete Advice, dated October 13, 2010, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.

(2) ARE Graduate Program Bylaws. CERJ was asked by the Graduate Program in Agricultural and Resource Economics (ARE) about whether program Bylaw amendments can be voted upon electronically, given difficulty in producing a quorum at meetings of its faculty. The complete Advice, dated November 8, 2010, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.

(3) American History and Institutions Requirement. CERJ was asked by the Division whether the universitywide American History and Institutions requirement for undergraduates can be waived in specific cases. The complete formal Advice, dated February 1, 2011, including background and rationale, is appended to this report.

(4) Authority of Public Service Committee and University Extension Courses. CERJ was asked about the authority of the Public Service Committee in regard to approval of University Extension Courses. The complete Advice, dated November 22, 2010 is appended to this report.

(5) Membership on the Library Committee. CERJ was asked several questions by the Library Committee concerning its membership. The complete Advice, dated November 22, 2010 is appended to this report.

(6) CERJ Advice on Approval of Minor Programs. CERJ was asked by the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science for advice concerning procedures for the approval of new minor programs offered by undergraduate colleges. The complete Advice, dated November 24, 2010, is appended to this report.

(7) Davis Division Regulation A540 and Repetition of Courses. CERJ received a request for advice from the Council of Associate Deans regarding repetition of courses. The Council of Associate Deans is concerned that “current practice” allows the circumvention of Davis Division Regulation A540, with respect to the repetition of courses. The complete Advice, dated December 2, 2010, is appended to this report.

(8) Proposed Grade Change Committee Guidelines. CERJ was asked to review the proposed Grade Change Committee Guidelines and made some observations about the proposed changes. The complete Advice, dated December 3, 2010, is appended to this report.

(9) Intramural Letters in Personnel Actions. A department inquired about the use of letters for personnel actions from members of research units to which the subject of the actions belongs. The complete Advice, dated January 7, 2011, is appended to this report.

(10) CAPAC Appeal Process. CERJ was asked by the Division for advice concerning the appeal process for faculty to the Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC). The complete Advice, dated January 12, 2011, is appended to this report.
Subsequent to the issuance of the Advice, the Division, in collaboration with CERJ, formulated a flow-chart indicating the routing of appeals requests.

(11) **Voting Rights in Graduate Programs.** CERJ was asked by the Graduate Council whether non-members of the Academic Senate may have voting rights in graduate programs of which they are members. The complete Advice, dated January 28, 2011, is appended to this report.

(12) **Grade Changes after Graduation.** CERJ was asked by the Division for advice regarding whether a student’s grade could be changed after the student had graduated. The complete Advice, dated February 2, 2011, is appended to this report.

(13) **Voting Rights and Zero-Level Departmental Members.** CERJ offered formal advice on September 5, 2002, according to which zero-level appointments in departments have full universitywide Bylaw 55 voting rights. CERJ was asked for further advice by the Committee on Academic Personnel regarding voting rights and zero-level appointments. The complete Advice, dated March 7, 2011, is appended to this report.

(14) **UC Davis Extension Credit for Graduate Level Courses.** CERJ was asked by the Division for advice concerning how to record and manage UC Davis Extension course offerings for credit at the graduate level. The complete Advice, dated May 19, 2011, including answers to three questions, is appended to this report.

**Other Advice/Responses 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. Only selected matters are reported here._

**School of Medicine Bylaw Revisions.** The Chair of the Faculty of the School of Medicine submitted Bylaw changes for CERJ review.

**School of Veterinary Medicine Electronic Voting.** The Chair of the Faculty of the School of the School of Veterinary Medicine sent to CERJ for review proposed changes to the Bylaws that would allow electronic voting.

**Executive Council Voting Rights.** The Division queried CERJ regarding the rights of representatives to vote in the Executive Council.

**School of Education Bylaws.** The chair of Faculty of the School of Education asked CERJ for advice in revising its Bylaws.

**Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions (Downsizing).** CERJ was asked by the Division to respond to a request for consultation from the systemwide Academic Senate. The item was two resolutions: (1) A resolution from Academic Council, and (2) A resolution from UCLA addressing downsizing at UC.
Meetings of the Representative Assembly. The Division inquired of CERJ and the Divisional Parliamentarian concerning the possibility of reducing the number of meetings of the Representative Assembly and of converting it to a General Assembly.

Self-Supporting Part-Time Professional Degree Programs. CERJ received from the Division a request for comments on a proposed revision to the policy on self-supporting part-time graduate professional degree programs.

Committee on Planning and Budget Approval of TOE and POP Proposals. The Committee on Planning and Budget consulted CERJ on potential Target of Opportunity for Excellence (TOE) and Partner Opportunity Program (POP) appointments.

Suspension of Admissions to Majors. A major program inquired of the Divisional office concerning the effects of suspending the major for “new admits” of continuing students.

Sustainable Agriculture Major Proposal. CERJ reviewed for conformity with the Code of the Senate a request for a new major in Sustainable Agriculture.

Avian Science Major: Discontinuation Proposal. CERJ reviewed a proposal from the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences requesting that the major in Avian Sciences be discontinued.

UC Senate Membership Task Force Report. CERJ was asked by the Division to review a report by a universitywide task force concerning membership in the Academic Senate.

Executive Council Subcommittee on Student Petitions. The Divisional Chair held a meeting with the chairs of the Faculty Executive Committees, the chair of the Grade Change Committee, and the CERJ chair to discuss the operations of the Subcommittee on Student Petitions.

Committees on Academic Freedom and Privilege and Tenure. A case arose in which a Senate member informed the Divisional Office of an academic freedom complaint. The member was referred to the Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF). Subsequently, the member filed a grievance with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T). CAF wished to continue its investigation. The Divisional Office inquired as to whether the filing with P&T should require suspension of the CAF investigation.

Departmental Organization. A member of a department queried CERJ about procedures for setting up departmental committees.

Student Petition to the Academic Senate. The Division asked CERJ for guidance in the handling of a student petition.

General Education Catalog Galley. CERJ was asked by the Division to review the first incorporation of the description of the new General Education requirement (GE3) into the General Catalog.
Graduate Studies Reorganization. CERJ was asked by the Division to review a proposal for splitting Graduate Studies into an academic and an administrative unit.

School of Veterinary Medicine Semester Conversion. The Division requested CERJ advice concerning the conversion to semesters of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine program in the School of Veterinary Medicine.

Provisions for Undergraduate Majors. An inquiry was received from a faculty member concerning the administration of a major program whose budget allocation was ended.

Polling System. CERJ was asked by the Division to comment on a conceptual proposal to develop in the School of Law an in-house Web-based polling system which could be extended to provide services such as secure voting and RSVP to the general campus.

Divisional Representatives to the Assembly. CERJ was asked by the Division to review the call for nominations for the 2011-2013 Divisional representatives to the universitywide Assembly. The call was made and the election was held under CERJ supervision.

School of Veterinary Medicine Admissions Requirement. The Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine requested advice as to whether students may be admitted to the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) program without a Bachelor's degree. CERJ advised that the question should be addressed at the universitywide level.

Departmental Representatives to the Representative Assembly. CERJ reviewed and approved the Divisional office's call for the election of departmental and constituent group representatives to the RA. The call was made and the election was held under CERJ supervision.

General Education Implementation Guidelines. The Divisional office requested that CERJ review a proposed set of guidelines for implementation of the new General Education (GE3) requirements. CERJ was asked to assure that the guidelines comply with the GE3 Regulations.

Information Technology Consolidation. CERJ was asked by the Division to review a response to a "white paper" proposing consolidation of a number of information technology systems on the campus.

UC Draft Privacy Policy. CERJ was asked by the Division to comment on a universitywide draft policy requiring knowledge and consent of individuals in certain situations or activities in which their privacy might be compromised.

Nominations for Committee on Committees. CERJ reviewed and approved a draft of the annual call for nominations to the Committee on Committees. The call was made and the election was held under CERJ supervision.

Consultation with Department in Chair Appointment. A department asked CERJ to examine the Academic Personnel Manual (APM), Section 245, to determine whether the requirement
for department consultation by the dean in the appointment of department chair should be revised.

Delegation of Committee Responsibilities. The Division requested that CERJ consider some mechanism for oversight of committees’ delegations of their authority to administrative units.

“Catalog Rights.” CERJ investigated the practice of allowing students to choose which year’s General Catalog governs their General Education requirements.

**Pending Matters for 2011-2012**

(1) **School of Education Bylaw Amendments.** The Faculty of the School of Education asked CERJ for advice in revising its Bylaws. The revised Bylaws have been sent to CERJ for review. The revised Bylaws will be reviewed by CERJ in Fall 2011 to ensure conformity with the Code of the Senate. The revised School of Education Bylaws will be included as an informational item on the Fall 2011 Representative Assembly agenda.

(2) **School of Veterinary Medicine Bylaw Amendments.** The School of Veterinary Medicine Faculty asked CERJ for advice in revising its Bylaws. The revised Bylaws have been sent to CERJ for review. The revised Bylaws will be reviewed by CERJ in Fall 2011 to ensure conformity with the Code of the Senate. The revised School of Veterinary Medicine Bylaws will be included as an informational item on the Fall 2011 Representative Assembly agenda.

(3) **Graduate School of Management Bylaw Amendments.** The Graduate School of Management Faculty asked CERJ for advice in revising its Bylaws. The revised Bylaws have been sent to CERJ for review. The revised Bylaws will be reviewed by CERJ in Fall 2011 to ensure conformity with the Code of the Senate. The revised Graduate School of Management Bylaws will be included as an informational item on the Fall 2011 Representative Assembly agenda.

(4) **Review of College and School Bylaws.** The Division has requested that CERJ provide advice on how to handle in a systematic way conformity of Bylaws and Regulations of Schools and Colleges to the Code of the Senate.

(5) **Delegation of Committee Responsibilities.** The Division requested that CERJ consider the establishment of some form of oversight of committees’ delegations of their authority to administrative units. The issue that gave rise to the request was the authority of college deans to waive the universitywide Senior Residence Requirement (ASR 630). Some preliminary work on this issue has been done by CERJ and the Divisional Chair.

(6) **Academic Senate Regulation 538(H).** The Division has requested that CERJ provide advice on revising Senate Regulation 538(H), which relates to faculty responsibilities for providing accommodations to students with disabilities.
(7) Student Evaluation of Teaching. In response to the report of the Special Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching, the Division has requested that CERJ consider development of a Regulation governing student evaluation of teaching.

(8) Faculty Voting Rights. CERJ will propose an amendment to Davis Division Bylaw 135 in 2011-2012 concerning voting rights by non-members of the Senate in the Faculties of the colleges and schools. The amendment has already been endorsed by the Executive Council.

(9) Certificates and Credential Programs. A question was raised in connection with the work of the Task Force on Self-Supporting Degree Programs about whether Graduate Council has authority over programs of study leading to a credential. CERJ will investigate and may propose an appropriate Bylaw amendment in 2011-2012.

(10) P&T Hearings Chair Recusal. The Division has requested advice from CERJ regarding recusal of the P&T Hearings Chair. A case has been referred to the P&T Hearings Subcommittee and the Chair has informed the Executive Director that he was involved in the case as a Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Adviser and will recuse himself from the case. The question is whether COC has the authority to appoint an interim Chair for the P&T Hearings Subcommittee.

(11) Davis Division Regulation 523: General Education. The Division has requested advice from CERJ regarding interpretation of Davis Division Regulation 523, concerning assignment of undergraduate courses to a Topical Breadth area. CERJ will review the issue and propose an appropriate Regulation amendment in 2011-2012 if necessary.

Respectfully Submitted,

G.J. Mattey, Chair
James Fadel
Mark Grismer
Kimberly Pulliam, Analyst
"In the event that an existing graduate program does not have approved bylaws, should the approval of the new bylaws be via a simple [majority] or 2/3 vote?"

CERJ advises that the program may report to the Graduate Council that the proposed Bylaws are approved if a simple majority votes in favor of the new Bylaws. Specific information about the number of votes for and against should be reported both on the overall Bylaws package and on any components of the Bylaws on which a vote is taken. After the votes are reported, it would be up to the Graduate Council to determine whether the level of support is sufficient for Council approval of the Bylaws.

CERJ also advises that the Graduate Council amend its Bylaws guidelines to specify the voting margin needed for approval of new Bylaws and possibly for approval for Bylaws changes. It might well wish to do so before receiving proposed Bylaws from the program in question.

Rationale:

Academic Senate Bylaw 310(A)(1) states: "Subject to such provisions as appear elsewhere in these Bylaws, each Division shall have authority to organize, to select its own officers and committees, and to adopt for the conduct of its business rules and regulations not inconsistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate." CERJ finds nothing in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate that requires a 2/3 majority for the initial approval of Bylaws. It is in fact standard practice for Bylaws changes to require a 2/3 vote, and there is an expectation on the part of the Graduate Council that changes to program Bylaws will require a 2/3 vote (as is seen from suggested language in its Bylaws template documents, described below). But expectations do not have the force of requirements.

Since the proposed Bylaws are new, there are no program Bylaw provisions regarding voting on their establishment. The only restrictions on voting on Bylaws, besides consistency with the Code of the Senate, would have to be established by the Graduate Council, which, in its capacity as an agency of the Davis Division, has mandated that graduate programs institute Bylaws, subject to Graduate Council approval.

It appears that there is there is only one voting rule that would apply to the initial submission of Bylaws to the Graduate Council. CERJ has reviewed the documents "Bylaws Guidelines for Graduate Groups and Departmentally-based Graduate Programs," "Bylaws Template for Graduate Groups," "Bylaws Template for Departmentally Based Graduate Programs," and "UC Davis Graduate Council Procedures for Establishing a New Graduate Degree Program" and knows of no further relevant documents.

In "Bylaws Guidelines," there is a description of a "cover memo" which should include "The date and manner in which the program approved the proposed bylaws changes, (e.g., in a program meeting or by an e-mail ballot), including the vote." Nothing is stated about the nature of the vote. Later on in that document, a minimum voting requirement is stated.
"The Graduate Council has defined a minimum quorum (see page 9). It specifies that all issues that require a vote must be:
-- voted on by 50+% of the eligible members--
-- passage requires a 50+% supporting vote of the members voting.
The program may set more stringent quorum requirements, if it wishes."

This language suggests that there is no 2/3 vote restriction placed by the Graduate Council with respect to voting on Bylaws. The apparent lack of a 2/3 vote restriction is reinforced by the fact that the only restriction placed on Bylaws amendments on the template for departmentally based programs is:

Amendments to these Bylaws may be made in accordance with program’s quorum policy.

(Although the template just cited concerns departmentally based programs and not graduate groups, it is cited only as a general indicator of Graduate Council policy.)
The Graduate Council would have to approve the voting policies of a graduate program and could require a 2/3 vote for changes to them, but this does not cover the case of the initiation of the Bylaws.

As far as expectations are concerned, the template for Bylaws for graduate groups gives the following "example" in the case of amendments to the Bylaws.

Amendments to the By-Laws shall be circulated to the membership by mail or e-mail and at least two-thirds of those votes, assuming a quorum as defined above, received within 10 working days of distribution shall be required for an amendment to pass.

A similar example is given for the template for departmentally based graduate programs.
However, an example does not constitute a requirement. Further, the "Bylaws Guidelines" state that: "If specific wording is required, it is noted under the appropriate article." There is no notation that specific wording requiring a 2/3 majority is required for Bylaws changes.

In summary, absent a specific Graduate Council requirement that a 2/3 majority is needed to approve (or amend) program Bylaws, the only condition for approval of new Bylaws is that 50% of the members of the program vote and 50+% of the members voting approve.
CERJ has been asked by the Chair of the Graduate Program in Agricultural and Resource Economics (ARE) about voting procedures within the program. Specifically, the question was whether program Bylaw amendments can be voted upon electronically, given difficulty in producing a quorum at meetings of its faculty. A related issue that was referred to CERJ was whether a 2/3 vote is needed to amend the program Bylaws.

The Graduate Council has adopted a policy whereby every graduate program in the Division must adopt a set of Bylaws, and those Bylaws must be approved by the Council. According to the document “Bylaws Guidelines for Graduate Groups and Departmentally-Based Graduate Programs,” October 8, 2005, “All graduate programs must have approved bylaws. Graduate programs may not operate under bylaws that have not been reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council.”

Authority for this requirement derives from two sections of Davis Division Bylaw 80. DDB 80(B) lists among the duties of the Graduate Council with respect to the Davis campus: “4. To regulate the conduct of graduate work of the Division with a view to the promotion of research and learning,” and 8. “To coordinate the procedures of the various departments and schools on the campus insofar as they relate to the conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor's degree.”

The Bylaws of the ARE graduate program have never been approved by the Graduate Council. Thus, according to Graduate Council policy, they may not operate under the existing Bylaws.

CERJ advises that the faculty making up the ARE graduate program submit Bylaws for approval by the Graduate Council as soon as possible. Included in the Bylaws should be provisions for electronic ballot (if desired) as well as procedures for amending the Bylaws. (Provisions for voting procedures are in fact required in all program Bylaws by the Graduate Council.)

Since it is not operating under approved Bylaws, and the unapproved Bylaws do not contain provisions regarding voting procedures, some other procedure will have to be employed in order to obtain approval for the Bylaws to be sent to the Graduate Council for approval. CERJ advises that the Graduate Council be consulted for guidance on this matter. As other graduate programs were required to develop Bylaws a few years ago, presumably the ARE program should follow the same procedures as they have followed in submitting Bylaws for approval.
The Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction has been asked by the Division whether the universitywide American History and Institutions requirement for undergraduates can be waived in specific cases.

Advice

CERJ advises that the Executive Council may recommend to the President for graduation a student who has not completed the American History and Institutions requirement. Such a recommendation requires approval from the Faculty of the school or college of the student’s major. Procedures for approval by a Faculty should be based on the Bylaws of that Faculty.

Rationale

The American History and Institutions requirement is stated in universitywide Regulation 638:

A knowledge of American history and of the principles of American institutions under the federal and state constitutions is required of all candidates for the degree of A.B., B.Arch., and B.S. This requirement may be met by passing an examination or examinations under the direction of the appropriate committee, or by passing any course or courses of instruction that may be accepted as satisfactory by that committee. The papers submitted in the examination shall be rated “passed” or “not passed.”

The policy of the Davis Division has been that students may satisfy this requirement in a number of ways, a list of which is published in the General Catalog. There is at present no designated “appropriate committee” to administer an examination which would allow the requirement to be met.

The recommendation for graduation of a student who has not satisfied the American History and Institutions requirement would be under suspension of Senate Regulations. Since the Regulation applies only to undergraduate students, DDB 73(C)(6) requires that a recommendation by the Executive Council requires the approval by the “appropriate faculty.” It seems clear that the appropriate faculty would be a faculty in a college or school in which the student is majoring.

Davis Division Bylaw 73(C)(6) states one of the charges of the Executive Council of the Division as follows:

To act on behalf of the Davis Division in recommending to the President of the University candidates for degrees and honors in a school, college or graduate division subject to the jurisdiction of the Davis Division. At its discretion, the Executive Council may recommend candidates under suspension of Divisional and Senate Regulations, provided that each such petition submitted by a candidate has been approved by the appropriate faculty or the Graduate Council. Such petitions may include those for the awarding of posthumous degrees. The committee, after forwarding its recommendations to the President, shall maintain in the Academic Senate Office a record of its actions, including separate lists of the names of candidates recommended under suspension of the Regulations.
CERJ advises that the Public Service Committee is not charged by the Code of the Senate with approving University Extension courses for credit. If the members of the Committee believe that they are so charged, as indicated in Chair Samaniego's letter, they are mistaken.

For the record, systemwide Regulation 792(A) states: "All lower division, "100" series upper division, and "200" series graduate courses bearing the prefixes "X," "XB," "XD," "XL," "XR," "XSB," "XSF," etc. [see SR 790] shall be approved by the Dean of University Extension (or the Dean's authorized representative) and the department concerned, and then submitted for approval to the Committee on Courses of Instruction (or other committee having jurisdiction over the corresponding regular courses) in the Division of the Academic Senate on the campus where the courses received departmental approval. Complete approval must be received before any public announcement of such courses is made."

Thus, COCI is charged with approving Extension courses. It is implied in Chair Samaniego's letter to CERJ that this authority has been delegated to the Public Service Committee. If this is the case, such delegation is not proper. COCI is the committee having jurisdiction over corresponding regular courses in the Davis Division, so that DDR 792(A) applies to it, and there is no provision in the Davis Division Bylaws for delegation of COCI's authority.

The role the Public Service Committee has in the approval process UNEX courses is to advise the Dean of UNEX regarding criteria for approval of UNEX courses (DDB 88(B)(5)(a)) and "To review new offerings and the approval process for courses carrying University Extension credit" (DDB 88(B)(3)).

Chair Samaniego's letter states that "members understand review of Extension course proposals does not include suggested revisions to improve quality." CERJ advises that the review process must allow for the suggestion of revisions to improve quality; otherwise the review process is pointless or "merely cosmetic," as described in Chair Samaniego's letter. It is implicit in the notion of a review process that comments on the outcome of the review are to be received by the agency for whom the review is done (in this case, that agency should be COCI). If the review process does not allow for suggestions for revisions, the process must be changed.

Finally, if the Public Service Committee wishes to be excluded from the review process altogether, or if COCI wishes to exclude it, the relevant committee should propose a Bylaws amendment. CERJ would be happy to assist with the execution of such a proposal.
CERJ Advice on Membership on the Library Committee
November 22, 2010

This is in response to several questions concerning membership on the Library Committee.

First, a point of clarification. In DDB 83, the chairs of college library committees are not listed as ex-officio (only the University Librarian is). All regular members of a committee are entitled to vote. So, the chair of a college library committee is eligible to vote. In fact, even ex-officio Senate members of committees have voting privileges except where noted in the Bylaws (i.e., administrators). Formal advice provided by CERJ on this matter can be found here:


Responsibility for determining whether an individual is a non-appointed committee member, as would be the chair of a college library committee, falls to the Committee on Committees, under DDB 40(B):

"The Committee on Committees shall ascertain who are the members ex officio of standing committees and who are the members and chairpersons of standing committees not subject to appointment by the Committee on Committees and shall report these names to the Representative Assembly" (emphasis added).

Therefore, if there is some question about the status of a college library committee chair, the question should be referred to the Committee on Committees.
CERJ has been asked by the Chair of the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science for advice concerning procedures for the approval of new minor programs offered by undergraduate colleges. The following advice should be taken to apply not only to the colleges, but also to any professional school which offers a minor. Any mention of colleges should be taken to apply to professional schools.

CERJ advises that any new minor program on the Davis campus must be approved by the Undergraduate Council of the Davis Division. Therefore, final approval may not be given by the Faculty of the college proposing to offer the minor.

This advice is based on Davis Division Bylaw 121(B)(2), which states as one of the duties of the Undergraduate Council: “Consistent with the rights of the Faculties under the Standing Orders of the Regents (105.2.b), to approve or decline to approve the establishment and discontinuation of undergraduate programs.” Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b) confers the following right on the Faculties: “No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned.” So, the Undergraduate Council is to approve or disapprove the establishment of undergraduate programs only after formal consideration by the Faculty of the college proposing it.

It is the view of CERJ that the phrase “undergraduate program” includes minor programs as well as major programs. There is no qualification in DDB 121(B)(2) which restricts approval authority to major programs.

It is true that it has been standard practice for colleges to approve new minors without Divisional approval. On the other hand, at least one college, the College of Engineering, has been submitting its proposals for new minors to the Undergraduate Council.

The primary argument against Divisional approval authority is based on a reading of Policy and Procedures Manual 200-25. This document describes the steps needed to establish “academic degree programs,” which are defined as sequences of courses leading to a degree. But minors do not in fact lead to degrees, and so PPM 200-25 apparently does not apply to the approval of new minors.

CERJ agrees that PPM 200-25 does not contain a basis for any claim of authority by the Division. However, it finds that there is a basis for a claim of Divisional authority in DDB 121(B)(2).

A further argument is that a college-based approval process seems consistent with the principles of faculty governance and responsibility for the curriculum, since it the approving body is the college Executive Committee. CERJ grants that approval by the college Faculty is consistent with the principles of faculty governance and responsibility for the curriculum. Indeed, as noted above, SOR 105.2(b) requires that the faculty of the college be formally consulted. However, this right does not vest the sole power of approval at the college level. Moreover, the Davis Division, as well as a college Faculty, is a governing body of the faculty and is also responsible for the curriculum.

If the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science wishes to retain its traditional autonomy in the approval of new minor programs, CERJ suggests the the Faculty bring to the Representative Assembly a Bylaws amendment adding the word ‘major’ before ‘programs’ in DDB 121(B)(2).

If the Davis Division ultimately retains the authority CERJ opines that it has, it should seek to amend PPM 200-25 appropriately, so that it explicitly states that its procedures apply to minor programs.
CERJ Advice on Davis Division Regulation A540 and Repetition of Courses  
December 2, 2010

The Council of Associated Deans is concerned that "current practice" allows the circumvention of Davis Division Regulation 540, with respect to the repetition of courses. They are quite right that the three current practices they mention, repetition of a course with a grade of C- or better, lack of permission from the Dean to repeat a course a second time, and enrollment even when permission has been denied by the Dean, do not conform to DDR 540. The Council suggests re-wording of the relevant section of DDR 540 to exclude these cases explicitly.

