

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE**  
**SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ**



**VIDEOCONFERENCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Wednesday, April 10, 2019**

**10:00 am - 2:00 pm**

To participate in the videoconference, contact your divisional Senate office for the location of a central meeting place. If you are off-campus, you may join the video and internet audio at

<https://UCOP.zoom.us/j/6568908103>

**Or by phone: 1 669 900 6833 Meeting ID: 656 890 8103**

<b>I.</b>	<b>ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>MINUTES [ACTION]</b>	
	Approval of the Draft Minutes of the Meeting of December 12, 2018	<b>4-8</b>
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, December 12, 2018	<b>9</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</b>	
	▪ Robert C. May	
<b>IV.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT</b>	
	▪ Janet Napolitano	
<b>V.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST</b>	
	▪ Michael T. Brown	
<b>VI.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES [INFORMATION/DISCUSSION]</b>	
	<b>A. Academic Council</b>	
	▪ Robert May, Chair Academic Council	
	1. Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the 2019-20 Assembly [ACTION]	<b>10-12</b>
	2. Ratification of the 2019 Mid-Career Leadership Awardees [ACTION]	<b>12-14</b>
	3. Amendment to Academic Senate Bylaw 336 [ACTION]	<b>14-21</b>
	4. Modifications to Assembly Approved Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area “d”) [ACTION]	<b>22-26</b>
	5. Proposed Policy on Posthumous Degrees [ACTION]	<b>27-29</b>
	<b>B. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs</b>	
	▪ Onyebuchi Arah, Chair	
	1. Flexible Master of Social Welfare Degree at UCB [ACTION]	<b>30-35</b>

**VII. SPECIAL ORDERS**

**A. Consent Calendar [NONE]**

**VIII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

## **I. Roll Call**

### **2018-19 Assembly Roll Call April 10, 2019**

#### **President of the University:**

Janet Napolitano

Amy Powell

#### **Academic Council Members:**

Robert May, Chair

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair

Barbara Spackman, Chair, UCB

Kristin Lagattuta, Chair, UCD

Linda Cohen, Chair, UCI

Joseph Bristow, Chair, UCLA

Kurt Schnier, Chair, UCM

Dylan Rodriguez, Chair, UCR

Robert Horwitz, Chair UCSD

David Teitel, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Kimberly Lau, Chair, UCSC

Eddie Comeaux, Chair, BOARS

Onyebuchi Arah, Chair, CCGA

Lok Siu, Chair, UCAADE

Daniel Farber, Chair, UCAP

Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, UCEP

Sean Malloy, Chair, UCFW

Andrew Baird, Chair, UCORP

James Steintrager, Chair, UCPB

#### **Los Angeles (7)**

Noel Boyle

Jessica Cattelino

Mansoureh Eghbali

Kym F. Faull

Sandra Loo

William Marotti

Peter Tontonoz

#### **Merced (1)**

Shawn Newsam

#### **Riverside (2)**

Thomas Cogswell

Manuela Martins-Green

#### **San Diego (5)**

Amy Bridges

Seth Cohen

Robert Kluender

Elizabeth Komives

Joseph Pogliano

#### **Berkeley (5)**

Victoria Frede-Montemayor

Fai Ma

Richard Scheffler

Daniel Boyarin (alt for Suzanne Fleiszig)

Oliver O'Reilly (alt for R. Jay Wallace)

#### **San Francisco (5)**

Elena Flowers

Marek Brzezinski

Steven Cheung

Jacqueline Leung

Vineeta Singh

#### **Davis (6)**

Anne Britt

Richard Grotjahn

George Mattay

Jeffrey Williams

S.J. Ben Yoo

*TBD*

#### **Santa Barbara (3)**

Charles Akemann

Eric Matthys

F. Winddance Twine

#### **Santa Cruz (2)**

David Brundage

Janette Dinishak

#### **Irvine (4)**

Jacob Avery

Elliott Currie

Masashi Kitazawa

#### **Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Andrew Dickson

## MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

December 12, 2018

## MINUTES OF VIDEOCONFERENCE MEETING

**I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, December 12, 2018. Academic Senate Chair Robert May presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Director Hilary Baxter called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

**II. MINUTES**

**ACTION:** The Assembly approved the minutes of June 13, 2018.

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR****▪ Robert C. May**

Budget: The University is developing a four-year budget framework to guide budget negotiations with the Legislature and Governor-elect. The framework focuses on full funding of the University's academic infrastructure and emphasizes UC's commitment to produce 200,000 more degrees by 2030, based on estimates of California workforce needs. It also highlights UC's role in promoting upward mobility, and the importance of faculty research. Senate leaders have encouraged UCOP to present a broad view of the University in the framework that stresses the value of the full range of disciplines, avoids the marginalization of the arts and humanities, and highlights the need to expand the ladder rank faculty.

Faculty Salaries: Last year, President Napolitano proposed a multi-year plan to eliminate the salary gap between UC faculty and faculty at UC's Comparison 8 group of institutions. The first year of the President's plan included a 4% increase to the published salary scales for 2018-19, which helped reduce the gap from 7.8% to 6.4%. The Administration is discussing a plan to augment the published salary scales in each of the next four years to eliminate the remaining differential.

Task Forces: An Academic Senate Standardized Testing Task Force will respond to the President's request that the Senate examine the role of standardized tests in undergraduate eligibility and admissions. A Scholarly Protections Task Force, co-chaired by Senate Chair May and UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal, will develop a policy addressing scholarly obligations and protections for non-Senate academic employees. Chair May has asked CCGA, UCPB, and UCAP to assess the Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree program; its overall success and effectiveness; impact on educational goals, campus budgets, State-supported programs, faculty effort, student/faculty diversity and the evaluation of faculty advancement. Finally, the President has empaneled a task force to develop systemwide guidelines for campus closures in emergencies like the air quality crisis caused by California wildfires in November.

Posthumous Degrees: Council Chair May has asked UCEP to follow-up its recommendation that campuses adopt policies on posthumous baccalaureate degrees, with a more specific proposed systemwide policy.

SVSH: A report from the California State Auditor recommended that Senate bylaws be further defined to specify that 1) hearings on sexual violence/harassment complaints against faculty respondents be scheduled before the Senate Privilege and Tenure Committee no more than 60 days after the Chancellor files charges, unless an extension is granted for good cause; and that 2) P&T issue its recommendation to the Chancellor no more than 30 days after a hearing concludes UCPT's proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 336 will be released for systemwide Senate review later this month.

#### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY UNIVERSITY SENIOR MANAGERS**

- **Janet Napolitano, President**
- **Michael T. Brown, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**

2019-20 Budget: The 2019-20 budget plan approved by the Regents was conveyed to the Department of Finance on December 1 for consideration by the incoming Governor. It requests a total of \$423 million in permanent new funding, including maintenance of last year's \$145 million in one-time funding, and \$277 million in new funding. The investments will support enrollment growth, mandatory cost increases, financial aid, and other high priority costs, and allow UC to avoid a tuition increase. The University is also requesting \$100 million in one-time funding to address deferred maintenance. The University also hopes to gain support for a General Obligation bond as an alternate source of capital funding to address deferred maintenance, seismic upgrades, and enrollment growth.

Multi-year Planning: UCOP will present a four-year budget and enrollment plan to the Regents in January. The plan includes three themes: 1) produce 200,000 more undergraduate and graduate degrees by 2030 to help meet California's growing workforce needs; 2) ensure the California Dream is available to all by eliminating graduation gaps and increasing degree attainment; and 3) invest in the next generation of faculty and research to help the state meet its grand challenges. The 2019-20 budget plan includes a \$60 million line item for improving degree attainment and student success. UCOP is working with campuses to develop specific strategies related to these goals.

Graduate Student Enrollment and Support: A meeting between President Napolitano and the Council of Graduate Deans focused on the need to increase graduate student enrollment and funding to help campuses keep pace with competitor institutions and enhance their ability to compete for the best graduate students, particularly in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

Faculty Salaries: As part of the President's plan to close the UC faculty salary gap, the 2019-20 budget sets aside funding to support 5% increases in the faculty salary scales, which represents a 4% increase in overall faculty salaries.

DACA: On November 8, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a preliminary injunction blocking the government from ending the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)

program. UC is exploring contingency plans for supporting undocumented students in case the Supreme Court acts to rescind the program.