CERJ believes that no amendment to DDR 540 is necessary, as the language is clear and unambiguous. What needs to change is "current practice." It seems that this practice is based on programming considerations in the SISWeb system used for registration. The Council suggests, along with its proposed amendments, a series of changes to the system which would prevent the circumvention of DDR 540.

CERJ endorses the proposal to re-program SISWeb and urges that the Division press the Office of the Registrar to make these changes as soon as is practicable. It is unacceptable for the Division's Regulations to be flouted for any reason.
CERJ Advice on the Proposed Grade Change Committee Guidelines
December 3, 2010

CERJ has some observations about the proposed changes to the Grade Change Committee Guidelines.

1. p. 3. A new category "Financial Need" has been added to the list of justifications for retroactive drops and withdrawals that might be given by petitioners. "Financial Need" is not defined, and it seems indistinguishable from the category "Financial Hardship" listed as item 1. The problem is that in some cases petitions based on Financial Hardship" will be approved, but in no case is a petition based on "Financial Need" to be approved. (Reference to financial need is also made in item 11.)

2. p. 3. "NS" is a notation, rather than a grade. The list of grades is given in DDR A540(A).

3. p. 1. This refers to existing language, 4) Clerical or Procedural Errors. "The Grade Change Deputy may approve all petitions that involve clerical and procedural errors. The word 'all' might best be replaced by 'any.'

4. pp. 1, 4. Again referring to existing language. "Clerical or Procedural Error' is generally interpreted by the Committee to mean an error made by someone other than the student (e.g. instructor or staff adviser)" (p. 1). "The Committee, like the instructor, has no authority to reassess or re-evaluate student work; only if it can be documented that a clerical or procedural error was made will the Committee have authority to alter the grade" (p. 4). The use of the word 'mean' on p. 1 seems to imply that any error made by someone other than the student is a clerical or procedural error, but the statement on p. 4 states that some such errors are not grounds for grade change. CERJ suggests that the language of p. 1 be amended, perhaps as follows: "Clerical or Procedural Error' is generally interpreted by the Committee to imply that an error has been made by someone other than the student."

5. CERJ believes that the charge of the Grade Change Committee is broad enough that it has the power to add the requirements in proposed clause 15) #2. for petitions based on discrimination or arbitrary treatment.
Grade Change Committee Guidelines

http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/GCC/

PREAMBLE: The Grade Change Committee (hereafter, “the Committee”), reviews all retroactive and grade change requests not unambiguously justified by the Regulations of the Academic Senate and of the Davis Division; the Committee is governed by Davis Division Bylaw 79. The Committee is dedicated to the academic standards, educational mission, and Principles of Community of UC Davis (http://principles.ucdavis.edu), and will review all petitions on a case-by-case basis to determine appropriate action. Petitioners to the Committee should understand that even in cases when the Committee may be sympathetic, the Committee is still required to abide by their own published Guidelines (below) and the Regulations of the Academic Senate. Approval authority to make certain determinations on the behalf of the Committee is delegated to the Deputy to the Committee in the Office of the University Registrar (hereafter, “Grade Change Deputy”), as noted below. The Committee reserves the right to determine when a petition warrants an exception to the below Guidelines.

Questions regarding the Committee or the Retroactive/Grade Change process should be directed to the Grade Change Deputy in the Office of the University Registrar, who may be contacted at GradeChanges@ucdavis.edu.

1) Any retroactive petition must be submitted within 3 academic quarters in residence. Petitions submitted after this time period must explain and document why the retroactive action being sought was delayed.

2) If a petition is denied by the Committee, a student may appeal one time, within one academic quarter of residence, with substantial and new information. A second appeal will ordinarily not be considered by the Committee.

   1. Bona fide appeals of final decisions made by the Committee may be referred to the Student Petitions Subcommittee of the Executive Council of the Academic Senate. However, appeals are limited to confirming that the Committee did not act in an arbitrary or capricious manner in making its determination and that the final decision was based on substantial evidence. The Student Petitions Subcommittee will not substitute its judgment on the substantive merits of the case for the judgment of the Committee.

3) After a degree has been awarded to a student, his or her record is closed. The Committee will consider requests only when they concern clerical or procedural error. The Committee will not consider retroactive drops or withdrawals after a degree has been awarded. Petitions made outside of the timeline specified in paragraph 1 will not be considered.

4) Clerical or Procedural Errors. The Grade Change Deputy may approve all petitions that involve clerical or procedural errors. Such petitions must meet all other standards set forth by the Committee and the Academic Senate.

   1. “Clerical or Procedural Error” is generally interpreted by the Committee to mean an error made by someone other than the student (e.g. instructor or staff adviser).
5) Petitions to change grade modes retroactively (i.e., to or from P/NP or S/U grading) will not be approved by the Committee except in cases of clerical or procedural error, even if based on academic need.

6) All grades except Incomplete or In Progress are final when filed by the instructor in the end-of-term course report (see DD Regulation A540E, http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/cerj/manual/dd_regs.htm#A540). The Committee, like the instructor, has no authority to reassess or re-evaluate student work; only if it can be documented that a clerical or procedural error was made will the Committee have authority to alter the grade.

1. All requests for a change of grade involving Incomplete must be accompanied by a copy of the Incomplete form filed with the original grade report, or documentation that the Incomplete grade agreement was made during the term. An instructor may not assign an Incomplete grade after a grade has been submitted, except in cases in which the Incomplete grade was not assigned due to clerical or procedural error.

7) If a student petitions to drop or withdraw retroactively because of a disability, the Committee will consider the disability aspect of the petition only if the student has first contacted the Student Disability Center (“SDC,” http://sdc.ucdavis.edu) and the SDC has determined that the student has a qualifying disability and is eligible to receive reasonable accommodations. The Committee will consider only the time period (generally, no more than one quarter) before the SDC disability determination. Once SDC has determined that a student is eligible to receive reasonable accommodation, the Committee assumes that such accommodations have been sought by the student and provided through SDC. **Retroactive action requested by the student of the Committee is not considered reasonable accommodation.** However, the Committee will work with SDC and a student to implement any reasonable accommodations that are necessary to allow the student equitable opportunity to participate in the petition process.

8) The Grade Change Deputy may approve the following petitions to add courses retroactively, without referring the petition to the Committee:

1. If the student was on the waitlist for the course and this can be documented; if the student was issued a Permission-to-Add (“PTA”) number for the course; if it can be reasonably verified that the student intended to add the course to his or her schedule during the quarter. Such petitions must meet all other standards set forth by the Committee and the Academic Senate.

2. For the following courses, even if the conditions above are not met: PE Activity courses (PHE 1 and 6); music rehearsal courses; internship units; and research units. Such petitions must meet all other standards set forth by the Committee and the Academic Senate.

9) Petitions to drop or withdraw retroactively are the most difficult cases for the Committee to evaluate. In general, the Committee will be very reluctant to grant any retroactive action for more than one quarter. All petitions to drop or withdraw retroactively must show evidence that a hardship occurred at a crucial time in the academic calendar (e.g., the week of final examinations), extended over a significant period, or offer sufficient justification as to why action was not taken to drop petitioned course during the quarter.
The majority of requests for retroactive drops and withdrawals will offer as justification one of the following reasons:

1. **Financial Hardship.** Ordinarily the Committee will grant such a petition only if there has been a sudden change in the student’s financial situation during the quarter. The student must provide documentation of the financial hardship, and/or documentation that his or her employer **required** an increase in work hours.

2. **Health problems,** including mental illness. These must be well documented. If a student believes that he or she may have a disability and is need of auxiliary aids or services in order to have an equal opportunity to participate in the Committee’s petition process, the student must contact the Student Disability Center in order to determine eligibility for reasonable accommodation. See paragraph 7, above.

3. **Family Hardship.** The death or severe illness of an immediate family member may be considered grounds for retroactive drop or withdrawal.

4. **Problems with drugs, alcohol, or violent behavior.** Generally, these are not considered sufficient justification for a retroactive drop or withdrawal.

5. **Sexual Trauma.** Events such as rape or abortion may justify a retroactive drop or withdrawal.

6. **Personal Problems.** Breaking up with a romantic partner will not generally be considered sufficient justification for a retroactive drop or withdrawal. Difficulties with landlords or roommates will not generally be considered sufficient justification for a retroactive drop or withdrawal. The Committee will consider legal entanglements or other time consuming procedures that may arise from such problems, but these must be well documented.

| 7. **Academic Need.** Retroactive drops or withdrawals for reasons of academic need will not be approved. |
| 8. **Financial Need.** Retroactive drops or withdrawals for reasons of financial need will not be approved. |

10) Requests to retroactively drop one or two courses, but not the entire quarter, will ordinarily be regarded as “selective” and will not be granted. The Committee will consider the possibility that one particular course was adversely affected more than other courses by situations as described in paragraph 9, but the Committee will require strong evidence.

| 1. **Incomplete Grades.** A course in which a student has received an Incomplete grade notation will not normally be dropped, except in situations outlined in paragraph 9. In accepting the Incomplete grade, the student obligates herself or himself to complete the work. |
| 2. **NS grades.** The Enrolled – No Work Submitted (“NS”) grade cannot be dropped unless a documented clerical or procedural error has occurred. The NS grade will not be dropped for the reason of refunding a student’s fees for a past term. |

11) Retroactive action will not be taken by the Committee for reasons of academic or financial need. The Committee will not make decisions relating to fee refunds, admission, readmission, or dismissal/reinstatement; statements regarding these matters should not be made in petitions to the Committee.
12) If a petition to add a course retroactively is approved by the Committee for a course in the regular quarter or during summer session, the student will be required to pay all necessary fees.

13) For retroactive petitions that concern the Education Abroad Program (EAP), a recommendation from the Committee on International Studies and Exchanges may be sought. In most situations the Grade Change Committee will support those recommendations. Because of the time involved for routing EAP petitions, said petitions are first on the agenda.

14) The Committee will review all retroactive petitions, also including grade changes for UC Davis Extension students enrolled in UC Davis classes. The UC Davis Extension student should provide a copy of her or his Extension transcript along with the petition.

15) Grade Disputes, Discrimination, and Arbitrary Treatment:

   1. **Challenging an instructor’s grade.** If the Committee finds that a clerical or procedural error has resulted in a student receiving an incorrect grade, it may authorize a change even if the faculty member who awarded the grade is opposed, if an appropriate grade can be determined. Generally, the Committee will require the student to have discussed the matter with the faculty member and the department chairperson. The Committee, like the instructor, has no authority to reassess or re-evaluate student work; only if it can be documented that a clerical or procedural error was made will the Committee have authority to alter the grade. The student will be expected to bear the burden of proving that a clerical or procedural error occurred and caused the incorrect grade to be assigned.

   2. **Discrimination or Arbitrary Treatment.** If a student petitions for a retroactive change due to alleged discrimination or arbitrary treatment (as defined by Policy and Procedural Manual chapter 280, section 5 http://manuals.ucdavis.edu/ppm/280/280-05.htm), the Committee will consider this aspect of the petition only after the student has first contacted the Office of Student Judicial Affairs (“SJA,” http://sja.ucdavis.edu) and a finding has been made by SJA. If the Committee determines that discrimination or arbitrary treatment was the cause of or motivation behind the assignment of an incorrect grade, it may authorize a change if an appropriate grade can be determined. The Committee may also determine if discrimination or arbitrary treatment rises to the level of a retroactive drop of the affected course. If in reviewing a petition the Committee determines that discrimination or arbitrary treatment may have occurred, the Committee will refer said petition to SJA for review.

16) If a student cites an advising error by a university staff or faculty adviser in his or her petition to the Committee, the student should provide documentation of the advising error with the petition. The Committee cannot make a determination regarding advising errors without appropriate documentation. Even in cases of documented advising errors, the Committee may deem it more appropriate that an exception be made by the adviser than for retroactive action to be taken by the Committee.

17) The Committee reserves the right to deny a petition, even if good cause for granting such a petition exists, if it determines that the petition represents a likely abuse of the
retroactive petition process or attempt to circumvent other university rules and procedures.
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A department inquired about the use of letters for personnel actions from members of research units to which the subject of the actions belongs. Three questions were asked, and they will be addressed separately.

Question 1. Are such supplementary letters appropriate for inclusion in the merit or promotion files?

The letters in question are classified as intramural letters, whose role is described in APM UCD-220(IV)(F)(3) (f):

f. Intramural letters
The only intramural letters accepted are those solicited by the department chair for providing:
1) Peer evaluation of teaching performance.
2) Evaluation of clinical activities, if applicable.
3) Input on the specific role of the candidate in collaborative research.
4) Evaluation of graduate group chair service.
5) Evaluation of Academic Senate committee service, if requested by candidate.

Letters from departmental colleagues or from colleagues in other departments on campus (other than those above) should not be included in the candidate's file.

Clause 3) is the key clause. It allows the letters to be included if solicited by the department chair.

Question 2. Does the department Chair have the right to decide whether or not to include such letters in the file if they are received?

APM UCD-220(IV)(F)(3)(c) applies to extramural letters:

1) All solicited letters must be included in the file.

Since there is no corresponding clause in (3)(f) regarding intramural letters, there is no requirement that all solicited letters must be included.

Question 3. Sometimes, the director's letter will include a vote of the faculty within the faculty member's residence unit. Is it appropriate for such non-departmental votes on the merit or promotion action to be included in the merit file?

Because there is no reference in UCD-220 to votes other than departmental votes, and only mention of the solicitation of letters, reporting such votes might be inappropriate. On the other hand, if such a vote is part of the content of a solicited letter, then removing reference to it would amount to censorship. Of course, the department chair's solicitation of the letter might state that a vote should not be reported or that it should be reported.
CERJ has been asked by the Chair of the Davis Division for advice concerning the appeal process for faculty to the Committee on Academic Personnel, Appellate Subcommittee (CAPAC).

The appeals function of CAPAC is specified in Davis Division Bylaw 42(C)(1): “To provide advice independent of the Oversight Subcommittee to the Chief Campus Officer on any review of a personnel action beyond the original review conducted by the Oversight Subcommittee or the Faculty Personnel Committee [CAPOC] subject to the requirements of Davis Division Bylaw 45.” This advice offers an interpretation of Bylaw 45.

A fundamental distinction is made in Bylaw 45 between two kinds of review by Senate personnel committees: reconsideration and appeal.

The necessary condition for reconsideration is that “a Senate member wishes to supply additional substantial or contextual information relevant to a personnel action.” That is, the only way that reconsideration may take place appropriately is when new information would be supplied. Reconsideration is done by the committee that made the original evaluation. While DDB 45(A) only makes the submission of additional information a necessary condition for reconsideration, it was clearly the intent of the authors of the legislation that it be a sufficient condition as well. The following quotation is from the Final Report of the Academic Senate Committee on Procedures for Appealing Recommendation of CAP (PARC), which accompanied the legislation establishing CAPAC. “This [appeals] procedure would not apply to ‘reconsiderations’ based on new information, which would continue to be considered by CAPOC or a faculty personnel committee.” Thus, reconsideration is appropriate if and only if new information would be submitted to the appropriate committee.

The necessary condition for the appropriateness of an appeal is “when a Senate member believes that a personnel committee has failed to apply established standards of merit or has failed to follow established procedures.” A member of the Division who so believes is to consult with an Academic Personnel Adviser, who “shall review the relevant information in light of the established standards and procedures and consult with the Senate member.” DDB 45(D) states that “the recommendations of committees duly constituted to consider appeals are the definitive advice of the Senate to the Chief Campus Officer on personnel actions, except in those cases in which the Committee on Privilege and Tenure makes a recommendation on particular matters within the scope of its authority.”

CERJ advises that CAPAC should only receive cases which are based on a perceived failure to apply established standards of merit or to follow established procedures. All other cases should either be referred to the relevant committee if reconsideration is appropriate or not heard. It should be the prerogative of CAPAC to determine whether the case is in fact of this kind.

If a case is accepted by CAPAC, new information may become relevant if it is determined that it was excluded from the case due to a failure to apply established standards of merit or to follow established procedures. Most likely, the reason for introducing new information would be that it had been excluded from the record due to a failure to follow established procedures. Any other information would be the basis for reconsideration, and reconsideration should take place before the appeal proceeds. The appeals process is clearly intended to exist as a means to correct procedural errors and not as means for re-evaluation except insofar as it is determined that established standards of merit were not correctly applied. The PARC report makes this clear: “The proposed procedure and By-law 45, permits a candidate to appeal on the basis of failure to follow ‘established’ standards of merit or defects in procedure. This practice is desirable because CAP (through CAPAC) should have an opportunity to remedy defects in its own recommendations, if the administration desires to seek the advice of the Senate concerning the appeal.” Clearly the “defects” cited here concern standards and procedure.

The advice given by CAPAC should be of one of two kinds. Either it finds that there has been no defect in the
evaluation of the case by the relevant committee, or it finds defects. If no defects are found, the advice of the relevant committee should be sustained by CAPAC. If defects are found, then the case should be re-evaluated on the basis of the standards or procedures that CAPAC deems to be correct. CAPAC should be sensitive to the evaluations made by the relevant committee which are correctly based and should reverse the recommendations of the committee only if those parts of the record on which the appeal is based, when weighed against those that have been handled correctly, are compelling enough to override the latter.
The Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction has been asked by the Graduate Council of the Division whether non-members of the Academic Senate may have voting rights in graduate programs of which they are members.

Advice

CERJ advises that nothing in the Code of the Senate prohibits non-members of the Senate having voting rights, though any such rights must be granted through explicit provisions of the Bylaws of the graduate program. Approval of graduate program Bylaws is the prerogative of the Graduate Council, which may at its discretion approve or deny proposed program Bylaws provisions which restrict the voting rights of non-members of the Senate.

Rationale

Davis Division Bylaw 80(B) gives broad powers to the Graduate Council of the Division. In particular, it has the power to “regulate the conduct of graduate work of the Division” and to “coordinate the procedures of the various departments and schools on the campus insofar as they relate to the conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor's degree.” Implicit in these powers is the right to establish graduate programs and to approve or disapprove the Bylaws of such programs.

In addition to the two powers just mentioned, the Graduate Council has the authority to “determine for the Division and to make recommendations to the statewide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs concerning the qualifications of departments and graduate groups for initiating new programs and for making changes in established programs leading to existing graduate degrees.” The Graduate Council, then, has the power to make final decisions on graduate matters on behalf of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Graduate programs, which are themselves established by the Graduate Council, do not have final say in administering their programs, but only make recommendations to the Graduate Council. In a number of situations, the Graduate Council itself only makes recommendations, such as to the Committee on Courses of Instruction (for course approval) or the Executive Council (for recommendations for graduation) and does not take final action.

Academic Senate Bylaw 35(C)(2) states that “Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies and their committees when those agencies or committees are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate.” Since graduate program committees are not taking final action for the Academic Senate, the prohibition against voting by non-members of the Senate does not apply in the case of votes taken within the program.

However, ASB 35(C)(2) requires that if non-members of the Senate are to have the right to vote, then they must be granted that right by explicit Bylaws provisions. The Bylaws of a graduate program are appropriate for granting the right to vote to non-Senate members.

Given the authority of the Graduate Council over Bylaws, any proposal Bylaws from a graduate program either granting or restricting the right to vote of non-members of the Senate is subject to Graduate Council approval.
Relevant Portions of the Code of the Senate

**Academic Senate Bylaw 35(C)(2).** Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies and their committees when those agencies or committees are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions.

**UCR&J Legislative Ruling 12.75.** Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies when those agencies are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions.

**Davis Division Bylaw 80(B).** It shall be the duty of the Graduate Council with respect to the Davis campus:

4. To regulate the conduct of graduate work of the Division with a view to the promotion of research and learning.

8. To coordinate the procedures of the various departments and schools on the campus insofar as they relate to the conferring of degrees higher than the Bachelor's degree.

10. To determine for the Division and to make recommendations to the statewide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs concerning the qualifications of departments and graduate groups for initiating new programs and for making changes in established programs leading to existing graduate degrees.
CERJ Advice on Grade Changes After Graduation
February 2, 2011

Advice

CERJ advises that under the Guidelines of the Grade Change Committee (GCC) published in the Spring Quarter, 2011 Class Schedule and Registration Guide, page 139, no student’s grade may be changed after the student has graduated. This advice applies to any student who has graduated since 2002 and any student who graduates in the future when the language of the current Guidelines, “once a student has graduated, the individual record is closed and no changes can be made to the record,” remains in place.

Rationale

The advice is based on the binding Legislative Ruling 7.07, which states:

The Grade Change Committee (GCC) has exclusive jurisdiction over all grade change requests. In exercising this authority it is fully bound by the Guidelines which it is required to issue on behalf of the Division. And it has no authority to change a grade on the basis of a reassessment of the quality of a student’s work, even with the concurrence of the student and the faculty member involved.

As noted in the Ruling, GCC “is fully bound by the Guidelines which it is required to issue on behalf of the Division.” (These Guidelines do not require approval by the Representative Assembly.) One of these published Guidelines states that “once a student has graduated, the individual record is closed and no changes can be made to the record.” CERJ has determined that the current Guidelines are consistent with the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate and the Standing Orders of the Regents. (While it is true that grades of “I” and “Y” may be changed after graduation, these changes are not made by action of GCC and are therefore not subject to this rule.)

The language precluding changes after a student’s graduation has appeared in the Class Schedule and Registration Guide’s section on Grade Change Guidelines since at least 2002. It also appears in the Faculty Guide. (Both documents are posted on the Registrar’s web site at registrar.ucdavis.edu.) There are many practical and equitable principles which provide a rational basis for this published rule, and students have a right to rely upon it.

These Grade Change Guidelines are not to be confused with the “guidelines” which previously appeared in the Senate manual and which were converted into Regulations by action of the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2004. They are also not to be confused with a committee’s informal “ground rules” from which the committee could choose to deviate, or standard procedural rules which may be suspended under the provisions of Robert’s Rules of Order.

Instead, Davis Division Regulation 549(D) specifies that GCC decisions “shall be governed” by those Guidelines, and the Legislative Ruling therefore concludes that the Guidelines are fully binding on GCC itself and may not be waived on a case-by-case basis.

As a result—even if grade changes were made in violation of Senate legislation at that time—the student’s grade cannot at this point be changed.
The Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction offered formal advice on September 5, 2002, according to which zero-level appointments in departments have full systemwide Bylaw 55 voting rights. Reciprocally, CERJ concludes presently that all eligible members of a department must be considered to have full Bylaw 55 voting rights with respect to any member with a zero-level appointment.

Academic Senate Bylaw 55(A) states: “No department shall be organized in a way that would deny to any of its non-emeritae/i faculty who are voting members of the Academic Senate, as specified in Standing Order 105.1(a), the right to vote on substantial departmental questions, excepting only certain personnel actions as detailed in Article B of this Bylaw.”

It follows from ASB 55(A) that no agreement may be made that may remove the right of a zero-level member of a department from voting on personnel actions specified in ASB 55(B) or that may remove the right of department members eligible by ASB 55(B) to vote on the zero-level faculty member. In general no faculty member may lose voting rights by agreement.

The zero-level faculty member (or candidate for zero-level appointment) may certainly make an explicit agreement not to exercise his or her Bylaw 55 right to vote. However, such an agreement does not abrogate that member’s fundamental right to vote, and the agreement may be rescinded if the member were to choose to exercise that right.

The other eligible department members may also make explicit agreements not to exercise their right to vote on the zero-level member. Again, such an agreement does not abrogate that member’s fundamental right to vote, and the agreement may be rescinded if the member were to choose to exercise that right.

Any agreement not to vote must be made by each individual separately. There can be no “departmental” agreement not to vote, even if the members of the department unanimously desire at any point in time not to vote. Such an agreement would constitute the department’s being organized in such a way as to deny an eligible member the right to vote, which would violate ASB 55(A).

It should be added that any agreement not to vote should be made completely voluntarily, without any pressure applied by any party. The rights granted by ASB 55 are fundamental to Senate membership.
CERJ was asked by the Division for advice concerning how to record and manage UC Davis Extension course offerings for credit at the graduate level.

Is it appropriate to apply regulation language governing undergraduate education to graduate education?

CERJ advises that it is not appropriate to apply Regulation language governing undergraduate education to graduate education. In many cases, there are separate rules for undergraduates and graduates, which indicates to CERJ that each is governed by its own set of rules.

Is there a limit to the number of credits a student may earn via UC Davis Extension coursework toward a graduate degree?

CERJ advises that there is no statutory limit on the number of units a student may earn Via UC Davis Extension coursework toward a graduate degree. However, we note that ASR 810(B) states: "Credit for University of California Extension courses including concurrent courses toward a higher degree is subject to the approval and regulations of the campus Graduate Council concerned." Thus Graduate Council is empowered to enact restrictions on the number of Extension units may be counted toward graduate degrees.

Is the XDC category valid given the designation is not listed in Senate Regulation 810?

CERJ finds no reason that the category should not be valid, despite the fact that it is not listed in ASR 810. Courses beginning with "XD" are permitted, and we regard the "C" index to be merely a convenient way to indicate concurrent courses. We note that in many cases one or more suffixes are used for various purposes, such as to designate new courses with the same number (N), courses abroad (S), etc. CoCI has the power to approve these Extension courses by ASR 800(C)(1), and there is no explicit prohibition against the numbering scheme they use. Perhaps an alphabetic suffix or even a new number would be more appropriate, but we believe that this is for CoCI to decide.
January 4, 2011

I am writing on behalf of the Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ), requesting a Legislative Ruling from UCR&J concerning Senate authority over professional schools. We request the answers to the following questions. The questions concern Standing Order of the Regents 105.2, which reads in part:

105.2(a) “The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, shall determine the conditions for admission, for certificates, and for degrees other than honorary degrees.”

105.2(b) “The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula offered under the sole or joint jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, except that the Senate shall have no authority over courses in the Hastings College of the Law, San Francisco Art Institute, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only.”

**Question 1.** What criteria determine whether a professional school offers work at the graduate level only? The answer to this question should make clear whether a professional school offering an undergraduate major or minor falls under the category of offering work at the graduate level only.

**Question 2.** If a professional school meets the criteria for offering work at the graduate level only, does it have sole jurisdiction, without Senate approval beyond that of the faculty of the professional school, over its courses, grading policies, and/or degree programs?

**Question 3.** If a professional school does not meet the criteria for offering work at the graduate level only, how does this fact affect the sole jurisdiction that it has? Does only the portion of the curriculum involving non-graduate level work fall under broad Senate authority, or does such authority extend to all matters, so that the exception in SOR 105.2(b) does not apply to it at all?

**Background**

The broad question of Senate authority over professional schools has been a subject of contention between the Davis Division and the professional schools at UC Davis for at least 33 years. At present, there are important jurisdictional issues pending between the Division and two of the professional schools. To end the on-going dispute over jurisdiction, the Davis Division believes that a Ruling is necessary because it has the force of legislation.
UCR&J has issued advice on the matter on at least two occasions, but this advice has not been codified as a Legislative Ruling. UCR&J has opined on the two occasions that authority over grading and courses rests with the professional schools, while authority over curriculum rests with the Senate. The most recent advice of which we are aware is the following: “In general, UCR&J has taken the position that the graduate professional schools retain their own authority over course-approvals and grading policies, but are otherwise subject to the same Senate oversight as any other graduate program” (Letter from Alden Mosshammer, Chair of UCR&J to David Bogy, Chair of CCGA, January 5, 1995, cited by CCGA).

If this is indeed the position of UCR&J, the Davis Division believes it should be codified in precise language. Most importantly, it should be made clear whether this ruling applies to all graduate professional schools or only to some. Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b) makes reference to professional schools offering instruction at the graduate level only. UCR&J has in the past advised that professional schools offering only a few undergraduate courses should be construed as offering instruction at the graduate level only.

SOR 105.2(b) was interpreted loosely by UCR&J in a 1977 letter from UCR&J Chair Robert S. Gerstein to the Davis Division. Schools that only occasionally offer undergraduate work were not taken to lose their exemptions thereby. Before that, General Counsel Reidhaar, on whose opinion UCR&J’s was based stated, “The intent of the Standing Order provision is to preserve the traditional autonomy of the faculty of those schools, such as law and medicine, which are limited to graduate professional training” He further notes that there might be “examples of confusion as to whether particular schools offer work limited to graduate instruction” and offers to consider such cases in themselves. That offer was never taken up by the Davis Division, but the Division now seeks a clear line of demarcation.

Of special importance to the Division is the fact that one professional school (the School of Veterinary Medicine on the Davis campus) offers an undergraduate degree (Bachelor of Science). Another (the School of Education) offers an undergraduate minor, and it is possible that other professional schools will wish to offer undergraduate majors or minors. The fundamental question regarding these programs is whether this significant engagement in undergraduate education should exclude their autonomy respect to course-approvals and grading policies in general, or perhaps at least with respect to its undergraduate courses.

Another issue has come up in the discussions over the year. Academic Senate Regulation 740(2) states that, “Graduate courses must be approved by the Graduate Council concerned and, if appropriate, by the Divisional Committee on Courses of Instruction.” There is no mention of any exception for courses offered by professional schools. If the exemption applies to graduate courses, then this should be made clear in the Regulations.

Supporting Arguments

The following arguments have been compiled from the various documents that have circulated over the years.

Arguments for Autonomy

Arguments for Autonomy of Professional Schools in General
Argument 1. Traditional Autonomy. Reidhaar to UCR&J: “The intent of the Standing Order Provision is to preserve the traditional autonomy of those schools, such as law and medicine, which are limited to graduate professional training.” UCR&J letter to CERJ dated May 19, 1977. “[G]eneral practice . . . has been to accord professional schools autonomy over grading in one form or another.” Professional schools have in fact had control over courses, grading, and degree requirements for a long enough period of time that such autonomy has become well-established. (Cited by CERJ in a letter of February 18, 1994 to the Chair of the Davis Division as the basis of “opinions issues by the University Rules and Jurisdiction Committee chaired by Alden Mosshammer at U.C.S.D.”) Reidhaar to UCLA reiterated this view in 1980. “The Regents did not intend to create a situation where a professional school would lose its independence over its own courses merely by reason of its faculty cooperating in courses for undergraduate students. . . . Based upon the foregoing, it is my view that the words ‘professional schools offering work at the graduate level only’ in Standing Order 105.2(b) are not intended to be read literally to deprive a professional school of authority over its courses simply because its faculty might occasionally teach undergraduates but are intended to describe a certain type of professional school, such as law or medicine.”

Argument 2. Accreditation of Graduates. From the May 19, 1977 letter from UCR&J to CERJ. “The exception surely rests on a desire to allow professional schools to function effectively as accrediting agencies for their respective professions. This policy is best served if control over grades as well as courses is given over to the professional schools.”

Argument 3. Accreditation of Professional Schools. Professional schools require autonomy over their courses in order to accommodate the requirements of accrediting agencies. This was cited by Smith in his 1994 letter to Hedrick as a reason for the original amendments to SOR 105.2(b), “to ensure that the accreditation of the then newly established UCLA Law School by the American Bar Association (which, for accreditation, requires an unspecified degree of autonomy) and to ensure that the accreditation of Berkeley’s Law School (granted without the autonomy from the Senate that was being sought for the UCLA law school) would not be jeopardized.”

Arguments for Authority over Grading

SOR 150.2(b) does not mention grading policies. UCR&J has taken the position that the exception applies to grading policies as well.

Arguments 1, 2, and 3 above may be applied to grading as well as course approval.

Argument 4. Derived Authority. From the first opinion of Reidhaar. “It is my opinion that the authority of the Academic Senate over grading derived from this authority over courses as well as from the traditional authority and unique competence of individual faculty members to judge academic performance. Since the Standing Order specifically deprives the Academic Senate of authority over courses in professional schools offering work only at the graduate level, it is my opinion that authority over grading rests with the faculty of such school.”

Argument for Exceptions to “Only”

Argument 5. The reason for the existence of the professional schools is to provide professional training. For this they require autonomy and in fact have traditionally had autonomy. This reason is not dispelled by the offering of some undergraduate courses, as these are insignificant in relation to the schools’ essential mission.
From UCR&J 1977. “The language is to be taken literally in that it exempts graduate level professional schools from jurisdiction. It is not to be taken so literally, however, as to mean that a medical or law school which occasionally opens courses to undergraduates loses the exemption.”

Arguments for Autonomy over Degree Programs

Arguments 1, 2 and 3 above apply to degree programs. Whatever the language of SOR 105.2(a), professional schools have long had control over their graduate programs and degree requirements.

Arguments for Senate Control

Arguments for Control over Courses

Argument A. Literal Reading. Although some professional schools offer work at the graduate level only, many do not. Because the wording of SOR 105.2(b) is explicit and should be taken literally, those schools that offer work not at the graduate level are subject to Senate control. It should be noted that General Counsel Reidhaar in his first memo opined that “As far as I know, the words ‘offering work at the graduate level only’ mean what they say.” It was UCR&J that introduced a spurious category of being “taken literally” but “not so literally” (are there degrees of literalness?). And even if UCR&J’s vague language is accepted, there is no well-defined criterion for what constitutes and “occasional” offering of undergraduate work. Counsel Reidhaar in fact recognized that there may be cases of confusion and offered to examine any such cases, an offer which unfortunately was not taken up.

Argument B. Original Intention. The original intention of amending SOR 105.2(b) to exclude professional schools was to preserve the autonomy of law schools. “Its purpose was to ensure accreditation of the then newly established UCLA Law School by the American Bar Association (which, for accreditation, requires an unspecified measure of autonomy) and to ensure that the accreditation of Berkeley’s Law School (granted without the autonomy from the Senate that was being sought for the UCLA Law School) would not be jeopardized” (Smith to Hedrick, 1994). The original wording proposed for amendment of SOR 105.2(b) exempted by name “the Schools of Law at Berkeley and Los Angeles.” The wording was then changed to exempt professional schools that offer courses at the graduate level only. This avoided singling out the two schools, but it achieved the result of excluding only them because they were the only schools that did offer courses at the graduate level only. The wording was changed to “offer work at the graduate level only,” which masked the intention to exclude only the law schools. “Our own reading of the transcripts of the Regents meetings in 1952 at which these issues were discussed convinces us that this system-wide ruling [by UCR&J] is not consistent with the original intent of S.O.R. 105.2(b) which was then regarded not to cover medical schools specifically because they did teach one or a few 100-level courses” (Smith to Hedrick, 1994).

Argument C. ASR 740(2). Since the Regulations of the Senate give authority over approval of graduate courses, without exception, to the Graduate Councils. Given that the Senate has this authority, it applies a fortiori to undergraduate courses.

Argument for Control over Degree Programs

Argument D. Literal Reading. Unlike the case with SOR 105.2(b) here is no ambiguity whatsoever in SOR 105.2(a).
Argument E. Curricula. SOR 105.2(b) asserts Senate control over all “courses and curricula” with the exception of “courses” offered by professional schools offering work at the graduate level only. The exemption does not apply to curricula.

Argument F. Original Intention. The intention of the exception in SOR 105.2(b) was to protect the schools of law from accreditation problems they might have if they lacked autonomy over their courses. No such potential problem exists as far as degree requirements are concerned.

Argument G. Limited Autonomy. Even if the professional schools were to have autonomy over its graduate degrees, this authority should not apply to a Bachelor’s degree offered by the school or even a minor that the school offers. None of the alleged original intention to treat professional schools differently because the offer “professional training” or act “as accrediting agencies for their respective professions” applies to undergraduate programs.

Sincerely,

G. J. Mattey, Chair
Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
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MOU: Davis Division of the Academic Senate and Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine  
August 3, 2010  
Amended January 20, 2011

Background

During the 2009-2010 academic year, the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM) adopted a change to its Regulations, specifically by adding Regulation 80, “Student Performance Standards for the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine.” Regulation 80 allows for the Faculty to establish and amend its own performance standards for the DVM. A set of performance standards was adopted in conjunction with Regulation 80.

The performance standards include instructions on grading, and a D grade is not given as an option for instructors. This grading policy conflicts with the grading policies of the Davis Division. More broadly, Regulation 80 itself allows the adoption of other standards which might conflict with grading policies specified in Davis Division Regulation A540. The revised Regulations were presented at the June, 2010 Representative Assembly meeting, but the RA voted to defer consideration of them.

To resolve these actual and potential conflicts, DDR A540 could be amended to provide an exemption, as is currently provided for Regulation 70 of the Faculty of the School of Medicine. Such an amendment cannot, however, be adopted before the Fall 2010 Representative Assembly meeting, which would preclude the application of the performance standards to the 2010-2011 entering class.

It has been a long-standing belief on the part of the Faculty of SVM that its Regulations are not subject to the authority of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. There is support for this position in advice provided by in 1977 and again in 1995 by the universitywide Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J). This advice was disputed in 1994 by the Davis Division Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction (CERJ), but no action was taken at that time.

At issue is the interpretation of Standing Order of the Regents 105.2(b), which states that “the Senate shall have no authority over courses in... professional schools offering work at the graduate level only.” Although UCR&J has issued advice concerning this interpretation, it has not issued a Legislative Ruling, which by ASB 206(A) has “the status of Senate legislation.” Concerning the status of advice, Legislative Ruling 12-93B states, in part, “Unless issued as a Legislative Ruling and in accordance with the appropriate procedures, such advice or finding does not have the status of legislation and is therefore not formally binding on the Senate officers and agencies to whom rendered. The advice, opinions, and findings of UCRJ and its counterpart agencies within the Divisions should nevertheless be considered authoritative in the sense in which that term is defined in Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary—‘entitled to obedience, credit or acceptance.’ They represent the considered judgment of a committee charged with preserving the integrity of the Code of the Academic Senate. In addition, they suggest the likely outcome should an action taken contrary to this advice be challenged before the Divisional Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction or before UCR&J, or should a Legislative Ruling be requested on the issues involved.”

It is the position of the Davis Division that because the SVM offers a Bachelor of Science degree, the Senate has authority over its courses. The Division intends to ask UCR&J for a Legislative Ruling on the matter. In the interim, the Division shall consider as “authoritative” the advice given by UCR&J.

It is the position of the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine that the Division does not have authority over its grading policies because of its status as a professional school.

Agreement

The Davis Division of the Academic Senate and the Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine hereby agree to allow the implementation of Regulation 80, as revised (described above), consistent with the following terms.
This agreement shall remain in effect until (1) the authority of the Faculty of SVM to implement Regulation 80 has been confirmed by a Legislative Ruling from UCR&J concerning Regents’ Standing Order 105.2(b), or an amendment to DDR A540, or (2) conclusion of the 2011-12 academic year, whichever occurs first. This time period is provided to permit appropriate consideration of this matter by the Academic Senate and so as not to unduly disrupt the administration of the DVM academic performance standards. Should both parties agree that an extension is desired or necessary, an addendum to this agreement must be created.

Robert Powell, Chair
Davis Division Academic Senate

Peter Pascoe
2011.03.04
09:19:09 -08'00'

Peter Pascoe, Chair
School of Veterinary Medicine Faculty Executive Committee
Committee’s narrative:

The Emeriti Committee had three meetings in 2010-2011 with the following members: John Reitan (chair), Karen Bales, JoAnn Cannon, Joel Dobris, John Fetzer, Charley Hess, J. Paul Leigh and Helen Henry.

The first meeting was to discuss the “rights and privileges” for the new Blue Book that was being rewritten. Charley Hess was the main participant and our thoughts were transmitted to the full UCDEA. This meeting was in early November 2010.

The second meeting was called because of a strange arrangement with the accelerated retirement of 20 UCDMC persons. They had seen a switch in authority over their additional retirement funds from the insurance company who set up the policy to the University which was ultimately responsible for paying out the monies. I spent considerable time discussing the system the University used with Mr. O’Neill at UCOP and Mr. Peklar at UCD Human Resources. The only misfortune the recipients ran into was having to pay for Medicare twice over. I talked to Dr. Larkin, the spokesman for the group, about my findings and I believe they were going to pursue rectification of this oversight on their own.

This meeting was discussed on Jan. 31, 2011.

The last meeting was held in late May 2011 and concerned the proposal by Extend Health to take over management of retirees’ health care from University Human Resources. We voted unanimously to deny the proposal as presented. Our feelings were sent to Dwaine Duckett at UC Human Resources and Mr. Peklar at UCD Human Resources.

Overall, the committee was certainly not stressed even though we lost our analyst this year because of budget cuts. Nonetheless, I feel this committee is important and shall continue to do important work.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Reitan (chair), Karen Bales (member), JoAnn Cannon (member), Joel Dobris (member), John Fetzer (member), Charles Hess (member), J. Paul Leigh (member), Helen Henry (Academic Federation Representative)
Committee on Faculty Research Lecture Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 1</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: Typically one or two meetings a year.</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: Approximately 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of nomination packets reviewed: Confidential.</td>
<td>No nominations were deferred from the previous year.</td>
<td>No nominations were carried forward to the coming academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: None.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: None.

Issues considered by the committee: The criteria to be used when reviewing nominations for the Faculty Research Lecture Award and the questions to be kept in mind when selecting the 2011 recipient of the award.

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

Committee’s narrative:

The charge of this Committee is to nominate for election by the Representative Assembly a member of the faculty or staff at UC Davis who has established a distinguished record in research, for the purpose of delivering a lecture on a topic of their choice. Over the course of the 2010-11 academic year, this charge was fulfilled. The Call for Nominations was updated, and the Call was distributed electronically on October 13, 2010.

Nomination packets were received and reviewed by the committee. The criteria used during the consideration of the nominations, the relative and relevant merits of each nomination and the questions to be kept in mind during deliberations were captured in the minutes of the committee’s January 13, 2011, meeting.

Distinguished Professor Margaret Ferguson, of the English Department, was selected and recommended as the 2011 Faculty Research Lecture Award recipient. On February 24, 2011, the Representative Assembly approved the committee’s selection and recommendation by unanimous vote. Distinguished Professor Ferguson was honored on May 11, 2011, at a combined Academic Senate and Academic Federation awards event. On May 27, 2011, she delivered a lecture entitled “Missing the Maidenhead: Cultural Debates About the Hymen.”
At the combined awards event, Distinguished Professor Ferguson was presented with an honorarium, a certificate mounted in a plaque and a medallion. The English Department hosted the lecture and a reception that followed the lecture.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy A. Dahlgren, Chair
Bruce C. Gates
Qizhi Gong
Kathryn S. Olmsted
Gerhard Richter
Bryan Rodman, Analyst, Academic Senate Office
### Faculty Welfare Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 9</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: 3 / Qtr and Always as needed</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total items reviewed: 19 (Items are listed in Appendix A)</td>
<td>Total number of items carried over from the previous year: 0 However, topics were revisited.</td>
<td>Total items carried over to the coming academic year: 0 However, discussion of issues that remain unresolved will continue to be discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** None.

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

**Issues considered by the committee:**
- Davis salary scale (revisited)
- Salary reductions and pay cuts to faculty and staff (revisited)
- Status of the University of California Retirement System (revisited)
- Status of the University of California Retirement Plan (revisited)
- Budget cuts (revisited)
- Retention and recruitment of faculty (revisited)
- Performance bonuses to administrative executives (revisited)
- Post-Employment Benefits (revisited)
- Recommendations of UC President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits
- Downsizing Resolutions of the Academic Senate and UCLA
- How best to inform faculty, and a greater number of faculty, on issues and matters of concern
- Shared Governance
- Transportation and Parking responsibilities

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:** None.
Committee’s narrative:

The committee met nine times during the 2010-11 academic year. Most committee meetings were scheduled the Monday following the most recent University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting. Committee Chair Saul Schaefer and Committee Member Lisa Tell shared the responsibility of representing the committee at the systemwide UCFW meetings. All of the 2010-11 UCFW monthly meetings were attended by Lisa Tell or Saul Schaefer. Committee procedures and practices were established at the beginning of the year and maintained throughout the year. The procedures and practices focused on the confidentiality protocols to be observed regarding the business of the committee and the UCFW, communication protocols, the scheduling and noticing of committee meetings, the management and processing of Requests for Consultation, and the recording of meeting minutes.

Throughout the year, efforts were made to streamline the management of the business before the committee. Electronic communications were the principal means by which streamlining was achieved. Email and the committee’s home page in the Academic Senate Information System (ASIS) were the tools used. Email was used to notify, distribute and communicate information of a non-confidential nature. ASIS was used to post committee business documents and elicit comments from the committee membership. Internet searches and web site information were computer projected during committee meetings. And electronic links to information were provided instead of typed synopses.

Summaries of the non-confidential matters discussed at UCFW meetings were presented at FWC meetings.

Although there were no items of unfinished committee business that carried over from 2009-10, the faculty welfare issues that were revisited during 2010-11 are marked as such in the “Issues considered” table above.

The committee began the year discussing the current status of the UC’s Post-Employment Benefits and reviewing the associated issues, and their significance. The primary focus of the discussion was the actuarial liability of retiree benefits and the modifications to the pension plan required to meet this liability. Variations of retirement benefits, lump sum cash-outs, the continuance of current plan benefits for those in the current plan, the new tier benefits available to new hires, early retirements, UC contributions and employee contributions as percentages of payroll, the ongoing negotiations between President Yudof, UCOP and the Academic Senate, Defined Contribution Plans (DCP’s), open enrollment into health benefit plans and the issues involved, and the impending changes to HealthNet participation were discussed. The potential consequences and ramifications of a medical care provider opting out of a HealthNet package were discussed with particularity.

The status and updates on the efforts of the Task Force on Investment and Retirement and the UCFW Health Care Task Force were topics of discussion throughout the academic year.

Other topics discussed were the San Francisco Chronicle article on 34 UC executives’ argument for pay raises, a Mortgage Origination Program foreclosure, compliance
issues, HRB administration costs due to staff shortages, the subsidized home/hotel care program service which operates to help people manage an emergency, student enrollment numbers, classroom space availability, the faculty/student ratio, the public’s perception that the faculty’s teaching load is considered a part-time job, the current practice and impetus to hire more non-senate faculty because of budget concerns, the HealthNet notification letter regarding loss of client data, the potential of reduced benefits for those working 50-75% time, Medicare coverage, benefits coverage during retirement and the changing qualifier, the reduction of health care credit, the reduction of health care benefits and the lowering of health care costs.

Post-Employment Benefits

In September, 2010, the recommendations of the UC President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits, a dissenting statement from the faculty and staff members of the PEB Task Force work groups, which proposed a third option C to options A and B of the President’s Task Force, and a letter from the Chair of the Academic Council, which provided informational links and requested divisional comments, were summarized and discussed. In October, the committee discussed the town hall meeting that occurred earlier in the month—at which PEB options A, B and C were presented, compared and discussed by means of a question and answer period.

In March, 2011, a note from Health Care Task Force Chair Robert May asking for help in gathering faculty perspectives on priorities for new health and welfare benefit designs was shared with the committee membership. The note included an HCTF questionnaire for feedback from campus FWC’s regarding higher health care costs and decreased health care benefits or both.

The Budget Crisis

The budget crisis and furloughs, which were impending issues in 2008-09, were revisited in terms of the actual equitability, scheduling and duration of salary cuts and variances in salary scales that were being administered. Moving beyond the general discussion of the status of the University of California Retirement System and the University of California Retirement Plan, the 2009-10 committee discussed the UCRS and UCRP in terms of their administration, paid benefits, preservation of medical benefits, solvency and means by which they were to be kept solvent.

During 2010-11, the committee reviewed the development of the budget crisis and salary cuts and focused on the short term and long term effects that each was going to have on the UC, the short term and long term funding plans of the UCD campus, Post-Employment benefits and the re-institution of employee contributions.

In December, 2010, the availability of funds to augment UC salaries and how to apportion these funds, was brought to the attention of the committee. The position of the UCFW was explained via an enclosed letter from the Chair of the UCFW.

In January, 2011, the committee was briefed by Academic Senate, Divisional Chair Robert Powell on Chancellor Katehi and Provost Hexter’s Campus Budget Update letter to the campus, dated Jan. 21, 2011. The brief touched upon the estimated impact on the campus of the State budget funding cut and ways to lessen the impact of the State and Campus cuts, besides the issues of keeping faculty, teaching assistant, staff support
and the June State tax initiative. UC Davis revenue sources and uses, structural change, balancing the budget, and a transparent approach to dealing with the budget were discussed.

In March, 2011, the committee considered the results of a survey of the membership of the Academic Senate at UC Irvine. The survey sought insight into the collective opinion of the faculty on some key issues related to the current budget reductions.

Matters about which the Committee had Questions:

The UCOP budget cut strategies to minimize cuts passed down to the campuses. The short sales and foreclosure(s) of the Mortgage Origination Program. The Task Force on Investment and Retirement investigation into why the disability benefit was cut from the new tier of benefits when it was compared with the old UCRP benefits. The formalization of the UCRS Advisory Board and seats designated for Academic Senate positions. The continuing conversations with the governor that focused on pension reform and some sort of spending cap and a potential trailer bill that would dictate how funds would be used by UC. The SMG banding project. Health Sciences Compensation Task Force data gathering. The UC Provost’s administrative task force regarding faculty salaries. Part-time faculty work groups. The existence of different relationships on the different UC campuses and different position titles. The classifying/regrouping of faculty on the standardization of systemwide position descriptions and criteria. UC President Mark Yudof’s five year plan. ExtendHealth’s ability to deliver on its claim to be capable of providing at substantially lower costs the same health care services and quality level that are and have been in place. The changes in health care that would be caused by President Obama’s Health Care Plan.

Committee on Transportation and Parking - Duties and Responsibilities

At the beginning of the 2010-11 academic year, Clifford Contreras, Director of TAPS, was informed that the previous Spring (2010) disestablishment of the Committee on Transportation and Parking resulted in the transfer of some of the committee’s duties and responsibilities to the Committee on Faculty Welfare. Director Contreras replied that, beginning in January 2011, meeting minutes of the Transportation and Parking Administrative Advisory Committee and the Campus Committee on Bicycle Programs would be electronically forwarded to FWC Chair Saul Schaefer, after they were approved at each committee’s next scheduled meeting. Director Contreras indicated is his reply that faculty representation existed on both of the committees, and he welcomed the Committee on Faculty Welfare to participate in future discussions. In addition to each committee’s minutes, the agendas for each committee’s meetings would be forwarded in advance of their respective meetings to provide Chair Schaefer the opportunity to attend or send a member(s) of the Committee on Faculty Welfare.

Wanda Brown, Assistant Manager, UC Davis Health System, Parking and Transportation Services, was also informed of the disestablishment of the Committee on Transportation and Parking and the transfer of some of the committee’s duties and responsibilities to the Committee on Faculty Welfare. Throughout 2010-11, Wanda kept the Committee on Faculty Welfare apprised of Parking and Transportation Services meetings and minutes.
Items Reviewed and Responded To

During the course of the 2010-11 academic year, the committee responded to the following matters of concern that were directed to its attention via Requests for Consultation distributed and posted by means of ASIS. In each case, the purview of the committee, as defined by its charge, was the criteria used for responding via the ASIS RFC functionality. The RFC’s included: Post-Employment Benefits options, the Academic Senate and UCLA resolutions regarding downsizing, Information Technology’s Shared Service Center concept, the UC Senate Membership Task Force Report, a Graduate School proposal, an HR and Finance Case Management Shared Service Center concept, a UC Draft Privacy Policy, a 2011-12 budget planning memo, a note from Health Care Task Force Chair Robert May.

Items Not Responded To

Although some membership comments were provided via the ASIS whiteboard “Comments” functionality and the topics were discussed during a committee meeting, the committee did not provide a formal response to the UCD APM Streamlining Initial Section Review or the Information Technology Excellence Committee Report Review.

Additional Items Presented to the Committee for Their Information and Consideration

The 2009-10 committee annual report. Draft revisions of APM 670 (HSCP). Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries response to Executive Vice President and Provost Lawrence Pitts on his first charge to the task force. Professors Dahl and Forbes of UCSD proposed statistical evaluation of the impact on employee behavior due to the roll out of the HealthNet Blue and Gold insurance plan option and their health welfare data request. “Gap” insurance coverage to provide short-term supplemental health insurance coverage for short trips. UCFW request of Dwaine Duckett, Vice President – Human Resources, for data regarding the impact of proposed changes in health benefits, especially regarding part-time employees.

Dean Emeritus Hess summarized a draft directive regarding the rights and privileges of emeriti/ae faculty. His summary included highlights and an administrative history of the draft directive.

Committee Resolutions

Three resolutions were passed out of committee. One was in response to the Post-Employment Benefits options A and B that the UC President’s Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits put forward, and the option C that was put forward in a dissenting statement from the faculty and staff members of the PEB Task Force work groups. A second resolution was in response to recommendations delineated in the Report of the Task Force on Senate Membership. The third resolution was in response to the Planning Principles for UC Davis as outlined by Chancellor Katehi and Provost Hexter.
Other Topics Discussed by the Committee.

New York Times article on faculty salaries. A statement issued by President Yudof and UC Regents’ Chair Gould concerning the retirement compensation letter signed by 36 UC community members. The rights and privileges of emeriti/ae faculty and professors or UC Davis. UC Davis as the only UC campus with an Academic Federation. The suitability of the Academic Federation to people because of what they want to accomplish professionally. The distinctions between health sciences faculty and non-health sciences faculty. Travel insurance: registration and reporting. UC’s need to create an overarching privacy and information security policy framework that appropriately balances University values of individual privacy and academic freedom with other institutional obligations, including data protection. Faculty unawareness of the benefit of travel insurance for anyone (and their co-travelers) who registers their business trip with UC (even if they haven't gone through CONNEXUS). Sabbatical overseas policies. UC online education. Differential fees concerning royalties and consulting fees. Recruitment of faculty from other campuses. Endowments. Tuition remission regarding fee waiver for children of UC employees. The ExtendHealth program. Grant funding mechanisms. The outsourcing of the regulation of parking on the main campus and the medical center and or the consolidation of the separate parking services organizations.

Committee Actions

The committee disseminated to the members of the Academic Senate and the members of the Academic Federation via their respective Academic Senate Office list serve information regarding the benefit of travel insurance for anyone (and their co-travelers) who registers their business trip with UC (even if they haven't gone through CONNEXUS).

Committee member Alan Jackman agreed to represent the committee as a member of a joint working group created by Academic Senate Chair Robert Powell and UC Davis Vice Chancellor John Meyer to discuss implementation of the UCOP policy governing purchase and use of controlled substances in research. The policy was to address the special requirements and procedures applicable to the procurement, storage, use, transfer, disposal, and inspections of controlled substances at all locations that are the responsibility of the UC Davis administration. The workgroup discussed how to implement the mandate at UC Davis in a manner that complies with UC policy and federal/state law and that creates as little administrative and fiscal impact as possible. Alan Jackman’s service involved attending a monthly meeting, participation via e-mail, draft review and presenting updates to the FWC throughout the process.

After hearing Dean Emeritus Hess summarize a draft directive regarding the rights and privileges of emeriti/ae faculty, the FWC offered a suggestion for consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Saul Schaefer, Chair
Michael Dahmus
Frances Dolan
Alan Jackman
Stuart Hill

Lori Lubin
Lisa Tell, UCFW DD Representative
Katherina Lin, Academic Federation Representative
Bryan Rodman, Resource Analyst
APPENDIX A
ITEMS REVIEWED DURING THE 2010-11 ACADEMIC YEAR

Letter from Academic Council to Division and Committee Chairs regarding review of the report of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force.

Letter from Academic Council to Senate Division Chairs and Committee Chairs requesting review of Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University.

Email sent on behalf of Academic Senate Chair to Senate Division Chairs and Committee Chairs requesting review of the report of the Task Force on Senate Membership.

UCFW endorsement of Dissenting Statement by Staff and Academic Senate Members of the Work Groups of the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits.

UCFW resolution regarding proposed Post-Employment Benefits Options.

Academic Council email message regarding Option B, as recommended by the Steering Committee of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force.

Request to participate in a conceptual review of an Information Technology Shared Service Center.

Draft directive regarding The Rights and Privileges of Emeriti/ae Faculty.

Summary of The Rights and Privileges of Emeriti/ae Professors at UC Davis.

Request to participate in a conceptual review of Case Management of HR and Finance issues in a Shared Service Center.

Biennial Accountability Sub-Report on Faculty Competitiveness

Draft of Davis Division Faculty Welfare Committee resolution regarding UC Senate Membership Task Force Report.

Draft of Davis Division Faculty Welfare Committee resolution regarding UC Davis Chancellor and Provost letter regarding Campus Budget Update.

Graduate School Proposal.

Draft of UC Systemwide Policy on Privacy.

Request for formal review of additional streamlining of APM and APM-UCD policy.

Letter from Chancellor Katehi and Provost Hexter regarding 2011-12 Budget Planning.

The UC Online Education Project Plan.

Information Technology Blue Ribbon Committee Report.
Committee on Grade Changes

<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>9</td>
<td>Once per month during academic year</td>
<td>2-3 hours meeting and 6-8 hours additional review time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Retroactive/Grade Change Petitions Reviewed:</th>
<th>Total of reviewed Retroactive/Grade Change Petitions deferred from the previous year:</th>
<th>Total Retroactive/Grade Change Petitions deferred to the coming academic year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>381 petitions reviewed, 111 approved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
The Committee recommends that the ENWS notation be discontinued or revised.
See attached for details.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
Updated Guidelines may be found at [http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/GCC](http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/GCC)

Issues considered by the committee

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
The Committee supports the introduction of a higher fee for Retroactive Change petitions. The Committee also supports the introduction of a fee for Retroactive Withdrawal petitions. See attached for details.

Committee’s narrative:
See attached
2010-2011 Summary and Highlights

During the 2010-2011 Academic Year, the Office of the University Register received 5,425 retroactive and grade change petitions. The Grade Change Committee itself reviewed 381 – 7% of the submitted petitions. The remaining 93% were approved and processed in-house by the Grade Change Deputies and related processing staff according to the Committee’s published guidelines. Of these 5,425 petitions, 4,141 were Grade Change Petitions, 1,052 were Retroactive Change Petitions, and 232 were Retroactive Withdrawal Petitions.

Of the 4,141 Grade Change Petitions, 704 cited “SmartSite” as being part of the reason for the change of grade. The specific reasons cited on these petitions ranged from user error to problems with the system. Several instances of an error compounding over a large number of students led to long lists of students needing a change of grade. The majority of these SmartSite-related changes occurred in March (292 petitions), April (137 petitions), and June (192 petitions). Many involved improper rounding of grades.

Furthermore, 88 Grade Change Petitions submitted to the Office of the University Registrar involved the Enrolled-No Work Submitted (ENWS) notation. These 88 represent 2% of the petitions received in 2010-2011, seemingly not that high a percentage. Yet these petitions did not tend to be part of lists and so represent 88 separate incorrect grade assignments, implying that there is still significant misunderstanding of this particular grade.

The Grade Change Committee approved fewer petitions in 2010-2011 than it did in 2009-2010 (29% vs. 33%), and significantly fewer than it did in 2008-2009 (47%). It is likely that this is due to a tightening of the Committee guidelines and a general trend towards being stricter in the application of these guidelines. Many of the complex petitions involve someone hoping to return to UC Davis after an absence of several years. That is, these petitions are part and parcel of re-admission decisions. Yet the various colleges do not seem to be consistent in their approach to re-admission.

The Grade Change Committee Guidelines were updated on December 9, 2010. The revised guidelines may be found at http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/GCC.

2010-2011 Committee Recommendations

1. The Committee recommends, as it did in its 2009-2010 Annual Report, that the ENWS notation be discontinued or significantly revised. It is the Committee’s belief that this grade tends to be misused, misunderstood, and assigned by instructors against Senate Policy as a means of allowing a student to late-drop a course in a way that bypasses established late-drop procedures. Furthermore, the Committee regards the ENWS as a drain on university resources; the notation encourages students to not attend class rather than drop the class, thus taking up seats that could be occupied by students who will attend. At the very least, the Committee recommends a comprehensive review of this grade and its impact on UC Davis.

2. The Committee supports the introduction of a higher fee for Retroactive Change petitions. Currently the fee for such petitions is $3.00, mirroring the fee that is charged a student for a late schedule adjustment. (A fee of $3.00 probably does not even cover the cost of processing the fee.) The Committee also supports the introduction of a fee for Retroactive Withdrawal petitions. Currently, there is no fee charged for such petitions. Retroactive change and withdrawal petitions require significant resources, from faculty review to staff processing. It is the Committee’s view that many petitions are based on faulty and unsound reasoning, representing a clear divergence from the published Committee guidelines and Senate regulations. It is the Committee’s belief that a charge, say of $25, would deter frivolous and repeat petitioners, and create more of an imperative for petitioners to review guidelines and other applicable regulations.
Overview of Retroactive Petitions Submitted to the Office of the University Registrar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retro-Changes</td>
<td>Retro-Withdrawals</td>
<td>Grade Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-10</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-10</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-11</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-11</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>4141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retro-Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-08</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar charts showing the number of petitions received for each month from 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011.
Overview of Petitions Considered by the Committee on Grade Changes
2010-2011

**KEY:**
- **A** = Petitions **denied** by the Committee
- **B** = Petitions **deferred** by the Committee
- **C** = Petitions **approved** by the Committee
- **D** = Total petitions reviewed by the Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Appeals/Deferrals</th>
<th>Grade Changes</th>
<th>Retro-Adds</th>
<th>Unit Changes</th>
<th>Retro-Drops</th>
<th>Retro-Withdrawals</th>
<th>Retro-P/NP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 13, 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 08, 2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19, 2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 09, 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 09, 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13, 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 11, 2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15, 2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee Approval Percentage (by Academic Year)**
- 2008-2009: 337 petitions
- 2009-2010: 396 petitions
- 2010-2011: 381 petitions

**Committee Approval Percentage 2010-2011 (by Meeting)**
- Oct-10: 19%
- Nov-10: 28%
- Dec-10: 28%
- Jan-11: 19%
- Feb-11: 24%
- Mar-11: 39%
- Apr-11: 46%
- May-11: 25%
- Jun-11: 37%
- **Total**: 29%
# Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-11

## Davis Division: Academic Senate

### Graduate Council

<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>Council: 11</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Graduate Council Chair - 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Planning &amp; Development: 8</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Council Members – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Appeals: 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRC Chair - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs Advisory: 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Subcommittee Chairs – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses: 1 (reviews online)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subcommittee Members - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Review: 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support: 2 (reviews online)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare: 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Items Reviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Items Reviewed:</th>
<th>Total Number of Items Carried Over from Previous Year:</th>
<th>Total items Carried Over to Coming Year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>126 business items</td>
<td>32 courses</td>
<td>1 program review report, 2 program review closure considerations, and 2 other items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 courses reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,831 student award applications reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Listing of Policies Approved, Established or Revised:

- Policy Doctoral Qualifying Examinations (GC2005-02) – revised policy (February 4, March 4)
- Policy on Service on Advanced Degree Committees (GC1998-01) – revised policy (February 4, March 4)
- Policy on the Review of Designated Emphases (GC2011-01) – revised policy (March 4)
- Policy on Quorum and Voting Rights & Responsibility (GC2011-04) – supersedes previous related unnumbered policies on quorum (April 1, May 6)
- Policy on Bylaws for Graduate Programs (GC2011-02) – new policy, supersedes previous guidelines on bylaws (November 5, April 1, May 6)
- Policy on Residence and Transfer Units (GC2011-03) – new policy (May 6)

### Summary of Issues the Graduate Council Considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Program Bylaw Revisions</th>
<th>Graduate Program Degree Requirement Revisions</th>
<th>Graduate Student Fellowship, Travel, &amp; Summer GSR Awards</th>
<th>Graduate Program Review Actions</th>
<th>Proposals for New Graduate Programs, DEEs, or GACs</th>
<th>Graduate Courses Reviewed</th>
<th>Responses to Requests for AS Consultation</th>
<th>Graduate Program Management Advice or Affiliation Approvals</th>
<th>Administrative Committee Appeals</th>
<th>Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>222 awards (2,831 applications reviewed)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total: 200 New: 96 Changes: 72 Cancelled: 32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Narrative:

The Graduate Council is a standing committee of the Divisional Academic Senate and is responsible for regulating and making recommendations on matters pertaining to graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues in accordance with Bylaw 80 of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate.

The Council is supported by a structure which includes the following subcommittees: (1) Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee, (2) Administrative Committee, (3) Bylaws Committee, (4) Chair’s Advisory Committee, (5) Courses Committee, (6) Educational Policy Committee (EPC), (7) Program Review Committee (PRC), (8) the Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC), the Student Support Committee, (9) and the Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Welfare Committee. This year, the Support and Welfare Committee split into two committees so that both components would receive equal attention.

A summary of the Council’s actions for the year is provided below; the item dates are typically those of Council meetings. Council agendas and minutes may accessed via ASIS or at http://www.gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/gradcouncil/minutes/.

A. Graduate Program Bylaw Revisions:

1. Soils and Biogeochemistry Graduate Program (October 1)
2. Avian Sciences Graduate Group (December 13)
3. Biomedical Engineering Graduate Group (December 13)
4. Agricultural and Resource Economics Graduate Program (February 4, March 4) *discussion only, no approval of the bylaws document*
5. DE in Native American Studies (June 3)
6. Ecology Graduate Group (June 3)
7. Chemistry Graduate Program (June 16)
8. Master of Public Health Graduate Group (June 16)

B. Graduate Program Degree Requirement Revisions:

1. Art Studio Graduate Program (November 5, June 3)
2. Geography Graduate Group (December 13)
3. Psychology Graduate Program (January 7)
4. Comparative Literature Graduate Program (March 4)
5. Horticulture and Agronomy Graduate Group (March 4)
6. Material Sciences and Engineering (March 4)
7. Plant Biology Graduate Group (March 4)
8. Biomedical Engineering Graduate Group (April 1)
9. Avian Sciences Graduate Group (May 6)
10. Biophysics Graduate Group (May 6)
11. Clinical Research Graduate Group (May 6)
12. Pharmacology and Toxicology Graduate Group (May 6)
13. Spanish Graduate Program (May 6)
14. Animal Biology Graduate Group (June 3)
15. Dramatic Art Graduate Program (June 3)
16. Ecology Graduate Group (June 3, June 16)
17. English Graduate Program (June 3, June 16)
18. Master of Public Health Graduate Group (June 3, June 16)
19. Neuroscience Graduate Group (June 3)
20. Chemistry Graduate Program (June 16)
21. Viticulture and Enology Graduate Group (June 16)

C. Graduate Student Fellowship, Travel, & Summer GSR Awards:

See appendix A for details

D. Graduate Program Review Actions:

1. Program Review Reports:
   i. Master of Public Health Graduate Group – acceptance of external accreditation in lieu of full program review (March 4)
   ii. Applied Science Engineering Graduate Program (April 1)
   iii. Political Science Graduate Program (May 6, June 3)
   iv. Forensic Science Graduate Group (May 6, June 3, discussed briefly in chair announcements June 16)
   v. Biological Systems Engineering Graduate Program (June 3, June 16)
   vi. Population Biology Graduate Group (June 3, June 16)
   vii. Anthropology Graduate Program (June 3, June 16)
   viii. Geology Graduate Program (June 16)
   ix. Sociology Graduate Program (June 16)
   x. Pending: Transportation Technology and Policy (delayed to 2011-12)

2. Program Review Closure Committee Recommendations:
   i. Applied Mathematics Graduate Group (December 13) *closure approved
   ii. Avian Sciences Graduate Group (December 13) *closure approved
   iii. Microbiology Graduate Group (December 13) *closure approved
   iv. Pharmacology and Toxicology Graduate Group (December 13) *closure approved
   v. Plant Biology Graduate Group (December 13) *closure approved
   vi. Applied Science Engineering Graduate Program (April 1) *closure approved with program review report
   vii. DE in Critical Theory – 2008-09 (May 6) *closure approved
   viii. DE in Native American Studies – 2001-02 (May 6) *closure approved
ix. DE in Reproductive Biology – 2007-08 (May 6) *closure approved
x. Education Ph.D. Graduate Group – 2007-09 (May 6) *closure approved
xi. Electrical and Computer Engineering Graduate Program – 2009-10 (May 6) *closure approved
xii. Linguistics Graduate Group – 2008-09 (May 6) *closure approved
xiii. Neuroscience Graduate Group – 2008-09 (May 6) *closure approved
xiv. Computer Science Graduate Group (June 16) *closure approved
xv. Civil and Environmental Engineering (June 16) * recommendation to keep review open approved
xvi. Program Review Closures still to be considered:
   1. Agricultural and Resource Economics Graduate Program Review (awaiting approval of degree requirements and bylaws)
   2. Genetics Graduate Group

E. Proposals for New Graduate Programs, Designated Emphases, or Graduate Academic Certificates:
1. Master of Professional Accountancy (MPAc) – new self-supporting program offered by the Graduate School of Management (October 1, November 5) *pending review by CCGA

F. Graduate Courses Reviewed and Approved
A total of 200 course requests were reviewed by GCCS this year:
- New course requests approved: 80 Graduate | 3 Professional
  New course requests denied/rejected: 10 Graduate | 3 Professional
- Course changes (new format) approved: 47 Graduate | 0 Professional
  Course changes (new format) denied/rejected: 25 Graduate | 0 Professional
- Courses cancelled/discontinued approved: 32 Graduate | 0 Professional
  Courses cancelled/discontinued denied/rejected: 0 Graduate | 0 Professional

G. Responses to Requests for AS Consultation:
1. Post Employment Benefits – did not opine (October 1)
2. Renaming Fees to Tuition – informational (October 1)
3. Graduate Tracking system (November 5)
4. Academic Council and UCLA Recommendations on Downsizing (November 5)
5. Policy on Self Supporting Graduate Professional Degrees (December 13, January 7)
6. Proposal to Discontinue Avian Sciences Undergraduate Program – did not opine (December 13)
7. Management of Animals Policy – did not opine (December 13)
8. DDR 528. Credit by Examination (December 13)
9. DDR A540. Grades (December 13)
10. Proposal to Merge the Department of Human and Community Development with the Department of Environmental Design (December 13)

11. UC Senate Membership Task Force – did not opine (January 7)
12. Report from the Task Force on the Future of UCD (February 4)
13. Graduate School Proposal (February 4)
14. SmartSite Concern (March 4)
15. Proposal to Consolidate the Programs of Film Studies and Technocultural Studies (March 4)
16. Proposal to Close Admissions to UG Textiles and Clothing (March 4)
17. Proposed Revision to DDB 80 on the Graduate Council (May 6)
18. Merger of the Entomology and Nematology Departments – did not opine (May 6)
19. 2011-12 Budget Planning (June 3)
20. UC Online Education Project (June 3)
21. UCD-Mars, Inc. Expanded Strategic Research Relationship Proposal (June 3)
23. IT Excellent Committee Report Review – did not opine (June 16)

H. Graduate Program Management

1. DE Affiliation Requests:
   i. Animal Behavior Graduate Group and Entomology Graduate Program affiliation with the DE in Organism-Environment Interactions (April 1)
   ii. Horticulture and Agronomy Graduate Group affiliation with the DE in Biotechnology (April 1)

2. Professional Fee Proposals (October 1)

3. Civil and Environmental Engineering request to discontinue the M.Engr. and D.Engr. degrees (October 1)

4. Oversight of Graduate Programs Offered Through Professional Schools: Memo to Professional School Deans (December 13)

5. HArCS/Social Sciences Student Support Augmentation Plan (January 7)

6. Disestablishment of the DE in Social Theory and Comparative History (June 16)

I. Administrative Committee Appeals:

1. Split Decision on the 2nd take of a Qualifying Examination: 10
2. Split Decision on the 1st take of a Qualifying Examination: 2
3. Policy Exceptions Requested by a Program: 5
4. Student Appeal of a Denial of Admission: 4
5. Reconstitution of Committee: 1
6. Request for Admission to the Individual Ph.D.: 2
7. Student Appeal of a Disqualification: 3
8. Request to Repeat Coursework in Excess of Policy Allowance: 0

J. Miscellaneous:

1. Restructuring of the Support and Welfare Committee into two separate committees: Graduate Student Support and Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Welfare (October 1)
2. National Research Council (NRC) Assessment Data and Analysis (October 1)
4. Development Initiatives to Increase Graduate Student Support (January 7)
5. Review of the GC Policy on Membership in Graduate Programs – GC1998-02 (January 7)
6. Graduate Student Researcher (GSR) Pay Scale Issues (April 1, June 16)
7. Professors for the Future: Teaching Opportunities for Postdoctoral Scholars (April 1)
8. Revised Fellowship Application Process for Prospective Students (June 16)
9. Appointment of Instructors (June 16)
10. Restructuring of the Program Review Committee for 2011-12 (June 16)
11. Restructuring of the Support Committee for 2011-12 (June 16)

Closing

In closing, Graduate Council wishes to thank all of those who have given of their time in support of graduate education and postdoctoral scholar issues during the past year. The contributions of the members of subcommittees and of the ad hoc program review committees have been extremely valuable and are deeply appreciated by the Council. Finally, we specifically appreciate the professional support and personal dedication provided by the administrative staff of Graduate Council.

Respectfully submitted,

André Knoesen, Chair
2009-2012 Graduate Council

Members: André Knoesen, Chair; Alan Buckpitt, Vice Chair and CCGA Representative; Patrick Carroll; Christiana Drake; Lynn Epstein; Jeffery Gibeling, ex officio and non-voting (Dean); Rachael Goodhue, ex officio and non-voting (CCGA Vice Chair); Lev Kavvas; Peter Lichtenfels; Adrienne Martin; James Murray; Blake Stimson; Jeffrey Stott; Bryan Weare.

Academic Federation Representatives: Pauline Holmes and Deanna Johnson.

Graduate Studies Representatives: Associate Dean Lenora Timm; Faculty Assistant to the Dean Chris Calvert.

Graduate Student Representatives: Brian Riley, GSA Chair; Adam Costanzo, GSA Vice Chair; Nicole Moore, GSA Representative; and Cassandra Paul, Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor.

Postdoctoral Scholar Representatives: Eliza Bliss-Moreau and Anke Schennink, PSA Co-Chairs.

Graduate Studies Attendees: Steven Albrecht, Hector Cuevas, Helen Frasier, Cathy Jurado, and Richard Shintaku.

This report was prepared by the Graduate Council Analyst and the subcommittee chairs and staff. The report was reviewed and approved by the 2010-2011 Graduate Council during the period of August 1 to September 1, 2011.
The Support Committee reviews applications for a variety of fellowships, including those from private and public sources. These fellowships cover research expenses, travel to present papers at national and international scholarly meetings, as well as full academic year support in designated fields. Committee members also review applications for Graduate Student Travel Awards in November and April, for the Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award, and for Summer GSR awards.

Core Committee members in 2010-2011: Jeffrey Stott, Chair (Veterinary Medicine), Lorenzo Berti (Academic Federation Rep, Internal Medicine), Robert Fairclough (Biophysics), Lynette Hunter (Performance Studies), Mark Mascal (Chemistry), Qing Zhao (Electrical and Computer Engineering), Stephen O’Driscoll (Electrical and Computer Engineering) and staff support provided by Steven Albrecht, Ruth Lee, and Lyndsey Williams (Office of Graduate Studies).

**Award Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Fellowships:</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crosby, Donald</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$19,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Marjorie and Charles</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$70,542.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulkner, Richard and Kate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibeling, Alfred H. &amp; Marie E.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden International Agriculture, William G. and Kathleen</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$31,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Scholars Fellowship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$362,442.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Fletcher</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft, Herbert</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35,271.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krantz, Bert and Nell</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, George</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons, Austin Eugene</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$114,814.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahan, Laura Perrott</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McArthur, Frank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKeenan, Beatrice Oberly and S. Atwood</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$99,814.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards, Lillie May</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwalen, Emily</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwall Dissertation Year Fellowship, Floyd and Mary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwall Medical Fellowship, Floyd and Mary</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$196,187.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Number of Applicants</td>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>Award Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stacey, Malcolm</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steindler, John F</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$171,289.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tryon, Herbert</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCD &amp; Humanities Graduate Research</strong></td>
<td>317</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UCD Dissertation Year Fellowship</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$253,900.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Velez, Miguel</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walker, Frank and Carolan</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wood, Elizabeth P.</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wright, Jarena</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zolk, George and Dorothy</strong></td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$33,271.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$1,531,899.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Internal Fellowships to support Campus Diversity:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cota Robles, Eugene</strong></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$468,563.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation Year Fellowship</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$253,900.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Research Mentorship</strong></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$286,971.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>McNair</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55,373.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>395</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$1,064,808.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Travel Awards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For professional meetings held July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For professional meetings held Jan 1 to Dec 31, 2011</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summer GSR Awards:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Graduate Student Researcher Award Engineering or Computer-related Applications and Methods</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$235,074.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$235,074.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand Total All Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Applicants</th>
<th>Number of Awards</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total All Awards</td>
<td>2,831</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>$2,881,782.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee on Information Technology

<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>As needed</td>
<td>fluctuates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Requests for Consultation responses: (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total of reviewed proposals deferred from the previous year -- None</th>
<th>Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year -- None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: 
None

Listing of committee policies established or revised: 
None

Issues considered by the committee:
- Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions (Downsizing)
- Graduate Tracking System (PPM 200-45 Review)
- Information Technology Shared Services Concept
- Conceptual Framework: Implementation of Regents Resolution on Administrative Efficiencies
- I&R Faculty Tracking System (FacTrac)-PPM 200-45
- SmartSite Concern
- PPM 200-45: UC Davis Active Directory/Unified Communications Design Whitepaper
- HR & Finance Case Management for Shared Service Center Concept (PPM 200-45)
- Polling/Secure Voting System Concept: PPM 200-45 Review
- PPM 200-45: Conceptual Review Construction Project Management and Accounting System
- IT Excellence Committee Report Review

Committee’s narrative:

The Committee on Information Technology (CIT) is the Academic Senate’s resource for providing recommendations and insight on IT issues. The committee has maintained a close connection with CCFIT as the natural means of communication between the administration and the Senate on IT. CIT actively participated in the activities of CCFIT during the year. We note that, in addition to the issues mentioned above, several CIT members have had to address related issues as members of CCFIT and CCFIT sub-committes. Some CIT members have also expressed the wish to be better informed of the possible impact of their recommendations after they are submitted.
An important issue discussed this year was the development and improvement of the SmartSite system, and in particular its Gradebook2 component. While the feedback provided by IET to CIT has substantially improved, it appears to be important for CIT to continue to carefully monitor ongoing developments related to this system. A number of other issues were submitted as part of the PPM 200-45 review process and often proposed the development of new software systems in the goal of reducing processing costs. The committee generally felt that many of these proposals were not including a sufficient cost/benefit analysis, in particular regarding the displacement of processing costs from administrative staff to Faculty.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francois Gygi (chair), Anupam Chander (member), Edward Dickenson (member), Paul Gepts (member), Felix Wu (member), Keith Brandman (AF Rep.), Pete Siegel (Ex-Officio), Matthew Blair (ASUCD Rep.), Mathew Lange (GSA Rep.)
Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-11
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on International Education (CIE)

| Total Meetings: 4 | Meeting frequency: One meeting after each systemwide UCIE meeting. | Average hours of committee work each week: 4 |

Reviewed a total 46 GE Petitions, in addition to the following: Academic Council and UCLA (Downsizing) Resolutions; UC San Diego Report on Academic Integration; English as a Second Language proposal; ESL Task Force Undergraduate Subcommittee Proposal; Preparatory Education Committee letter; Education Abroad Center Statement of Guiding Principles for Affiliate Provider Selection; UCEAP Budget and Funding presentation; UCEAP Reciprocal Exchange white paper; and UCEAP MOU between UCOP and UCSB.

0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 2 issues (the status of EAP and the GE protocol for “new” GE Requirement) continued from the previous year.

0 GE Petitions, 0 reports and 3 issues continue to the coming academic year: pursuit of a change to the committee’s bylaw (i.e. removal of DD Bylaw 64.B.4.); committee letter in support of the ESL Task Force proposal; and the internationalization of the UC Davis campus.

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
Removal of Davis Division Bylaw 64.B.4.

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None.

Issues considered by the committee that were also considered last year
Chancellor’s vision document
Criteria and protocol for getting GE credit for EAP coursework
Changes in the EAP funding model
Proposed openings and proposed closures for various EAP programs
Campus agreements with 3rd-party education-abroad providers
Impact of “new” GE requirements
Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions regarding Downsizing
Restriction of EAP students from linguistic classes because of budget cuts
Committee’s narrative:

The committee was engaged in international-education issues of concern to UC Davis and UC systemwide. The minutes of the committee’s four 2010-11 meetings capture the topics of discussion at the meetings and summaries of the four University Committee on International Education (UCIE) meetings that took place before the fifth UCIE meeting on June 16, 2011. The committee met regularly after each UCIE meeting, except the UCIE meeting scheduled mid-June. The minutes also relate the focus, interests and actions of the committee for the 2010-11 academic year.

The main focus of the committee was the internationalization of the UC Davis campus within the parameters set by the University of California Education Abroad Program, as authored by its office, the University Office of the Education Abroad Program. The committee used the Education Abroad Program’s new self supporting business model and the constraints of the current budget crisis as discussion guides. The committee limited its interests and business items to those of the UCIE and to those subjects that supported, developed and promoted the internationalization of the campus. Committee actions were discussed and formulated with respect to all campus units.

Education Abroad Program
The Committee discussed two dimensions of the University’s Education Abroad Program (EAP). The first is the status of the systemwide EAP office; the second is the UC Davis campus Education Abroad Center (EAC). The systemwide EAP is still in the process of adjusting to the new funding plan, under the guidance of its new director, Jean-Xavier Guinand. In part as a result of the reorganization of the universitywide EAP office, and in part because of UC budget cuts in general, the UC Davis EAC has received less funding to support its activities. The Committee expressed concerns about having sufficient staff to guide UC Davis students in the education abroad choices. Budget cuts have also contributed to the lack of mechanisms for interaction between international students and UCD students, and the lack of student services for international students (e.g. health
coverage, health services, housing, protection against fraud). Student satisfaction numbers and analysis of these numbers are needed to give a more complete update on the status of the EAP. More information is needed on the funding of the EAC in order to know and to decide how best to proceed with the program.

The prohibition of introducing new programs at the systemwide EAP that was set in place a year and a half ago has been lifted. Clear criteria for shutting down a program and for setting up a program are understood to be necessary. The new EAP self-supporting business model requires students to be more self-reliant. Now, they will have to rely on the International Offices of the University they are attending abroad for services. The goal is to take advantage of available resources and to stay within current budget constraints. Questions persist concerning the reporting hierarchy, the degree of contact that the Universitywide Office of the Education Abroad Program (UOEAP) has with a designated officer of the International Office of Education who was to be on site, and the proximity of the point of contact in a student emergency. Student surveys reveal that students do not often go through the chain of command which has been developed over the years of the programs.

**Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director for the UCEAP Appointment**

UCD’s Food Sciences Professor and Associate Vice Provost for International Programs Jean-Xavier Guinard’s appointment as the Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director for the UCEAP was commended. In a time of change on multiple fronts, his pragmatism in moving forward seems to be an attribute that would allow him to guide the systemwide office capably.

**UCD Chancellor Katehi’s Draft Vision Document**

The comments on the internationalization of the UC Davis campus contained in Chancellor Katehi’s 2009 Draft Vision Document entitled “UC Davis, A Transformative Vision,” and former Chancellor Larry Vanderhoef’s 2005 Fall Conference Recommendations for internationalizing the UC Davis undergraduate experience motivated the committee to readdress these points and to seek ways to support and promote these visions in the current budget crisis environment and the institution of the new Education Abroad Program self-supporting business model.

**Request for Budget Information**

The committee considered requesting the budgets of various campus units involved with international education for the purpose of informing itself on how best to advocate support for these units to comply with Chancellor Katehi’s and former Chancellor Vanderhoef’s visions for internationalizing the UC Davis campus.

**Committee Letter in Support of ESL Task Force Proposal**

This letter was drafted by committee member Julia Menard-Warwick. It was subsequently edited and made available for review and comment by the committee membership for eventual forwarding to the Academic Senate Divisional Chair. The goal was to get the letter to UC Davis Provost Ralph Hexter after completing the divisional vetting process. The drafted letter will be a business item for the 2011-12 committee.

**Academic Integration**

CIE consultant and Associate Director of the Education Abroad Center Zachary Frieders presented a history of the Academic Integration program. The program, formally adopted by the UOEAP as a UC-wide initiative in 2004 and including students
participating in EAP, campus-based programs abroad (i.e. UC Davis’ Summer Abroad and Quarter Abroad programs) and programs offered by third-party providers, initiated a shift from a general knowledge to a specific knowledge of education abroad, preparation for study abroad, and the building of programs on discipline rather than location. The conclusion of the presentation left the CIE membership asking what the committee should be doing in regards to academic integration and searching for ways that it could facilitate and support academic integration.

**Proposed Revisions to CISE’s Charge—Davis Division Bylaw 64**

On April 28, 2011, CIE Chair Jeannette Money addressed a letter to Academic Senate, Davis Division, Chair Robert Powell seeking to remove Davis Division Bylaw 64.B.4. The letter reflected the consensus of the committee and cited the Chancellor’s initiative to internationalize the campus and the new General Education Requirements that would be going into effect the Fall of 2011 as rationale for the change in the bylaw. The proposed change to the bylaw could not be made effective by the end of the 2010-11 academic year as there was not enough time to complete the vetting process. The proposed change will be a business item of the 2011-12 committee.

**Affiliation Agreements**

The committee considered Affiliation Agreements (also known as Agreements of Association or Association Agreements) when it reviewed and discussed the Education Abroad Center (EAC) Statement of Guiding Principles for Affiliate Provider Selection. The business viewpoint and the academic oversight viewpoint of such agreements were considered. The committee recognized the need for a formal procedure in addition to guidelines, the need to have every campus CIE vetting/supporting the programs of these agreements, and the need to protect students from injury and from wasting their time academically. The fee/payment for services structure and legitimate academic gap filling were considered by the committee. As was stated in CIE’s 2009-10 Annual Report, under such contracts, UCD would affiliate with selected third-party providers for providing alternative, generally non-competing study abroad programs (supplementing EAP, Summer Abroad, and Quarter Abroad), particularly in the light of EAP budget cuts and concerns about increasing student costs for participation in study abroad programs.

**General Education Petitions for EAP Coursework**

Throughout the academic year, CIE reviewed petitions for EAP coursework to be designated for General Education credit. Always, the committee endeavored to review and comment on the petitions in a timely manner. Forty-six GE petitions were received for review and comment. Two of these were re-submissions that switched the original Topical Breadth category to the appropriate Topical Breadth category recommended by the committee. Initially denied, the two petitions were approved upon re-submission. Ultimately, forty petitions were approved, and six were denied. Five of the petitions received requested expedited review. When a petition’s required information was not provided, review of the petition was postponed until the missing information was provided.

Two issues that were addressed were the need for submission of hardcopies of petitions for signature, since there was no electronic signature functionality set up, and the need for greater participation of the committee membership in the review of petitions.

The nature of the coursework being petitioned for GE credit designation and the expertise that the committee membership could provide suggested that review of the
petitions might be more appropriately the charge of another Academic Senate committee—one with authority over courses and a membership with greater expertise. Although other campus units were suggested, the Academic Senate Committee on Courses of Instruction was suggested as the most viable. (See foregoing section of this report entitled Proposed Revisions to CISE’s Charge—Davis Division Bylaw 64 for further details.)

Requests for Consultation
A committee response was requested on only one RFC. This RFC concerned the Academic Council and UCLA resolutions on downsizing the university. As the RFC was distributed on Sept. 9, 2010, with a response due date of Nov. 5, 2010, and the committee did not have its first meeting until Nov. 12, 2010, there was no opportunity for the committee to discuss the RFC and submit the requested response.

Committee White Papers
Chair Money wrote two white papers on the topic of internationalizing the UC Davis campus. The titles of the papers are: “A Living-Learning Program”; and “International Experiences for Students.” The papers are attached to this report as Appendices A and B.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeannette Money, CIE Chair and UCIE DD Representative
Leopoldo Bernucci
Kentaro Inoue
Francis Lu
Julia Menard-Warwick
Halifu Osumare
Gang Sun
Hnin-Hnin (Ma) Aung, Academic Federation Representative
Yvette Flores, ex-officio
Eric Schroeder, ex-officio
Wesley Young, ex-officio
Zachary Frieders, EAC Program Manager and Committee Consultant
Paige Farrell, EAC Coordinator and Committee Consultant
Bryan Rodman, Committee Resource Analyst
APPENDIX A:

White Paper on Internationalizing the UC Davis Campus

“A Living-Learning Program”
TO: Bob Powell  
Chair, UC Davis Faculty Senate  
FROM: Jeannette Money  
Chair, Faculty Senate Committee on International Education (CIE)  
SUBJECT: Internationalization of the UC Davis Campus  
A Living-Learning Program  
DATE: April 28, 2011

The Faculty Senate Committee on International Education would like to take the initiative to propose programs that emphasize the University community’s commitment to integrating the campus into the global community. Although the campus has been interested in promoting this goal and, in fact, held a Chancellor’s Fall Conference in 2005 to generate ideas for internationalizing the campus, we feel that a new emphasis is important in an era of significant change for the university. The CIE will forward three white papers with ideas for possible implementation. This is the first white paper.

We propose that the campus community develop a “Living-Learning” program that emphasizes the global community and invites freshmen to participate in a two year program that provides a curriculum leading to a minor in Global Studies. Living-Learning programs are not new to the UC Davis campus. Currently, the Davis Honor’s Challenge supports a small residential learning community and the Colleges at La Rue originally provided a living-learning program for continuing students associated with the Center for Leadership Learning.

An example of a living-learning program that incorporates an international theme is the Global Communities Program at the University of Maryland, College Park. The program has been in existence for 10 years and is now undergoing a program revision. The program offers admission to a select group of students who apply for the experience. Of the 75 spaces in the dormitory, approximately one third is allocated to international students. The admission of international students serves two purposes: the first is to provide an environment in which international students can more easily integrate into the larger university community and knit close relations with local students. This type of residential living-learning program may draw international students to the UC Davis campus.

The second purpose is to provide local students with an opportunity to live and learn from their peers from foreign countries. The University of Maryland program offers a 10 (semester) unit program over two years, with a central theme running through each year. For example, the curriculum for the 2011-2012 year centers on food – a theme that would allow for students to become knowledgeable with the food/culture intersection, agriculture, sustainability, local and global hunger, and so forth.

The resources to create and sustain a living-learning program are modest – although allocating the living space on campus for the program would take planning. The University of Maryland program is supported by a half-time faculty member, a full time permanent staff member and two half-time graduate students. If the University decides to proceed with the program, adequate resources – perhaps from the tuition paid by international students – must be
available to ensure success of the program. It is likely that the program can be scaled up to incorporate a larger portion of the incoming student population.
APPENDIX B:

White Paper on Internationalizing the UC Davis Campus

“International Experiences for Students”
TO: Bob Powell  
Chair, Faculty Senate  

FROM: Jeannette Money  
Chair, Committee on International Education (CIE)  

SUBJECT: Internationalizing the UC Davis Campus  
International Experiences for Students  

DATE: May 13, 2011  

A university education today must provide students with the skills to live and work in a globalized environment. The most immediate way to provide some of these skills is to have students live, study, and work abroad through education abroad programs. UC Davis should have as a goal to ensure that 100% of the undergraduate student population study or work abroad. The campus should review best practices at other large public universities that are successful in their education abroad programs. And there are a number of ideas to promote education abroad at UC Davis.

1. The promotion of education abroad should come from the highest academic officers on the campus. The campus should undertake a campaign that is rolled out over a specified period of time to educate students and their families about the benefits of education abroad and provide adequate resources to ensure that all students have options for study abroad.

2. Integrating study abroad requires advanced planning. Therefore, communication should begin with entering freshmen and their families. The campus should educate students and their families about the goals of study abroad – even when the student and/or the student’s family immigant – and how they can meet their other academic goals while including this international experience. The media campaign should begin with the admissions process and continue through onsite orientation and academic counseling within the student’s department. Each department should be required to place education abroad as an item on the department’s undergraduate advising list and they should propose one or more programs that fit well with accomplishing major requirements while studying abroad during sophomore, junior and senior years, as well as appropriate summer programs. This type of department support would facilitate academic integration and ensure that students meet their broader academic goals on a timely basis. All types of media should be considered including blogs from current study abroad students, Facebook sites for students who plan to study at each center, and twitter.

3. If we are to increase UC Davis undergraduate participation in study abroad, we need to make sure that adequate opportunities are available to our students. One way to do so would be to provide UC Davis programs specifically, that could be scaled up to meet
increased demand – such as summer programs in a neighboring country. Both the 4 week, 8 unit summer abroad program and a UC Davis 6 week summer session could be considered as models. Institutions that are easily accessible geographically might be University of British Colombia in Vancouver and/or the University of Victoria in Victoria on Vancouver Island. Immersion of the students may be possible although specific courses that enhance the international experience might be appropriate. See attachment for suggestions.

4. Course proposals:
   a. The Canadian and U.S. welfare states in comparison
   c. The oceans of North America: Local actions with global consequences
   d. Canadian politics and society
September 9, 2011

DANIEL WILSON, Chair  
Academic Federation

LINDA BISSON, Chair  
Academic Senate

BARBARA HORWITZ, Vice Provost  
Academic Personnel

RE: 2010-2011 Annual Report of the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

Please find enclosed the 2010-2011 Annual Report submitted by the Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC). The JPC finished another challenging and productive year. The 2010-2011 JPC reviewed 223 personnel actions and four departmental voting group and peer review plans.

The workload of the JPC is extensive, and as such, the time commitment from all members is significant. I offer my sincere appreciation to the following members:

Bill Casey – Professor (Chemistry)  
Louise Ferguson – Specialist in Cooperative Extension (Plant Sciences)  
David Jones – Project Scientist (Civil and Environmental Engineering)  
Winder McConnell – Professor (German and Russian)  
Jim Oltjen – Specialist in Cooperative Extension (Animal Science)  
Randy Southard – Professor (Land, Air and Water Resources)  
Cliff Tepper – Professional Researcher (SOM: Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine)

Each member significantly contributed to the success of the committee. I am very grateful to them for their dedication, commitment and participation in the committee. As Chair, I am honored to have worked with such outstanding colleagues.

Sincerely,

Peter Klavins, Chair 2010-2011

Enclosure

cc: Jo-Anne Boorkman, Academic Personnel  
2010-2011 Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee Members
Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-11
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 33</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: weekly</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each meeting week: 4-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total: 223 Actions Reviewed</th>
<th>Total # of reviewed or deferred from the previous year: 0</th>
<th>Total deferred to the coming academic year: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
none

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
none

Issues considered by the committee

- **Appointments and Appointments Via Change in Title**
  Proposed appointments were generally supported by the JPC at the level proposed or higher. The JPC supported 29% of appointments as proposed (32 of 110). In 57 of the 78 appointments not supported (73% of those not supported, 52% overall), the JPC recommended a higher step than proposed. The JPC recommended a lower step appointment in only 18% (20 of 110) of the proposed appointments.

- **Position Descriptions**
  Many submitted Position Descriptions (PDs) were inappropriate for the proposed title. This has been a continuing problem. Most often the PDs lacked information, percent time assigned to each category evaluated, or contained unclear or inappropriate expectations regarding independent research, publishing, or grant acquisition requirements for the specified series. Improved training of the academic and administrative staff at the departmental level may be needed. We believe that many candidates are being proposed for the Professional Researcher series who would be more appropriately hired as Project Scientists. Similarly, many candidates are being proposed for the Project Scientist series who would be more appropriately hired as Specialists.
• **Academic Federation Streamlining Proposals – Phase I and Phase II**

The Committee received a proposal in December 2009 from the Vice Provost Academic Personnel regarding streamlining Academic Federation personnel actions. The proposal included streamlining opportunities in the Academic Federation appointment process. This Phase I proposal is in effect on a trial basis for two years through November 2011. One of the recommendations from this workgroup was to eliminate extramural letters for the following titles: Assistant Specialist in CE, Assistant Agronomist (in the AES), Assistant Professional Researcher, Assistant Project Scientist, and Assistant and Associate Specialist (i.e., all titles reviewed by JPC where possessing a PhD or its equivalent is the basic campus requirement for appointment). The JPC understands that it takes time to process and acquire the extramural letters; however, after reviewing appointment dossiers for almost two years without the letters, the committee feels that they are helpful when determining the appropriate position or level for a candidate at the Assistant level. Additionally, the JPC agrees that appointment packages are too streamlined at the Assistant level and the committee is having a hard time evaluating some of the appointments. The JPC agrees that the new appointment template for the Project Scientist and Specialist series is not helpful. Departments are not submitting enough information, especially in the Quantitative section, which makes the packages extremely difficult to evaluate.

The Committee received a proposal in July 2010 from the Vice Provost Academic Personnel regarding streamlining Academic Federation personnel actions. The proposal delegated all normal appointments, merits, and promotions (except above scale actions) in the Academic Administrator, Academic Coordinator, Specialist, and Continuing Educator series to the Dean. All actions would be sent directly to the Academic Federation office. If the Dean’s intended decision differs from the Academic Federation personnel committee recommendation, delegation would revert to the Vice Provost. In addition, the original dossier for all the title series above would be sent to the Academic Personnel office after the action is complete. The above Phase II delegations are for a three-year trial basis and subject to periodic audit by Academic Personnel. The Committee reviewed several Specialist actions during the 2010-2011 academic year. Overall, the committee agrees that the academic personnel streamlining procedures seem to be working effectively for all units involved.

• **MyInfoVault (MIV) Demonstration**

The Committee viewed a demonstration of the MIV system in January 2011. JPC agrees that MIV could help streamline the process of reviewing personnel actions in the future when all features of the system are fully implemented and the titles that are reviewed by JPC submit dossiers through the system. One of the main committee concerns is that
appointment actions are currently not available within MIV. Over 50% of the actions that JPC reviews are appointment actions. Therefore, the committee would be reviewing actions electronically and on paper. There are still many features of the system that are not fully developed and many enhancements that cannot be addressed for several years. The JPC looks forward to considering the MIV system again when it is fully implemented.

- **UCD APM 330: Appointment, Merit, and Promotion of Specialists**
  During the 2010-2011 academic year the JPC was concerned about UCD APM 330 and the appointment of Specialists. UCD APM 330-11(a) covers appointments within the Specialist series and each rank within that series. According to UCD APM 330-11, "The initial rank (assistant, associate, full specialist) of an appointee to the Specialist series is dictated by the specialization and experience of the candidate, the complexity of the research for which the candidate will be responsible, the level of independence with which the candidate will work, and the specialized research duties the candidate will assume."

  Most appointments reviewed by the JPC in this series are for the Assistant Specialist level and in many of the cases the candidate has obtained a PhD. Therefore, the JPC consistently recommends that the candidate be appointed at the Associate level given the language in UCD APM 330-11(a)(2). The JPC agrees that a doctoral degree is equivalent to a PhD. In many recent cases, the JPC has reviewed appointment actions where the proposed level and department recommendation is Assistant Specialist and the candidate clearly has obtained a PhD and has experience. In all of the cases where the candidate has a PhD and the Assistant level is being recommended, the JPC has voted down the proposed level and recommended that the candidate be appointed at the Associate level. The JPC feels that candidates are being appointed at a level significantly lower than they should be given that they have PhDs.

  The JPC recognizes that UCD APM 330 and APM 330 are different in that the language above regarding appointments and ranks within series and the language regarding the Junior Specialist series do not exist in systemwide APM 330. The JPC strongly agrees that the language stated in UCD APM 330 regarding appointments should be applied by departments and Dean’s offices when proposing appointments in the Specialist series. If the language in UCD APM 330 is not going to be applied or considered when appointing candidates in the Specialist series, then the JPC recommends that UCD APM 330 be revised or removed from the UCD APM.

- **UCD APM 330: Junior Specialist Appointments**
  In a similar issue, the JPC reviews many cases where the department is
proposing to move a candidate appointed in the Junior Specialist series directly into an Assistant Specialist position. It appears that many departments use the Junior Specialist title because appointing a post-baccalaureate candidate into the series only requires Dean level approval. UCD APM 330-21 clearly states the following: “This title is not intended to be an initial appointment to the assistant, associate, or full specialist ranks, although it may be possible to advance into that series if the appointee meets the qualifications.” Unfortunately, in most of these cases, the candidate does not meet the qualifications to advance into the assistant level in the Specialist series. In two cases reviewed by the JPC this year, the candidates clearly did not meet the requirements to be appointed in the Specialist series at all and the JPC recommended that the department either petition for extension of the Junior Specialist title or appointment the candidate in a staff title.

- **Checklists for Appointments, Merits and Promotions**
  The Committee had the opportunity to review the Checklists for Appointments, Merits and Promotions for each of the titles reviewed. The JPC understands that the Checklists for Appointments, Merits and Promotions (currently posted on the Academic Personnel web site) were used to develop the list of items to include when faculty build their dossier in MIV and became concerned because the lists are more than ten years old in most cases. The JPC notes that these checklists are out of date and they were not consulted before MIV was developed regarding whether all items on the list should be included or if some items could be removed. In reviewing the checklists, the committee recommended that some items on the list be removed and some items be added in certain cases. In some cases, the JPC recommended that an item be required instead of optional.

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:**
none

**Committee’s narrative:**
The Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel Committee (JPC) met 33 times during this period to review packets. Of the 223 personnel actions reviewed, information on the corresponding final decision was available for 207 actions. The JPC also reviewed 4 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 (223) is 5 more than the caseload from the previous year (218). Table 2 below summarizes the number of actions reviewed by the JPC and the corresponding recommendation:
### TABLE 2: JPC Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointments</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointments via Change in Title</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferral of Emeritus/a Status</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Merits</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merits</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Promotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Reviews</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>223</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The JPC reviewed two 5-year review cases. In one case, the JPC recommended no advancement, performance satisfactory and in the other case, the JPC recommended no advancement, performance unsatisfactory. In both cases, the final authority agreed with the committee recommendations.

In one Redelegated Merit case for a Specialist in Cooperative Extension, the JPC recommendation resulted in a split vote. The final authority did not approve the proposed merit.

---

**APPOINTMENTS and APPOINTMENTS VIA CHANGE IN TITLE**

Once again, most of the actions reviewed were for the relatively new Project Scientist series (effective July 1, 2004) – with 57 proposed appointments plus 5 appointments via change in title. The combined appointments to this series accounted for 56% of all appointments reviewed by the JPC.
The JPC supported 32 of 110 (29%) 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>
<th>Agree w/ JPC</th>
<th>Higher</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Agree with Original Proposal</th>
<th>*Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist &amp; ---in the AES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Higher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO: Lower</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Percent Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is unavailable. Not reflected in agreement percentage.

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 86% of these cases.
2. **NO: Lower**: This means the JPC recommended a lower step (and/or rank) than the level originally proposed. The JPC and the final authority agreed on 82% of these cases.

3. **Other**: In one appointment via change in title case, the JPC voted against appointment in the Professional Researcher series because the record did not support appointment within that series. In addition, the record was not sufficiently independent to warrant the proposed change in title. The JPC recommended promotion to the next level within the candidate's current title series. The final decision agreed with the JPC recommendation.

**MERITS (including Accelerated Merits)**
The JPC supported 62 of the 75 (83%) 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>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist or ___ in the AES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Percent Agreement</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is not available. Not reflected in agreement percentage.

Of the 13 merits which the JPC did not support, the final authority agreed with the JPC in 100% of the cases.

1**Specialist in Cooperative Extension**: In one Redelegated Merit case for a Specialist in Cooperative Extension, the JPC recommendation was a split vote. The final authority did not
approve the proposed merit. In addition, in one Redelegated Merit case for a Specialist in Cooperative Extension, the JPC recommended a retroactive merit, however the final decision was not available.

\[\text{Professional Researcher}\]: In two Redelegated Merit cases for Professional Researchers, the JPC voted in favor of the proposed actions. However, the final decisions were not available.

**PROMOTIONS (including Accelerated Promotions)**
The JPC supported 25 of the 29 (86%) proposed promotions; the final authority agreed with the JPC on (97%) of all promotions. In the four cases where the JPC voted against the promotion; the final authority agreed with the JPC on all four of these actions (100%). Table 5 below summarizes the JPC's recommendations on these promotions:

<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>Agree with Original Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomist &amp; ---in the AES</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Percent Agreement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes actions where the final decision has not been made or the data is not available. Not reflected in agreement percentage.
CONFERRAL OF EMERITUS/A STATUS
The JPC received 2 requests for Conferral of Emeritus status. Both actions were for Specialists in Cooperative Extension. The JPC supported both requests and the final authority agreed.

POSITION DESCRIPTIONS
The primary problem with position descriptions this year was unclear definition of responsibilities mainly in the Project Scientist and Professional Research series. Another problem was the breakdown of categories evaluated into percent time devoted to each. Table 6 below shows the breakdown of recommended position description revisions per title. In requesting the updated PD the JPC is looking for confirmation that the candidate and department have reviewed the expectations and they are still appropriate or they have been updated as necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Series</th>
<th>Revisions Recommended</th>
<th>% of Total Actions per Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Split Appointments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Researcher</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scientist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists in CE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VOTING GROUP & PEER REVIEW PLANS
The JPC reviewed a total of 4 voting group and peer review plans. The JPC’s recommendations are summarized below:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted with Recommended Revisions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected; requiring revisions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The JPC found that 3 of 4 (75%) submitted plans were acceptable without the need for revision, and 1 of 4 (25%) was accepted with recommended revisions.
## APPENDIX - TABLE 1: Committee Recommendations per Title and Action 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Type</th>
<th>---in AES (Agronomist)</th>
<th>Split Appointments*</th>
<th>Professional Researcher</th>
<th>Project Scientist</th>
<th>Specialist in Cooperative Extension</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td>Yes No Other Total</td>
<td>Yes No Other Total</td>
<td>Yes No Other Total</td>
<td>Yes No Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>2 11 0</td>
<td>19 38 0</td>
<td>3 0 0</td>
<td>3 22 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment via Change in Title</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>5 1 0</td>
<td>5 0 5</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2 0</td>
<td>0 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferral of Emeritus Status</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 2</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Merits</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redelegated Merit</td>
<td>2 0 2 8 1 9</td>
<td>14 3 0</td>
<td>14 6 0</td>
<td>8 3 0</td>
<td>7 0 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Merits</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>2 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Promotions</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>12 2 0</td>
<td>10 2 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Year Review</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 2 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2 0 2 10 1 11</td>
<td>35 21 0</td>
<td>50 47 0</td>
<td>97 18 4</td>
<td>22 13 22</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS, ACADEMIC YEAR 2010/2011

prepared by Professor Brian H. Kolner, Chair
bhkolner@ucdavis.edu

October 14, 2011

The Academic Senate Library Committee met only twice during the academic year owing to difficulties in scheduling. Following are synopses of the Committee's activities.

Monday, November 15, 2010, 3:30PM-5:00PM, 410 Mrak Hall

Meeting Summary.

Welcome and Introduction. The chair, B. Kolner, opened the meeting and thanked everyone for coming. He announced that a change of membership and duties for the Library Committee was submitted to CERJ sometime ago but the status of that is unknown. A committee member countered that it was a business item in the previous committee but was not formally discussed. The implications are that the Library Committee will get larger and some schools, such as the School of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine will need bylaw revisions as a result of the change. This item is being tabled for a future meeting.

Academic Senate Requests for Consultation (RFCs). From time to time, this committee is being asked to provide comments on various issues of interest to UC. The comments feature in the Academic Senate Information System (ASIS) is a feature that is available for use to provide comments by members. These items may also be discussed at a committee meeting. After some consensus is reached, the Library Committee Chair, with assistance from the Library Committee Analyst, may submit the committee's response on behalf of the committee to the Davis Division. A presentation by the ASIS programmer to this committee would be helpful. This will be scheduled as soon as possible.

Faculty Response to Librarians on Journal Priorities. G. Yokote provided general information about packages for renewal. She also distributed a handout showing the planning and consultative structure for UC Libraries: http://www.cdlib.org/groups/docs/UCL_Consult_Structure.pdf. The purpose of the handout was to illustrate the various streams used to gather input and feedback for initiatives which the UC Libraries and/or the California Digital Library (CDL) propose and/or implement. The consultative channels include advising UCOP officials (President, Provost Senior VP - Academic Affairs) and SLASIAC on library matters. The center area (Library Planning, Action, Consultation) represents the various committees/groups which the UC University Librarians use to coordinate library public and technical services, collections, and technology efforts. Also, represented are the committees’ groups which the CDL use for their activities. The two side boxes represent consultative streams involving campus groups (Academic Senate, EVCs, etc.) and UC systemwide groups (Council of Academic Senate, LAUC, UCOLASC. The list of ejournals in UC-wide licensed packages can be found at: http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/publisher_info/index.html. UC Davis faculty, staff and students are encouraged to review the title lists and submit comments to his/her librarian subject specialist. One does not need to wait until the ejournal package is subject to renewal. The library has a website called Inside the Library which can be accessed at:

http://www.lib.ucdavis.edu/ul/about/inside
It provides news, blogs and information on or about the library. Messages get sent out to the library reps and the library relies on its reps in colleges and schools. However, the library is sensitive not to inundate faculty with news and messages. The California Digital library (CDL) is under negotiation on behalf of UC. The CDL website lists all of the packages.

How can the library leverage existing space? Perhaps keep one copy instead of three; move the Institute of Governmental Affairs (IGA) out of the Library. No book comes in without one going out of the Physical Sciences Library. Hence a storage facility is needed, currently located in Richmond, CA. It is called the Northern Regional Storage Facility (NRLF).

Task Force Report on the Physical Science Engineering Library. Co-Chair of the task force, R. Siverson, updated the committee on the four charges of the task force. He indicated that the first charge was now complete. The committee has three more tasks to tackle and will do so in the weeks and months ahead. While doing its work, the task force received helpful information from Acting Co-Librarians G. Yokote and H. Henry. These two individuals are shepherding the library. It was indicated that the library’s budget cut will be phased in over three years. If, however, the budget situation becomes more manageable, the scholarly service function of the library will surely be enhanced.

Report on the Search for a University Librarian. The search has been suspended. The Chancellor is looking into possibilities for an internal solution.

Monday, May 23, 2011, 3:00 PM Shields Library, 1st Floor Conference Room

Meeting Summary.

Bio-Ag Journals Update. Karen Andrews, Head Librarian, PSE Library gave a detailed account of why and how certain journals in the Bio-Ag sector are being dropped. This was in response to criticism from some faculty that this process was not done in an open and transparent way. Karen gave a compelling argument as to the openness and necessity of these actions.

Issues Confronting the Future of the UC Davis Libraries. Randy Siverson, University Librarian, UC Davis. Professor Siverson gave a talk about the future issues confronting the UCD libraries which rest on the current financial crisis facing the entire UC system. He presented some options for dealing with the large budget reductions planned for the libraries and also some ideas about how to better utilize space in the current library buildings.

Academic Senate Requests for Consultation. Chair Kolner highlighted several current AS Requests for Consultations as well as the impending SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force Interim Report.

Comments on the SLASIAC Library Planning Task Force Interim Report. In May Executive Vice Chancellor and Chair of the Library Planning Task Force released the Interim Report of the Task Force, convened by the Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC), for review and comment. The report may be viewed or downloaded at

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/taskforce

Chair of the AS Library Committee Kolner read the report and sent the following comments to SLASIAC:

“In general, the report is comprehensive (if not lengthy and a bit redundant), but the main recommendations make sense. The goals of the recommendations:

1. Improve efficiency by leveraging the size and scope of the UC System.
2. Manage collection growth and reduce duplication.

3. Scrutinize library building space and use for future scholarly.

4. Continue a strong position with expensive journal publishers and encourage faculty to move toward open-access journals modalities.

5. Spread the efforts out over a 3-year, 3-phase approach.

seem justified and well-reasoned. My only criticisms so far revolve around two points:

1. The report is long on global goals but short on specific ideas and mechanisms. Perhaps it is intended to be left to the functional organizations such as CoUL, COVC, SLASIAC, CDL and LAUC.

2. There is only scant mention of UCOLASC which is really the main point of entry for faculty input into the process from the Academic Senate. Since the primary users of the library resources are faculty faculty and students, it would seem that UCOLASC and some student representation should be integrated into the detailed plans for cost savings in the future.

In addition, a specific issue that is changing rapidly with technology and has a direct impact on the cost of libraries to universities is the structure, operation, cost and importance of peer-reviewed journals. I think the SLASIAC report could have included more ideas on this point.

The big picture as I see it: The high cost of maintaining access to scholarly materials is due to the historical model that pertains today. Namely:

1. The legitimacy of the scholarly materials rests on peer review which is, in many cases, organized and run by businesses that therefore carefully guard the process.

2. Said businesses are often the publishers of the scholarly information and therefore have a vested interest in maintaining control over and pricing of access to these materials.

With electronic communications and near-instant access of materials in digital form from virtually anywhere in the world, the historic model will eventually crumble as the principal users of the scholarly work can no longer pay the rapidly increasing costs required by the purveyors of the traditional print media. In fact, because of the speed and availability provided by the internet, the "information-guarded-by-business" model is no longer necessary to achieve timely dissemination. The only hurdle is that of legitimacy the materials engendered by peer review. In many non-profit environments, peer review is managed by volunteers who are themselves scholars interested in the welfare of the dissemination process. Therefore, this model is successful and, coupled with the internet and "server farms" supported at a base cost by article, journal or society fees (or combinations thereof), there is no necessity for a "for-profit" middleman and they will eventually fall by the wayside.

These ideas of course do not preclude the necessity of infrastructure to manage the operations of the scholarly materials and dissemination. It is likely that as time goes by, the infrastructure can and will be replaced by "software" (quotes implying a complete lack of vision as to what form this might take). Could the CDL (UC) take a leading role in this? I think there is a fair chance that could. However, the cost of initiation would likely be high and the return on the investment, sought by user fees and canceled subscriptions to outdated paper journals, might take a very long time. Also, there would be a sizable time lag as acceptance and adoption by other institutions could take years.”

Brian H. Kolner, October 14, 2011
Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-11
Davis Division: Academic Senate
Committee on Planning & Budget

Total Meetings: 19
Meeting frequency: biweekly; as needed
Average hours of committee work each week: members: varies. Chair: 5-8 hrs/week

Total proposals/items reviewed: 64 (TOEs-2, POPs-0, Endowments-12, others-50)
Total deferred proposals from the previous year: none
Total proposals deferred to the coming academic year: none

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: Davis Division Bylaw 48(C): Committee on Planning and Budget. The proposed amendment changed the title of the center for ex-officio member of the Instructional Space Advisory Committee to the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: none

Issues considered by the committee: see Committee’s Narrative below

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year, or general carry-over items:

CPB recommendations for 2011-12:

- CPB would like to examine the Target of Opportunity for Excellence process. This would include reviewing data from the last 10 years. The data would include grants, dept/unit the candidate was hired into, teaching responsibilities, and salary information.

- Any department merger or disestablishment must involve review by the affected members of the Academic Senate and Academic Federation and the administration, as well as input from impacted students, according to the guidelines described in the relevant section of the campus Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM 200-20: Establishment/Revision of Academic Units).

- CPB recommends that there be more faculty participation on F&A/indirect cost policy issues. More faculty participation would allow the campus to come up with a more effective recovery rate on grants. CPB would like to request a revised presentation based on comments from CPB and COR in Fall 2011 before the final rate proposal is submitted.

- CPB would like to request data on all appointments and retentions on an annual basis. These data must include information on salary, research support, start-up and retention packages, and teaching responsibilities.

- It is requested that CPB be involved in both the funding streams and new budget model projects at UC Davis. The committee feels strongly that faculty participation and input is critical to help fulfill the UC Davis Vision for the Future.

- CPB should have a role in the allocation of FTEs. For planning purposes, CPB recommends that departments have a target size, understanding that due to the current budget situation, this may be a goal not a reality.
COMMITTEE’S NARRATIVE

The Academic Senate Davis Division Planning and Budget Committee (CPB) considered matters regarding policy on academic planning, budget, and resource allocations according to Davis Division Bylaw 48. Ann Orel, the Chair of CPB, also served as CPB’s representative to Representative Assembly and as a member on Executive Council. CPB member Chris van Kessel served as the Committee’s representative on the UC Systemwide Planning and Budget Committee (UCPB) and provided regular updates to the Committee. The two members appointed to CPB’s Instructional Space Advisory Group Subcommittee (ISAG) were: Susan Keen and Kent Wilken.

This section outlines the Committee’s activity in 2010-2011 regarding the following review items:

I. GUESTS WHO ATTENDED CPB 2010-11 MEETINGS

- Ralph Hexter, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
- Kelly Ratliff, Associate Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management
- John Meyer, Vice Chancellor, Administrative and Resource Management
- Mike Allred, Associate Vice Chancellor of Finance
- Mike Legrand, Director of Cost Policy and Analysis
- Chris Carter, Budget Director, Administrative and Resource Management
- Gary Ford, Director, Summer Session
- Deans and Faculty Executive Chairs:
  - 2/28: Dean Harold Levine, School of Education

II. ENDOWMENT, PARTNER OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, AND TARGET OF EXCELLENCE PROPOSALS

Endowment Proposals Reviewed (12 reviewed):
- Maxine Adler, School of Veterinary Medicine, Genetics
- Maxine Adler, School of Veterinary Medicine, Oncology
- John Ayer, School of Law, Bankruptcy Law
- Robert and Rosabel Osborne, College of Biological Sciences, Evolution and Ecology
- Arline Miller Rolkin, Professorship, SOM: Clinical Effectiveness
- Arline Miller Rolkin, School of Medicine, Health Innovation
- Arline Miller Rolkin, School of Medicine, Informatics
- Arline Miller Rolkin, School of Medicine, Physiology and Membrane Biology
- Arline Miller Rolkin, School of Medicine, Population Health Policy
- Arline Miller Rolkin, School of Medicine, Public Health Sciences
- Arthur H. Rosenfeld, Energy Efficiency
- School of Medicine Dean’s Chair in Medical Microbiology and Immunology

Partner Opportunity Program Proposals (0 reviewed)

Target of Excellence Proposals Reviewed (2 reviewed)
- David Lloyd, English
- Thomas O’Rourke, Civil and Environmental Engineering

III. BUSINESS ACTION REVIEW ITEMS FROM AS CHAIR AND/ OR SYSTEMWIDE

1. GSM: Professional Accountancy Proposal
2. Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions (Downsizing)
3. Post Employment Benefits
4. Merger Proposal: Human & Community Development and Environmental Design
5. Renaming Fees to Tuition
6. UC Senate Membership Task Force Report
7. Proposal to Revise APM 10 and 15 (Academic Freedom)
IV. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS AND TOPICS OF DISCUSSION

a. **Discussions with AVC Ratliff and Provost Hexter:** CPB discussed budget/planning with AVC Kelly Ratliff and Provost Hexter several times throughout the year. Discussion items included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Discussed the Budget Ideas list including the proposed savings for each proposal on the list
- Reviewed several Budget Ideas Whitepapers including the Faculty Salary Cost Recovery and Efficiency Ideas: Reduce Numbers of Staff Managers/Supervisors
- Compared the Budget Ideas with the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) reports from 2008-09
- Reviewed the areas and amounts to be targeted for future budget cuts
b. **Faculty Salary Cost Recovery:** CPB sent a letter to Vice Chancellor Lewin regarding faculty salary cost recovery on grants. CPB discussed the issue in May and felt that the issue was very time sensitive since one of the NIH deadlines is in the spring. There was concern that if faculty waited for information to move down from the Deans that time would be lost and opportunities for the current grant cycle would not be used. CPB strongly advised that the Vice Chancellor send notification of the faculty salary cost recovery plan to all PIs and encourage them to redirect part of their salaries to their grants if feasible.

c. **F&A/Indirect Cost Rates:** CPB met with Associate Vice Chancellor Mike Allred and Mike Legrand on June 24, 2011 to discuss the F&A Rate proposal process. The chair of the Committee on Research was also invited to attend the meeting. CPB had several recommendations after hearing the presentation. CPB recommends that there be more faculty participation on F&A policy issues including representatives from CPB and COR. CPB agrees that having faculty input will allow the campus to come up with an effective recovery rate on grants.

d. **Funding Streams/New Budget Model:** CPB discussed the systemwide funding streams project with Provost Hexter and AVC Ratliff. CPB hopes to be involved in constructing the new budget model. Having faculty input and participation is critical. In addition, CPB endorses the FUTURES report and feels that a comprehensive program review process in which the Senate actively participates throughout the process, with CPB, Undergraduate Council, and Graduate Council taking a major role.

e. **Forensic Science Self-Supporting Program:** At the request of Graduate Council, CPB reviewed the Forensic Science Self-Supporting program. Graduate Council conducted its own full review of the program and that report was distributed to CPB for consideration during their review. Overall, CPB recommends that the program costs for each of the self-supporting programs be reviewed annually. In addition, sufficient data to assess true costs and revenue must be supplied to CPB as part of this review process. Furthermore, CPB recommends that an appropriate rate be determined for all the self-supporting programs on campus, (analogous to on and off campus overhead rate determinations for research grants) that the University should charge the programs to reflect the true costs to the University of maintaining these kinds of self-supporting programs.

f. **Department Merger/Disestablishment Principles:** During the 2010-11 academic year, CPB received a number of proposals to merge and in some cases disestablish academic departments and programs. These proposals, in many cases, seem not to originate from academic planning in the Academic Senate, but from the Dean’s level, usually in response to budget issues. CPB acknowledges that in this time of budget crisis, there may be a need to prune academic programs. However, CPB believes that there should be principles that guide such a process.

g. **Reallocation of Faculty FTE:** In light of the many department mergers and disestablishment proposals, CPB discussed the establishment of guidelines for the transition period, i.e., while members of a disestablished department remain with the campus. CPB proposes that any shift of a faculty member from a disestablished or merged department to another department must be approved under existing procedures. This involves departmental faculty as well as the college and campus administration. In addition, the following problems must be considered: (1) degree programs, (2) service courses, (3) space, and (4) support budget.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann Orel (chair), Tom Famula (member), Jack Gunion (member), Jerry Last (member), Jonna Mazet (member), Bahram Ravani (member), Phillip Shaver (member), Julia Simon (member), Chris van Kessel (member), Bob Powell (advisor), John Oakley (advisor), Jim Chalfant (guest), and Christophe Morisseau (Academic Federation Representative)
### Committee on Privilege and Tenure

<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>Investigative: 3</td>
<td>Investigative: quarterly</td>
<td>Investigative: 6 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearings: 0</td>
<td>Hearings: As Needed</td>
<td>Hearings: dependent on workload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigative: Total grievances: 3</th>
<th>Investigative: Total grievances deferred from previous year: 1</th>
<th>Investigative: Total grievances continued: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hearings: Total Hearings: 0;</td>
<td>Hearings: Total hearings/matters deferred from previous year: 0</td>
<td>Hearings: Total hearings/matters continued: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Disciplinary Matters Referred: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:**
None

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

**Issues considered by the committee**
None beyond routine review of matters referred to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

**Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:**
None
Committee’s narrative:

Investigative:

As of August 31, 2010:

One grievance did not meet *prima facie*.
Three investigations were carried over into 2011-12.
  One case remains under review.
  One case awaits more information.

Hearing:

No activity
Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-11
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Public Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 1</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: as needed; UCDE proposals reviewed electronically</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total UCDE Proposals Reviewed: 5 (See below.)</td>
<td>Total reviewed items deferred from the previous year: None</td>
<td>Total items 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:
- Resignation of originally appointed Chair and appointment and installation of replacement Co-chairs.
- Delay in PSC review and comment on UCDE certificate proposal caused by the resignation of appointed Chair and the selection, appointment and installation of replacement Co-chairs.
- Postponement of DSPSA selection process until the selection, appointment and installation of replacement Co-chairs—necessitated by the resignation of appointed Chair for health reasons.
- Carrying over the nominations of non-recipients from the previous year to the current year.
- Streamlining the DSPSA selection process to bring its timeline current with those of the Representative Assembly and the academic year.
- A more aggressive approach to publicizing the DSPSA, its recipients and UCD’s public service.

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

Committee’s narrative:

The committee’s charge, Davis Division Bylaw 88, can be found via the following link: http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/ceji/manual/dd_bylaws.cfm?CFID=24354&CFTOKEN=67079693#88-

The overarching committee charge is “to review and advise on non-personnel matters relating to the involvement of faculty in public service activities.” The three principle tasks of the charge are to “Select up to four members of the faculty to receive the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award (DSPSA) . . . review new offerings and the approval process for courses carrying University Extension credit . . . [and] establish policies and criteria for admission to University Extension courses.”

The 2010-11 academic year began with the unfortunate and untimely resignation of the Chair of the committee, for health reasons. Although the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award Call for Nominations could be distributed before it became apparent that the appointed Chair would have to resign, the subsequent review and selection processes for the award and the committee review of one UCD Extension certificate program proposal had to be postponed until the chair position could be filled.
The 2010-11 Call for DSPSA Nominations was distributed on October 13, 2010, via the Academic Senate list serve.

Vito Polito, the appointed chair of the committee, submitted his resignation on October 22, 2010.

Lynn Roller and Marc Schenker were appointed Co-chairs of the committee as of December 16, 2010.

After Co-chairs Roller and Schenker were informed of the status of the committee and its business items, attention was focused on the DSPSA selection process and the committee response to the UCD Extension certificate program proposal that was submitted on October 22, 2010. A favorable and supportive committee recommendation letter regarding the UCDE proposal was sent to Dennis Pendleton, Dean of the UCD Extension, on January 10, 2011.

Only one committee meeting needed to be scheduled for the academic year. The welcoming and introductory meeting, traditionally scheduled in the Fall (October/November), was scheduled during the Winter Quarter, on February 4, 2011. At this meeting, Co-chairs Lynn Roller and Marc Schenker welcomed those attending, explained how they came to be appointed, and drew attention to the committee’s normal business cycle and the need to bring the annual business current. Co-Chair Roller concluded members’ introductions with a brief background of the PSC, focusing on its two main tasks: the selection of up to four recipients for the 2010 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award; and the review of University of California, Davis, Extension certificate program proposals. The established procedures for the committee’s review of UDCE proposals, including the committee’s recommendation letter, were presented and accepted as viable. (These procedures are described in the minutes of the meeting.)

The discussion of the nominations for the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award that had been received by the November 15, 2010, deadline began with a conversation on the criteria to be used in selecting award recipients. The conversation included a summary of what previous committees had considered and deliberated. (The committee’s 2009-10 annual report is referenced for this information.) The discussion of the nominations concluded with the selection of Amparo Villablanca, Ross Thompson, Neal Fleming and Jeffrey Williams as the 2010-11 DSPSA recipients to be recommended to the Representative Assembly for approval.

On February 24, 2011, the Representative Assembly approved the committee’s recommended recipients for the 2010-11 DSPSA.

On May 11, 2011, at the Academic Senate and Academic Federation Awards Reception, each of the recipients was presented an honorarium and a certificate mounted on a plaque. Each recipient was also publically recognized in a brochure that was distributed at the reception, and each will be added to the DSPSA list of recipients maintained on the Academic Senate, Davis Division website.

The committee conducted electronic reviews of five new UCDE proposals. With the exception of the proposal presented for review in the Fall, all UCDE proposals were reviewed in a timely manner.

The committee did not pursue the proposed change to Davis Division bylaw 88 that the 2008-09 committee postponed to the 2009-10 academic year and was not addressed during that year. The change proposed that the Director of the Public Service Research Program no longer be designated as an ex-officio member of the committee. The rationale for the proposed change was based on two considerations. First, the change would reflect the current status of the Public Service Research Program. (The Public Service Research Program had been an independent unit, but it had since become a program within the John Muir Institute of the Environment.) Second, the change would allow the more appropriate rotation of the position among outreach/public service units. Because positions comparable to the PSRP Director’s position exist in other units on campus, it seemed reasonable to rotate the ex-officio position among them.
Although this proposed change was not pursued during the 2010-11 academic year, the following information came to light when Joyce Gutstein, former Director of the Public Service Research Program, was consulted via email October 7, 2010, and replied as follows:

The Public Service Research Program is fully absorbed into the John Muir Institute of the Environment and no one is the director of PSRP anymore. So, you may need to do nothing, as the Program is no longer a free standing entity.

Thus, I do recommend, as I have in the past, that such an “ex officio” position become a rotating one among campus units that conduct significant outreach/public service. PSRP has contributed for many years, and a rotating position would bring new perspectives to the Public Service Committee. Examples of entities that might then qualify include the Agricultural Sustainability Institute, Davis Humanities Institute, John Muir Institute of the Environment, and the Center for Regional Change (in CA&ES: another example of a unit that conducts and promotes significant engagement beyond the campus—as part of its core mission). Perhaps this could be the focus for a change in the bylaws.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Roller, Co-Chair
Marc Schenker, Co-Chair
Robin Erbacher
Philip Martin
Michael O’Mahony
Ravi Dasu, Academic Federation Representative
Michele Fortes, Academic Federation Representative
Bernd Hamann, ex-officio
Jacquelyn Hague, delegated replacement for William Lacy, ex-officio
Dennis Pendleton, ex-officio
Baxter Boeh, ASUCD Representative

Bryan Rodman, Committee Resource Analyst
### 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COR Policy: 9</td>
<td>COR Policy: Approx. 3 meetings/quarter</td>
<td>4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR Grants: 5</td>
<td>COR Grants: 1-2 meetings in fall quarter and 2-3 meetings in the spring quarter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Grant Proposals Reviewed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Grants (2K): 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Grants (10-25K): 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Initiative/Collaborative Interdisciplinary: 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Grants ($800): 354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of reviewed grant proposals deferred from the previous year:</th>
<th>Total projects deferred to the coming academic year:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Grant Proposals Approved for Funding in 2011-12:
- Small Grants (2K): 110
- Large Grants (10-25K): 10
- New Initiative/Collaborative Interdisciplinary: 74
- Travel Grants ($800): 354

Listing of bylaw changes proposed: **Davis Division Bylaw 99 (Committee on Research):** The proposed amendment changes the structure of the Committee on Research by consolidating the two subcommittees into a single committee, and a subcommittee of which would review grant applications. The subcommittee would consist of the voting Senate members of the parent committee.

Listing of committee policies established or revised: **Funding cutoffs for all programs will be determined by availability of funds.** The committee will examine the policies again during the 2011-2012 academic year and will...
Committee’s narrative:
The Committee on Research Policy subcommittee dealt with a number of issues of substantial importance to the campus during the 2010-2011 academic year. The Committee on Research Chair attended Senate Executive Council meetings, Representative Assembly meetings, Provost Senate Chair’s meetings, and had frequent updates with Vice Chancellor Klein (fall quarter), Interim Vice Chancellor Stan Nosek (winter quarter), Vice Chancellor Lewin (spring quarter), and other representatives from the Office of Research.

The Vice Chancellor for Research (or a representative from his office) regularly attended the Committee on Research Policy meetings and provided information and updates on campus and systemwide issues, including the ongoing reorganization of Sponsored Programs. The committee routinely invited various faculty members and officials from the campus for discussion and advice on policy issues important to research, including the review of ORU’s, effort reporting, technology transfer, extramural accounting, graduate programs, the performance and reorganization of the office of research, and campus-wide budget issues that affect research programs at UC Davis.
Important COR Items Discussed/Reviewed During 2010-11:

2011-2012 COR Grant Awards
The Committee on Research Grants (CoRG) subcommittee awarded 110 Small Grants in Aid and 10 New Initiative/Collaborative Interdisciplinary Grants to Promote Extramural Funding. The committee also awarded 354 Research Travel Grants during the 2010-2011 academic year. The relative distribution of monies across campus remained consistent with an approximately 50/50 distribution between the “hard” and “soft” disciplines. Travel grants remain the first priority of the grants program.

Committee on Research Budget
As a result of reductions in the UC Davis budget, the budget for the Committee on Research was reduced by 8%. This was for the current 2010-11 fiscal year and also a permanent budget reduction for the COR budget. This resulted in a $79,593.00 reduction in the COR Grants budget for 2010-2011. Fortunately, the Committee on Research budget was able to absorb these cuts this year by reducing the total number of grants awarded. Overall, the Committee on Research grants program was able to stay within budget. However, further budget reductions of this magnitude will make it nearly impossible for the committee to sustain its grant programs. Over the last four academic years, the Committee on Research budget has been reduced by more than $280,000.00.

Approved Revisions to Davis Division Bylaw 99
The proposed amendments to Davis Division Bylaw 99 were approved by the Representative Assembly on June 3, 2011. The approved amendments change the structure of the Committee on Research by consolidating the two subcommittees into a single committee, a subcommittee of which would review grant applications. The subcommittee would consist of the voting Senate members of the parent committee. The rationale for the amendment was that it would reduce staffing needs by consolidating two separate committees. The change will also reduce the workload of the Committee on Committees, who will have ten fewer members to recruit. In addition, there has been difficulty in the past recruiting members of the COR Grants committee because they are not eligible to compete for non-travel research grants due to conflict of interest.

As stated in the original Bylaw amendment proposal, the amendment would become effective September 1, 2012. However, it was determined that the Committee on Committees already recruited members for each separate committee (COR Policy and COR Grants) for the 2011-2012 academic year. To resolve this issue, a motion was proposed and approved during the June 3, 2011 Representative Assembly meeting. The motion stated that the amendment of DDB 99 be effective immediately, upon adoption, with the exception that for the 2011-2012 academic year only, the membership of the committee be no more than 21, the initial 21 members being those who have been approved for
membership on the committee, and whose terms of service are to be determined by the Committee on Committees. The motion was voted on and approved so the 2011-2012 Committee on Research membership will be a combination of both committees (those appointed to COR Policy and COR Grants for 2011-12) with a total of no more than 21 members.

**Composite Fringe Benefit Rates**

The Committee on Research Policy learned in January 2011 that the campus was proposing to change the benefit policies for employees and institute composite fringe benefit rates. On March 23, 2011, the Committee on Research Policy met with Director of Cost Policy and Analysis, Mike Legrand (Accounting and Financial Services) to discuss the plan to institute composite fringe benefit rates on grant proposals. Initially, the committee had several concerns. One main concern was the transition costs for existing grants. The committee noted that a change in benefit policy for existing grants that had already been negotiated and signed by both the faculty and the federal government would randomly add or subtract direct cost dollars to the PI’s account that he/she was unable to plan for. After considering the potentially serious concerns regarding the new composite fringe benefit rates, COR Policy agreed to send a letter stating the concerns to Provost Hexter. In addition, the composite fringe benefits issue was brought forward by COR Policy for discussion at a ProvostSenate Chairs meeting where Provost Hexter supported a policy that would “hold harmless” PI’s who were negatively affected by the change in policy. COR Policy strongly agreed that this was highly important to avoid potential laboratory shut downs or unplanned negative grant balances caused by the policy change.

In a letter dated May 19, 2011 to CODVC; Provost Hexter wrote that he would support a program to provide supplemental funding to mitigate or offset the impacts for PI’s negatively affected by the composite benefits policy change. The proposal from the Provost was made in good faith with the understanding that the change in benefits policy represents the following long term advantages: (1) provide a long term improvement and consistent accumulation and allocation of fringe benefits expenses required by Cost Accounting Standards, and (2) simplify the accounting for fringe benefits expenses and standardize benefit costs across employee groups.

**UCTV/UC Seminar Network**

On May 25, 2011, COR Policy met with Professor Jim Carey regarding the UC Seminar Network and UCTV. Professor Carey discussed the initiative and provided a demo of the UCTV technology for the committee. CORP fully endorsed the use of this technology and agreed that UC Davis should be given credit for the launch of this new technology as the campus will realize many benefits in research, teaching, and outreach. CORP agreed to send a letter of support to Chair Powell stating that many of the committee members had already thought about recording their lectures as a feedback tool for teaching and the UCTV technology would work very well to fill that role.
Committee on Research Funding

During the 2010-11 academic year, the Committee on Research-Grants discussed funding sources for the Committee on Research (COR) grant programs. The Academic Senate Committee on Research grant program is funded currently from indirect cost return from state funded contract and grants (19920). In addition, the committee is concerned because UC Davis appears to be the only campus that receives funding from a state-funded source for the Committee on Research grant programs. Over the last four fiscal years, COR has experienced a total of approximately 32% in budget reductions. This totals approximately $280,000.00. COR Grants is concerned that as long as the funding is from a state source (19920), the program will be inappropriately targeted for future permanent budget reductions. Additional reductions will severely impact the Divisional Senate’s ability to meet the membership’s need for research funding. In April 2011, the committee sent a letter to Chair Powell requesting that COR funding be reallocated to a non-state source.

Respectfully submitted,

CoR Grants Subcommittee
David Fyhrie, Chair
Gino Cortopassi
David Hwang
Judy Jernstedt
Marjorie Longo
Nelson Max
Sally McKee
Dan Ragland
Gerhard Richter
Ed Taylor
Xiangdong Zhu
Kimberly Pulliam, Analyst

CoR Policy Subcommittee
David Fyhrie, Chair
Gino Cortopassi, Vice Chair
Zhaojun Bai
Kent Erickson
Oscar Jorda
Lynn Kimsey
Mike Kleeman
Mark Matthews
Jade McCutcheon
Chris Miller
Marty Privalsky
Subhash Risbud
Jeff Walton, AF Representative
Harris Lewin, VC for Research, Ex-officio
Kimberly Pulliam, Analyst
## Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-11
### Davis Division: Academic Senate

### Undergraduate Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings: 16</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: <strong>Meetings were held every other week during fall, winter and spring quarters, and one time during summer quarter.</strong></th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: <strong>Chair can expect up to 5 hours per week; committee members, approximately 1 hour per week.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Proposals Reviewed: 32</td>
<td>Total proposals deferred from the previous year: <strong>2</strong> (Proposed Engineering Minors: Energy Efficiency; and Sustainability in the Built Environment)</td>
<td>Total projects deferred/continued to the coming academic year: <strong>3</strong> (Proposed Engineering Minors in Materials Science; Computational Biology &amp; Bioinformatics; and Biomedical Engineering)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:** None.

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

**Recommended Procedural changes recommended for the coming year:** None.

**Issues reviewed and considered by the committee:**

1. Undergraduate Major in Managerial Economics in the Graduate School of Management
2. Proposed Minor in Engineering: Energy Efficiency
3. Proposed Minor in Engineering: Sustainability in the Built Environment
4. Academic Council and UCLA Resolutions regarding Downsizing
5. Proposal to Merge Human & Community Development and Environmental Design
6. White Paper Suggesting Changes in Management of Animals Used in Teaching and Research
7. Proposed Policy Changes to Address Hate Crimes
8. Revised Proposal for New Major: Sustainable Agriculture and Food Systems
9. Proposed Minor in Human Rights
10. Proposal to Discontinue Avian Science Major
11. Impacted Courses
12. Proposed Davis Division Regulations Revisions: 528-Credit by Examination; A540-Grades
13. Report of the Special Committee on Student Evaluation of Teaching
Committee's narrative:

Undergraduate Council (UGC) has statutory authority over undergraduate education and programs. This includes establishing policy for undergraduate education on the Davis campus, as well as developing and reviewing campus wide educational objectives and criteria for evaluating educational effectiveness; establishing policy and exercising authority to approve or not approve establishment and discontinuation of undergraduate programs; authority on academic disqualifications and or/dismissals, and authority over undergraduate transcript notations.

Four subcommittees report to the UGC. The Committee on General Education was particularly active this year preparing for the implementation of the new GE requirements in Fall 2011. The GE Implementation Task Force, co-chaired by Chris Thaiss, realized the review of thousands of courses for their appropriateness as GE listings and developed clear implementation guidelines for new, continuing and transfer students in fall 2011. The UGC commends and thanks Chris and the GE Committee for what appears to be a successful transition to the new requirements this fall.

The Special Academic Programs Committee, chaired by Diane Strazdes, developed a set of guidelines for Academic Senate review of Special Programs and used these to review two undergraduate programs, the Intern and Career
Center, and the Undergraduate Research Center. The ICC got high marks for their valuable services and the committee’s only concern was that further reductions in ICC funding will have grave impact on its effectiveness. The Special Programs Committee was less enthusiastic about the URC and concerns about the effectiveness of student advising at URC and its potential redundancy with other campus advising services. The committee also expressed concerns about the lack of participation of Humanities and Arts students and the overall low number of faculty involvement in the URC annual research conference. The Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies, Pat Turner, wrote a detailed rebuttal to the Committee’s report and both the committee report and the VP’s rebuttal will be considered by the 2011-2012 UGC.

The Undergraduate Program Review committee, co-chaired by Dan Potter and Carl Whithaus, successfully completed the scheduled reviews of the Science and Society (SAS) and Atmospheric Science (ATM) programs. The Review Committee made suggestions for maintaining the integrity of the relatively small ATM major in the current budgetary difficult environment. Reviews of some LSA programs have been delayed because of lack of materials being provided the committee.

The Committee on Preparative Education, chaired by Alessa Johns, reviewed the the ESL Task Force proposal to required ESL coursework from Linguistics to University Writing Program (UWP). The Committee on Preparatory Education voted to support the move as did the UGC. On a somewhat related matter, the Committee expressed concerns that because transfer students are not required to take UWP lower division courses, many transfer students lack basic writing skills.

UGC’s counterpart at the UC system wide level is the UC Education Policy committee (UCEP). This committee meets once per month in at UOP in Oakland. UGC Chair John Yoder served as a representative to UCEP and in this capacity he provided regular updates to UGC about issues relating to undergraduate education on UC campuses system wide.

Probably the most problematic issue that came before UGC is the increasing number of requests from Departments and Colleges to discontinue or consolidate majors. The trend towards major closings or consolidations are largely driven by financial constraints and the UGC expressed concerns that administrative decisions driving by budgetary anxiety are not necessarily the most appropriate decisions from a campus or system wide viewpoint. The UGC would like to see proposals to eliminate majors clearly describe the academic rationale for such actions. The proposals need to include plans for student continuing in the major once admissions are suspended. Because existing students are allowed to finish in the major being closed, it is generally necessary to close admissions to a major prior to its formal discontinuance. Requests to close admissions to major
should therefore include the information and rationalization required to
discontinue the major.

The ASUCD representatives on UGC, Rodolfo Ornelas and Matthew Blair
brought forward the issue of that the minimum progress requirement can be
burdensome to students who need to work while taking classes. With gracious
assistance of the University Registrar Frank Wada, the UGC reviewed student
achievement data and came to the conclusion that the data did not warrant
changing the minimum progress requirement at this time.

Respectfully submitted,

John Yoder, Chair
John Bolander
Gregory Dobbins
Patrick Farrell
Alessa Johns
Susan Keen
Janet Roser
Diana Strazdes
Christopher Thaiss
Shrinivasa Upadhyaya
Carl Whithaus
Matthew Blair (ASUCD Rep)
Rudy Ornelas (ASUCD Rep)
Amaan Shaikh (ASUCD Rep)
Patricia Turner (Ex-Officio – Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies)
Frank Wada (Ex-Officio – University Registrar)
Nancy Kilpatrick, Undergraduate Council Analyst
Issues Considered by the Committee

- Approval criteria to be applied by Committee on Courses of Instruction to new and existing courses proposed to meet Topical Breadth and Core Literacies of GE3
- Coordination with Office of the Registrar and Deans’ offices re; implementation of GE3, to go into effect Fall 2011
- Evaluation of proposed catalog changes re: GE3
- Proposed changes to DDR 522 re: GE policies concerning transfer students, off-campus coursework, and Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit
- Development and initial testing of procedures for ongoing assessment of GE3
- Coordination of assessment design with Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies re: requirements of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

Recommended Procedural or Policy Changes for the Coming Year

a. We recognize that GE procedural and policy questions will continue to arise from departments and administrative offices in coming years, with ongoing implementation of the new GE requirements, and that the Committee will need to address these in a timely fashion (as we did in 2010-11).

b. A permanent charge of the Committee is “continuous review of the effectiveness of the General Education program.” Especially as the new GE program has many more facets and more stringent criteria than the former program, fulfillment of this charge will require some resources and support (for example, some Academic Senate staff support). We note, also, that the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will continue to be very concerned about GE assessment and will want the Committee to work with them on measures and procedures.
Committee Narrative

The many issues dealt with by the GE Committee in this very active year concerned the impending effective date (Fall 2011) for the new General Education requirements (GE3). Some of these will mean ongoing responsibilities of the committee as implementation proceeds.

1. Approval of criteria to be applied by the Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) to new and existing courses proposed to meet Topical Breadth and Core Literacies of GE3

After conclusion of the course approval work of the GE Implementation Task Force in 2010, COCI took on full Senate responsibility for approvals of all new and changed courses in regard to GE criteria. The GE Committee was consulted by COCI in refining interpretation of these criteria to ensure efficiency of COCI’s process.

2. Coordination with Office of the Registrar and Deans’ offices re; implementation of GE3, to go into effect Fall 2011

We assume that, as the new GE requirements affect new students beginning this fall, questions will continue to arise and be referred to the Committee from the Office of the Registrar, Dean’s offices, and departments/programs regarding procedures, criteria, and regulations. In 2010-11, for example, questions arose regarding differences between GE2 and GE3, policies for transfer students, differences between Senate regulations and college policies, policies for continuing students doing off-campus coursework, course approval criteria and procedures, etc. In some instances, the GE Committee referred these questions to other responsible committees, but in others the GE Committee was the most knowledgeable respondent. (See below (4) for an example of cross-committee cooperation in resolving questions through change in DDR 522.)

3. Evaluation of proposed catalog changes re: GE3

The Office of the Registrar sought the GE Committee’s comments on catalog copy for the 2011-12 supplement. Our comments were submitted to the Undergraduate Council. Eventually, areas of comment concerning transfer policies became the subject of cross-committees’ consultation (CERJ, COCI, GE, UGC) that resulted in changes to DDR 522.

4. Proposed changes to DDR 522 re: GE policies concerning transfer students, off-campus coursework, and Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credit

The amendments to DDR 522 were proposed by CERJ in consultation with GE, COCI, and UGC. The amendments were approved by the Representative Assembly in June.
Each will facilitate the ongoing implementation of GE3 by the Registrar and the colleges.

5. Development and initial testing of procedures for ongoing assessment of GE3

An assessment plan was not embodied in the approved new GE requirements but it is part of the ongoing charge of the GE Committee requiring “continuous review of the effectiveness of the General Education program.” With no prior plan in place to assess GE at UC Davis, the committee based its design of methods on practices at other institutions and discussed by the GE Assessment Task Force of the Reinvention Center (a consortium of research universities to which UC Davis belongs).

Without assigned Academic Senate staff support or other assigned resources, what we could undertake was very limited; nevertheless, we decided to begin a systematic survey of a cross-colleges sample of instructors of approved GE courses in regard to their plans for meeting the new criteria. Several members of the Committee created lists of courses that would be surveyed in regard to specific core literacies: writing experience, scientific literacy, and American culture, history and governance were selected for this pilot study. The Committee was fortunate to have the assistance of three GSRs supported by a grant from the Spencer and Teagle foundations (the Committee chair is PI) for the assessment of the “writing experience” sample. (This grant expires in December 2011). Collection of data will continue through this Fall, but the Committee does not know at this point how it might be continued.

6. Coordination of assessment design with Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies re: requirements of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)

An additional impetus toward assessment of the new GE program comes from UC Davis’s regional accreditor, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The Committee chair, the chair of the Academic Senate, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies met with WASC representatives in 2010 to hear WASC expectations for a GE assessment plan. Subsequently, the Vice Provost and the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning have worked with the Committee in piloting parts of a review structure for the new GE program. In addition to the pilot study of GE instructors described in (5), a first meeting of a cross-majors focus group of undergraduate students was held in Spring 2011, co-led by the Committee and the Office of the Vice Provost.

Respectfully submitted.

Christopher Thaiss (Chair), Steven Carlip (Member), Ronald Hess (Member), Kentaro Inoue (Member), Maggie Morgan (Member), John Smolenski (Member), Karleen Darr (Academic Federation Representative), Joey Chen (ASUCD Representative)
Committee's narrative:

We met once each quarter, and the main issues we dealt with were 1) the ESL task force's proposal to switch ESL instruction from Linguistics to UWP; 2) a review of workload writing and math courses (reports from Cynthia Bates and Andrew Waldron); 3) the increase of international students, esp coming via community colleges, who will be needing ESL writing support, at a time when the support budget looks as though it will be cut; 4) concerns about transfer-student achievement and whether, or what kinds of, support might be needed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Alessa Johns (chair), Chris Drake (member), Julia Menard-Warwick (member), Robert Newcomb (member), Ning Pan (member), Pamela Major (Academic Federation Representative)
# Committee on Undergraduate Instruction and Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings 2</th>
<th>Meeting frequency: <strong>as needed.</strong></th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week: <strong>varies</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total of 2 Undergraduate Programs Reviewed (courses, proposals, cases, etc.)</th>
<th>Total deferred from the previous year: 1</th>
<th>Total deferred to the coming academic year: 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Listing of bylaw changes proposed:**

**None.**

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

**None.**

**Issues considered by the committee:**

The committee is concerned that reviews are running behind schedule and it appears they linger in the Deans’ Offices at the Colleges.

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

**None.**

**Committee’s narrative:**

The committee held a meeting of representatives from SARI / ARM and Cluster 5 programs in January to discuss anything specific to their programs that should be addressed in the data supplied to them. Data reports were subsequently submitted to UIPR and forwarded to the colleges.

UIPR receives reviews from the colleges upon completion of program, department and college review.

For each program, committee members review the following materials: the self-review by the home department of the program, the report on the program by the College’s Undergraduate Program Review Committee, and the responses from the department chair and/or master adviser, the Dean, and the College Executive Committee. For each program, the reviewers prepare a report providing a summary of the program’s major strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations on how to address the weaknesses. The reports are then posted for review by all members of the committee, finalized and forwarded to Undergraduate Council with a summary for discussion.
The committee completed and submitted reports to Undergraduate Council on reviews of two undergraduate teaching programs:

One program that was deferred from 2009-10, and this completes Cluster 2 reviews:
- CAES: Atmospheric Science

One program from Cluster 3:
- CAES: Science & Society

Cluster 3 reviews from eight CLAS programs are deferred to 2011-12. They have not yet been forwarded to UIPR from the College Deans' Office. Cluster 3 has no programs in CBS.

Cluster 4 reviews from CAES and CLAS are currently in process.

It is anticipated that outstanding Cluster 3 program reviews will be submitted to UIPR early in the upcoming 2011-12 academic year. Additionally, UIPR anticipates Cluster 4 and Cluster 5 reviews will be submitted during the year. The committee will initiate Cluster 6 program reviews by facilitating communication between Cluster 6 programs and SARI / ARM to determine the data programs need prior to initiating their internal reviews.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Potter, Plant Sciences, UIPR Co-Chair
Carl Whithaus, University Writing Program, UIPR Co-Chair
Anthony Bello, Mathematics
Susan Ebeler, Viticulture & Enology
Michele Igo, Microbiology
Angelique Louie, Biomedical Engineering
Victoria Cross, Psychology, AF Representative
Winder McConnell, Ex-Officio, German & Russian and Director, Teaching Resource Center
Jessica Jaswal, ASUCD Representative
Kelly Riggle, ASUCD Representative
James Addona, GSA Representative
Nancy Kilpatrick, Academic Senate Analyst
TO: The Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate

The Committee first met on November 18, 2010 during the Fall Quarter to organize for the year. At this meeting, committee members reviewed the 2009-2010 Annual Report and the calendar for 2010-2011. 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.

For the 2011-2012 academic year, 59,794 students applied for undergraduate admission: 13,585 new transfers and 46,209 new freshmen. The Committee does not evaluate all freshmen and transfer applicants to the University. Only eligible EOP freshmen are read by the Committee; those not read by the Committee were evaluated on the basis of their grades and test scores alone. Transfer applicants must have submitted a letter of recommendation in order to be evaluated by the Committee; those who did not submit the letter of recommendation are considered for undergraduate scholarships, but are not eligible for bonus points through the review.

A Winter Quarter meeting was held on January 21, 2011 to discuss the reading procedures for application evaluation. Shortly thereafter, the Committee began receiving and reviewing 2011-2012 scholarship applications. In order to be considered, all applicants had to have a minimum 3.25 GPA. The Committee evaluated all complete continuing student applications (731); they evaluated the eligible transfer student applications from those who submitted a letter of recommendation (120) and eligible freshmen EOP applications (617). All applications were read twice, and scores were entered by early March, 2011.

A total of 1468 applications needed to be evaluated for the 2011-2012 scholarship award year. Because each application is to be reviewed by at least two Committee members, 2936 reads needed to be completed within a 5 week period. If all 18 members read equal amounts of applications, they would each need to review about 163 files; this equates to about 23 hours of work, given a 7 – 10 minute/file reading rate. Unfortunately, not all 18 members read their quota, leaving an undue burden on others; specifically, there were 6 members who read 225 applications or more this cycle, 8 who read about 175 or less. We request the Academic Senate Committee on Committees to increase the membership of CUSHP to 20 members, not including the Chair. This cycle, we had 17 active members. More help will be needed as application numbers increase and as unforeseen absences for committee members arise (maternity leaves; sick leaves; sabbaticals; etc.). Furthermore, we’ve had only two representatives from the Colleges of Biological Sciences and Agricultural and Environmental Sciences on the Committee; CUSHP requests a more diverse make up, if at all possible.

The University Medallist Sub-Committee reviewed the nomination packets of and interviewed 4 finalists on May 9, 2011. The group decided upon Kristin Kelley, a Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior major from the College of Biological Sciences as the 2010-2011 University Medal recipient.

The Committee met again on June 3, 2011 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, 2010-2011; these figures do not include the Regents, National Merit or NCAA Scholarships.
Thank you for considering our request to increase the size of the Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Prizes.

Respectfully submitted,

Rajiv Singh, Chair
Patricia Chikotas Boeshaar
Hussain Al-Asaad
James C. Bremer
R. Holland Cheng
Mark Halperin
Carlos Jackson
Kristin Lagattuta
Ian C. Faloona
Markus A. Luty
John B. Gates
Joanna R. Groza
Andres Resendez
Kenneth Jan-Hwang Loh
Pieter Stroeve

*Academic Federation Members*
Ana Maria Ibanez
Lauren C. Liets

*Student Representatives*
None
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>CBS</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-2011 SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td>3745</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>7106</td>
<td>14991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>2385</td>
<td>3327</td>
<td>4935</td>
<td>12200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4398</td>
<td>6136</td>
<td>4634</td>
<td>12054</td>
<td>27222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012 SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2591</td>
<td>4116</td>
<td>1397</td>
<td>7803</td>
<td>15907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>2448</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>5468</td>
<td>12846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not indicated</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4140</td>
<td>6568</td>
<td>4782</td>
<td>13281</td>
<td>28771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-2011 SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>3063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>3565</td>
<td>5006</td>
<td>3760</td>
<td>9749</td>
<td>22080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4398</td>
<td>6136</td>
<td>4634</td>
<td>12054</td>
<td>27222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012 SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>3580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>5264</td>
<td>3927</td>
<td>10476</td>
<td>22926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4140</td>
<td>6568</td>
<td>4782</td>
<td>13281</td>
<td>28771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-2011 SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Freshmen</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>5316</td>
<td>4160</td>
<td>8435</td>
<td>21146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>3307</td>
<td>5313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4398</td>
<td>6136</td>
<td>4634</td>
<td>12054</td>
<td>27222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2011-2012 SCHOLARSHIP ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Freshmen</td>
<td>3077</td>
<td>5633</td>
<td>4362</td>
<td>8770</td>
<td>21842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>4234</td>
<td>6198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4140</td>
<td>6568</td>
<td>4782</td>
<td>13281</td>
<td>28771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals may represent multiple awards to individual student recipients
** Number of scholarship eligible students, from 2009-2010 annual report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CA&amp;ES</th>
<th>CBS</th>
<th>ENG</th>
<th>L&amp;S</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-2011 SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2010-2011 SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STUDENT STATUS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entering Freshmen</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>NEED-BASED ACCEPTED &amp; PAID</em> (Students must show financial need)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Awards</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award $</td>
<td>$280,042</td>
<td>$292,812</td>
<td>$165,044</td>
<td>$506,809</td>
<td>$1,244,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>NON-NEED BASED ACCEPTED &amp; PAID</em> (Financial need not required)</em>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Awards</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award $</td>
<td>$1,207,013</td>
<td>$122,858</td>
<td>$158,700</td>
<td>$540,570</td>
<td>$2,029,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARD TOTALS PAID</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Awards Accepted</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award $</td>
<td>$1,487,055</td>
<td>$415,670</td>
<td>$323,744</td>
<td>$1,047,379</td>
<td>$3,273,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL 2010**</td>
<td>4,398</td>
<td>6,136</td>
<td>4,634</td>
<td>12,054</td>
<td>27222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL $ PER CAPITA</td>
<td>$338.12</td>
<td>$67.74</td>
<td>$69.86</td>
<td>$86.89</td>
<td>$120.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals may represent multiple awards to individual student recipients
** Number of scholarship eligible students, from 2009-2010 annual report
PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 135
MEMBERSHIP OF THE FACULTY

Submitted by the Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

Endorsed by the Executive Council

The proposed amendment would change a clause in Davis Division Bylaw 135, which would then specify that the limitation of voting rights in Faculties of schools and colleges to Senate members applies only to final actions on matters for the Academic Senate and to advice given to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the Senate’s name. Non-Senate committee members would be able to vote on other matters if explicit Bylaw provisions permit such votes.

Rationale.

DDB 135 denies the right to vote by non-members of the Senate “in the Faculty or Faculties.” The expression “in the Faculty or Faculties” is vague, in that it does not specify whether it applies to actions of committees of Faculties or to the final actions of Faculties themselves. The proposed amendment would make it clear, using language taken from systemwide Bylaw 35(C)(2) and Davis Division Bylaw 28(E), that the prohibition applies only to final actions taken by Faculties.

Recently, the Bylaws of several Faculties are being amended to allow non-Senate faculty to play a greater role in governance. The mechanism is to reserve final action on any matter for the Executive Committee and to restrict voting in the Executive Committee to Senate members only. It is believed by those Faculties that relations between Senate and non-Senate faculty would be improved while the rights of the Senate are protected.

It is proposed that the amendment to Bylaw 135 be effective immediately upon adoption.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 135 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

135. Membership of the Faculty

The membership of each Faculty shall be defined by Bylaws of the Davis Division in accordance with the provision of Academic Senate Bylaw 45. Only voting members of the Academic Senate shall be eligible to vote in the Faculty or Faculties of which they are members when the Faculty or Faculties are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions.
June 29, 2011

G.J. Mattey, Chair
Committee on Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction

RE: SVM BYLAW LANGUAGE REVISIONS

Dear G.J. Mattey,

Thank you for your assistance to revise the SVM Bylaws to permit the SVM faculty in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor title series to serve on SVM standing committees and to vote in SVM elections and voting action issues (in non-Academic Senate action items; for senate related items these votes would be counted separately as “advisory”). CERJ's suggestions for change were incorporated and the language was discussed and approved by the SVM faculty on June 8, 2011.

To recap, these bylaw changes will allow individuals in the SVM Health Sciences Clinical Professor series (a non-Academic Senate title) to vote in elections or issue actions in the School. They are heavily involved with SVM teaching, developing the professional curriculum and discussing faculty salary issues, and this will give them an official voice in the planning of policy and the decision-making processes related to the issues in which they are so involved.

I have included below the final revised versions of the sections impacted - SVM Bylaws 2, 8 and 22. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments. We will also be forwarding the revised language to Chair Bob Powell and the Academic Senate Office.

Sincerely,

Peter Pascoe, Chair
SVM Executive Committee

cc: Kimberly Pulliam
PART II. MEMBERSHIP

2. The Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine shall consist of:

(A) The President of the University;
(B) The Chancellor at Davis;
(C) The Dean of the School of Veterinary Medicine;
(D) All members of the Academic Senate who hold appointments in the School of Veterinary Medicine;
(E) As representatives, all salaried members of the School of Veterinary Medicine in the Health Sciences Clinical Professor series.

Title 1. Appointment, Tenure and Voting

8. (A) Committees shall be appointed or elected each year, not later than July 1, term of one year from July 1, unless otherwise provided for.

(B) Special committees shall exist no longer than five years unless established as standing committees by legislation.

(C) Committee meetings may be convened and presided over only by the committee chair, a designee of the committee chair, or a designee of the chair of the faculty.

(D) A quorum for committee meetings shall be fifty percent of the voting members. If the number of members is an odd number, a quorum shall be fifty percent of the voting members rounded up to the next whole number.

(E) All members of the Standing Committees of the Faculty and Ad hoc Committees appointed by the Executive Committee, unless otherwise indicated in these Bylaws, may vote on questions that will be referred to the Faculty Executive Committee for approval and on questions that will be referred for final Academic Senate action to another Academic Senate agency. Voting rights are extended to Faculty who are non-members of the Academic Senate (salaried Health Sciences Clinical Professor series) to the fullest degree permitted by Legislative Ruling 12.75 of the Academic Senate of the University, which states, “Only members of the Academic Senate may vote in Senate agencies when those agencies are taking final action on any matter for the Academic Senate, or giving advice to University officers or other non-Senate agencies in the name of the Senate. Persons other than Senate members may be given the right to vote on other questions, such as those that involve only recommendations to other Senate agencies, but only by explicit Bylaw provisions.”

22. Membership and Elections. This committee shall consist of three members. It shall determine and count membership as defined in Part II of these Bylaws. A report to the faculty consisting of a list of the voting membership shall be made at the first official faculty meeting of each fall quarter. A statement of the number constituting a quorum as defined under Part V shall be part of this report. This committee shall be responsible for the conduct of elections and voting on all other matters submitted to the membership for written ballot, including elections, resolutions, and Bylaw revisions. Ballots shall be counted and recorded by the three members, or their duly appointed substitutes, jointly and together. When the Faculty vote on any matter for the Academic Senate or advising in the name of the Academic Senate, votes of Academic Senate and non-Academic Senate members (salaried Health Sciences Clinical Professor series) shall be recorded separately, with the vote of the non-senate members provided as advisory. The committee annual report shall include a summary report of all balloting or elections so conducted and not previously reported.
Dear Bob,

Please find enclosed the proposed amendments for the School of Education By-Laws. These have been passed by the Faculty of the SOE at two different points: June 9th, 2009 and June 6th, 2011.

June 9th, 2009 Amendments – These are presented in blue to distinguish them from the amendments passed in 2011.

The first set of amendments targeted the election process for the officers and the members of the Faculty Executive Committee (Art. IV and Art. VI). Unfortunately, this amendment was not forwarded to the Academic Senate. In addition, the amendment for Art. IV was not inserted into the internally posted bylaws of the SOE and the version used in the ballot had several typos. These have been corrected in the version enclosed. The rationale for this set of amendments was that one-year terms limited faculty governance because it was difficult for officers to get a sense of their role, identify issues to address and develop productive ways of responding. A related concern was that Faculty serving as officers or members of the FEC should not be coming in and going out all at once because it was difficult to maintain momentum and continuity. Thus these amendments extended terms for officers and members of the FEC and staggered the rotation. One limitation was that the language outlining the staggering process was not always clear and we have added some text to clarify the process over a cycle. These edits are shown in bold blue in the version attached. This addition was approved in June, 2011.

June 6th, 2011 Amendment
The second set of amendments targeted Art. III - Members; Art. IV. Officers and added responsibilities; Art. V; Meeting of the Faculty; Art. VI members of Standing Committees and FEC structure and Art. VI 2 B Standing Committees adding a new committee: Courses.

These amendments are the result of a two-year review of the SOE bylaws by the By-Laws Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the FEC Chair to conduct a systematic review of By-laws at the SOE and other units at UCD and propose changes to the SOE By-laws. This review grew out of the concern that the SOE bylaws were seriously under-specified in key ways (eg. length of terms) and that many committees were not being staffed as per the SOE By-laws or as per the Graduate Council By-laws. For example, the Ed Policy committee of the SOE has not been operating as specified. Thus one of the amendments that passed asks the Secretary to provide an inventory and monitor the membership of the Senate committees of the SOE, reporting results to the FEC Chair and the Faculty annually in time to make changes when members have not been appointed or elected.

In the attachments enclosed, each amendment proposed is outlined with a brief rationale in a Table with a summary of the Amendments passed and tabled. Finally, the By-laws
for the SOE are presented in another attachment with new language added in bold italic and language deleted with a strike out. Amendments passed in 2009 are in blue; those from 2011 are in black bold.

The two tabled amendments will be considered by the Faculty this coming Fall. These were tabled because some members wanted to have more time for discussion and to develop refinements in the language of the amendment. In the case of extending access to the Meetings of the Faculty to Lecturer Supervisors as "Representatives" (Art. II. 1 & 2), some Faculty wanted to see more detailed specification of how the protocol for the Meetings of the Faculty would be changed. In the case of the Ed Policy Committee, some Faculty wanted to limit the specification of duties and wished to reconsider the committee's composition and size.

In general, three key principles guided our deliberations: serving the mission of the SOE; insuring adequate governance for key decisions on curriculum and policy; being efficient in how we operate as a unit. In sum, we think we have improved the SOE By-laws. We know we still have more to do with the tabled amendments.

In any case, we wish to thank you and other members of the Senate Leadership for coming to talk to us about governance at UCD in the Fall of 2009. We are especially grateful to G.J. Mattey who met with us several times to consult on Senate policies and offered many constructive ideas over the past year. Let me know, if you have any questions or concerns.

Best

Barbara J. Merino, Ph.D.
Professor
Secretary of the Faculty
School of Education
UC Davis.

Cc; C.J. Trexler
Chair of the Faculty
School of Education
UC Davis.
BY LAWS of the SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

*Note -  Bold in black represents new additions: deletions have a strikeout across the text. Amendments passed on June 6th, 2011 are in black italics bold. Amendments passed on June 9th, 2009 are in blue italics. Clarifications and or editing of typos of the 2009 amendment corrected on 6/11 are in bold black but not italicized. See Art. VI.1.

ARTICLE I. –NAME OF ORGANIZATION

The name of this organization is the School of Education, University of California, Davis (hereafter, the School).

ARTICLE II. –PURPOSE OF ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this organization is to be a leader in educational research and the preparation of educational researchers and practitioners, and to pursue significance, excellence and scholarly rigor in research, graduate and undergraduate teaching, and service to the people of California.

ARTICLE III. –MEMBERS

III.1. Faculty

The Faculty of the School shall consist of
a. the President of the University of California;
b. the Chief Campus Officer of the Davis campus;
c. the Dean of Graduate Studies of the Davis campus;
d. the Dean of the School of Education (hereafter, the Dean);
e. all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the School of Education.

III.2. Voting Faculty

Voting rights and their extension are governed by Academic Senate Bylaws SBL 55B and 55C and apply to the Faculty and its committees.

III.3. School Regulations and functions of the Faculty and the Dean

The faculty Faculty shall determine the institutional policies, regulations and procedures of the School pertaining to curriculum, student admissions, and academic personnel evaluation and appointments. The Dean shall be the chief administrative and fiscal officer of the School. The term “dean” as used in these Bylaws includes the Associate Dean.
ARTICLE IV. –OFFICERS

IV.1. Chair

The Faculty member serving as Secretary of the Faculty will become Chair after his or her one year term has ended. He or she shall take office on September 1 and serve through August 31 of the following year.

The Faculty member elected to the Chair Elect position shall be determined by votes, with ties decided by lot. The Chair Elect will take office on September 1 and serve as Chair in waiting as one of the four elected Senate Faculty members through August 31 of the following year. On September 1 of the subsequent year, the Chair Elect will become Chair and serve in that capacity for two years through August 31st. The Chair shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee, shall preside over all Meetings of the Faculty of the School, and have such other secondary duties as the Faculty shall direct. The Chair is authorized to refer directly to the appropriate committee of the Faculty any or all questions, including petitions of students pertaining to School matters, placed in his or her hands for presentation to the Faculty.

IV.2. Secretary

The Faculty member receiving the most votes for service on the Executive Committee of the School each year shall serve as Secretary for a one-year term, with ties broken by lot. He or she shall take office on September 1 and serve through August 31 of the following year, at which time he or she will become chair for a one-year term.

The Faculty member receiving the most votes, with ties decided by lot, for the position of Secretary on the Executive Committee of the School shall serve as Secretary for a two-year term. The Secretary will take office on September 1 and serve as Secretary for two years through August 31st. The duties of the Secretary shall include, but not be limited to, the taking and distribution of minutes for meetings of the Executive Committee and the Faculty, the distribution of all calls to meetings, the maintenance of a current roster of members of the Faculty and of the membership and officers of all committees and programs connected to the SOE. The Secretary shall meet with the officers of the EDGSA to insure that students are elected to the Standing Committees as prescribed by the bylaws of the SOE.

IV.3. Replacements

If the Chair is unable to complete his or her term of office, the Secretary will become Chair for the remainder of the year and then begin another full year term as Chair. If the Secretary becomes Chair or is otherwise unable to complete his or her term of office, the elected members of the Faculty Executive Committee will choose a replacement from among the remaining members of FEC: either the Chair-Elect, Secretary, or another elected member. If the Secretary or an ad-hoc member of FEC becomes Chair (in the Chair-replacement scenario) or is otherwise unable to complete his or her term of office the elected members of the Executive Committee shall select a
ARTICLE V. –MEETINGS

V.1. Regular Meeting

The Faculty shall meet at least once each quarter during the academic year. At least one fall quarter meeting shall be held during the month of October.

V.2. Special Meeting

The Faculty may meet at such other times as called by the Chair. In addition, upon written request of five members of the Faculty to the Secretary, a special meeting must be called within ten instructional days of receipt of the request. If the Chair and Secretary is unavailable, the immediate Past Chair of the Faculty of the School is empowered to call special meetings of the Faculty and to serve as Chair pro tempore.

V.3. Attendance and Quorum

It is generally expected that all voting Faculty shall attend faculty meetings. Only members of the Faculty may be present at faculty meetings during consideration of student petitions for reinstatement, student disciplinary matters, and matters determined to be strictly confidential by the Chair. Guests, including students, may be present at other times by the invitation by the Chair. Upon objection, a majority vote is required to allow a guest to be present. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Faculty eligible to vote and in residence. Voting members who are on leave or on sabbatical are not included in the quorum count, but they are eligible to vote.

V.4. Meeting Agenda

At least five instructional days before a Meeting of the Faculty, other than a special meeting, the Chair shall give the Faculty and others entitled to attend copies of the agenda and of committee reports and like documents to be discussed at the meeting. The agenda shall consist of the following items in this order: minutes of the last meeting, reports of officers, committee reports, unfinished business, and new business. Additional items may be placed on the agenda upon the written request of three Faculty members eligible to vote, and the revised agenda shall be distributed no less than two instructional days before the meeting.

V.5. Voting

a. A majority vote means more than half of the votes cast by the voting Faculty. An abstention is not a vote cast.

b. Ordinarily, votes shall be cast by voice or show of hands, but any Faculty member
eligible to vote may require that a vote on a matter be taken by secret ballot.

c. A motion to submit a measure to mail ballot has precedence over a motion to vote in a meeting.

d. A member may provide another member with a written proxy for a particular meeting or agenda item.

V.6. Amendment of Bylaws and Policies and Procedures

a. These Bylaws may be added to, amended, or replaced at any regular or special meeting by a two-thirds vote of all the voting members of the Faculty present, provided that written notice has been sent to all members as prescribed in DD Bylaw 180. No change shall be made in the Bylaws that is inconsistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

b. Policies and procedures related to curriculum, admissions and senate faculty personnel matters may be added to, amended, or repealed by a majority vote of all the voting members of the Faculty, provided written notice shall have been sent to all members as prescribed in DD Bylaw 180. No change shall be made in the policies and procedures that is inconsistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

V.7. Procedure

a. Questions of procedure that are not governed by the Bylaws shall be resolved by Robert’s Rules of Order.

b. The procedural rules of the Faculty governing meetings may be suspended by vote of the Faculty, provided that not more than two voting members present object to such suspension.

ARTICLE VI. COMMITTEES AND ADVISORS

Members of standing committees shall take office on September 1, or on the date of appointment, and shall serve through August 31 as specified by each committee. Terms shall be staggered and no longer than two years.

VI.1. Executive Committee

(A.) The Executive Committee shall consist of four elected members, the Dean of the School, ex officio and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs, ex officio. Ex officio members have the right to vote. Ex officio members shall not have the right to vote. When FEC officer or member terms are up, the Chair shall call for nominations before the last spring Meeting of the Faculty. The election shall be by secret ballot administered each spring by the current Chair with ties broken by lot. Each voting member of the Faculty is entitled to vote for up to two members of the committee each
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year. Each elected member shall serve a two-year term in total. The terms of the elected members shall be staggered and members shall be elected on a two-year cycle. Chair Elect and Secretary elections shall alternate by year; as shall elections for the remaining members. When the Chair Elect becomes Chair in the second year, two member slots become available. One will be a one-year term; the other, a two-year term. Thus in Year 1 faculty will elect the Chair for a three-year term (one year as Chair-Elect/ad-hoc and two years as Chair) and a Secretary for a two-year term. In Year 2 faculty will elect two ad-hoc members, one for a two-year term and one for a one-year term. The member with the most votes will become Chair and the second most votes will become Secretary with ties settled by lot. To accomplish staggering, all four members will be elected at a first election. The member assuming the position of Secretary will have a two-year term; the Chair a one year term, and one of the remaining members will, by lot, fill a one-year term and the other a two year term. Elected members who are not officers and who are unable to complete their term will be replaced by a vote of the remaining elected members.

(B) The Executive Committee shall meet as necessary, but at least once per month at the discretion of the Chair during the academic year. once per academic term in advance of each faculty meeting

(C) The Executive Committee shall receive requests that may require committee action and direct such requests to the appropriate committee(s).

(D) At least three of the elected membership, excluding vacancies noted in the records of the Secretary, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business by the Executive Committee.

(E) The Executive Committee shall submit to the Faculty each year, at the regular meeting in May or at a special meeting in June designated for elections October nominations for the members and chairs of all standing committees of the Faculty. The Faculty shall either elect those nominated or make additional nominations from the floor. If additional nominations are made, election for the respective committees shall be by secret ballot at this meeting. The Executive Committee shall appoint members to fill any vacancies occurring during the year.

(F) The Executive Committee shall appoint members to and designate the Chair of special committees as may be authorized by the Faculty.

(G) The Executive Committee shall consider administrative matters referred to it by the Dean through the Chair.

(H) The Secretary shall provide the Faculty with written minutes of each Executive Committee meeting within ten instructional days. These minutes shall clearly describe all actions taken by the Executive Committee, and may be distributed electronically.

(I) In the event of a tie vote on matters requiring a vote of the Executive Committee, the
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decision shall rest with the chair or acting chair.

(J) Any member of the Faculty can attend the Executive Committee meeting and have the privilege of the floor.

(K) In situations requiring emergency action by the Executive Committee, it may issue statements and take actions in its own name as required. However it must inform the faculty by mail of its actions, and have its actions confirmed, rejected or changed at the next regular or special meeting of the faculty.

VI.2. Standing Committees

(A) The Educational Policy Committee shall advise the Faculty on curriculum, admissions and other matters of educational policy referred to it by the Chair. Issues may be related to courses of instruction, undergraduate programs, graduate programs, admissions, and the awarding of financial aid. The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) also assist the Graduate Advisor as appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies in determining when students are no longer in academic good standing or academically disqualified from the School, and shall hear and determine petitions from academically disqualified students. This committee shall consist of the Graduate Advisor and the Associate Dean for Academic Programs as an ex officio member, and at least three other Faculty members elected by the Faculty and two students elected by their peers.

(B) The Courses Committee shall advise the Faculty on issues related to the proposal of new courses or revisions to existing courses for any program in which SOE faculty teach as referred to it by the Chair. Issues may be related to courses offered by the SOE on its own or in collaboration with other UCD faculty or with faculty from other institutions. Courses developed for income-generation programs must be reviewed by the Courses Committee when these courses are first developed and periodically as directed by the Chair of the FEC. This committee shall consist of three Faculty elected by the Faculty, one representative elected by the Lecturer/Supervisors and two students elected by their peers. Elected members shall serve for two-year terms on a staggered basis. To achieve staggering for the first election, two Faculty members shall serve for two-year terms and one for a one-year term. The Courses Committee shall meet at least once a term. The Faculty Executive Committee shall nominate the Chair of the Courses Committee from the elected Faculty members. The Faculty member elected to represent the SOE in the Academic Senate Courses committee shall be one of the elected members. The Committee shall elect a Secretary to maintain a record of meetings. The Dean shall appoint a staff person to assist the Secretary in keeping an accurate record of meetings and preparing an annual report to the FEC.

Approved by the Faculty of the School of Education. June 6th, 2011
Approved by the Faculty of the School of Education; June 9th, 2009

Approved by the Faculty of the School of Education: February, 10, 2003
Reviewed by the Committee of Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction (date): April 10, 2003
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