Title IX: On November 16, the U.S. Department of Education issued proposed new rules regarding how colleges and universities handle Title IX complaints about campus sexual misconduct. The rules are prescriptive, narrow the scope of what constitutes sexual harassment, and weaken the Office of Civil Rights' authority to enforce Title IX. UCOP is working with campuses on a University response to the proposed changes by the January 28 public comment deadline.

UCOP Restructuring: After a broad consultation process, the President has decided to consolidate UC's Mexico-related entities (the UC-Mexico Initiative, UC MEXUS, and Casa de California), into a single entity housed at UC Riverside. In addition, the President has accepted the recommendations of the UC Health Advisory Committee to maintain UC Health as a UCOP division with its existing governance structure, to be funded by the health systems as a separate subline item in the UCOP budget. The President is reviewing the recommendations of the ANR Advisory Committee for UC ANR's structure, governance, and funding. Additional organizational reviews are underway for UC Press, UCDC, UC Center in Sacramento, the Research Grants Program Office, and the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative.

Other Systemwide Groups: A Tiger Team commissioned by the President and the chancellors to explore issues around the security of intellectual property and threats posed by foreign entities has submitted its recommendations to the President. In addition, Provost Brown is assembling a Native American Advisory Council to develop a plan to review and update existing policies, committee structures, and implementation practices related to the curation, repatriation, and disposition of Native American remains and cultural items in the University's custody.

Cal Grant Expansion: The California Community College (CCC) system has proposed a dramatic expansion of Cal Grants for CCC students. UC is concerned that if new funding is not provided, the plan may shift existing resources away from UC and CSU to the CCC. UC is encouraging a do-no-harm approach.

Legislative Meeting: The University recently hosted a half-day interactive meeting on the Berkeley campus for a small group of legislators and three faculty experts to discuss policy topics of legislative interest. More events are planned in Sacramento on topics such as tax reform, utility restructuring, early childhood education, health care, climate change, and homelessness.

#### Discussion:

Professor William Marotti of UCLA asked about the prospects for convincing the incoming Governor to fully fund California higher education, in contrast to the previous Governor's incremental and austerity approach to funding, noting also that California voters overwhelmingly supported a presidential candidate who proposed tuition-free public higher education for families making up to \$125,000.

President Napolitano noted that she has met with Governor-elect Newsom, who is familiar with UC and its budget challenges and who has promised to work with the University. CFO Brostrom added that UC hopes to gain the Governor's support for a higher education General Obligation bond that would appear on a statewide ballot in 2020. If approved by the voters, such a measure would help UC campuses meet their capital and deferred maintenance needs and reduce overall pressure on the operating budget. The University is also active in the bond market for housing

projects using the Public-Private-Partnership (P3) model. UC has housing projects on every campus, and is well on the way to adding 30,000 new beds by 2025.

Chair May noted that the Academic Senate appreciates the Administration's commitment to graduate education and to increasing the competitiveness of graduate student support packages in a broad range of disciplines. The Senate is eager to work with the President on this issue. Provost Brown added that the administration is considering graduate student support in very broad terms, but focusing on the need to grow academic doctoral education and the research professoriate. He also noted that the current generational shift presents an institutional opportunity to grow a diverse faculty. Vice Chair Bhavnani remarked that it is important to build child care provisions into any faculty housing plans.

## **V. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT**

### **▪ Sean Malloy, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW)**

Faculty Salaries: Last year's UCFW helped make a convincing case to the President and Provost that closing the faculty salary gap is crucial to maintaining the UC faculty core. UCFW worked with the Office of Academic Personnel to develop a concrete plan for closing the gap, and then, after the President announced her three-year plan, followed-up with a proposal for continuing the President's plan to close the residual gap within the remaining two years.

SVSH: UCFW has been concerned less with the specific elements of the proposed revised UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Harassment, and more with ensuring that there is a mechanism to promote fair, transparent, and consistent application of the policy across campuses and within a campus.

Health Sciences Faculty Morale: UCFW has asked for a comprehensive study of factors contributing to low faculty morale and attrition in the UC Health Sciences to better understand the faculty experience at the medical centers. The underlying principle is the need to support health faculty across the system and to maintain research and teaching as central to their mission.

## **VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### **A. Academic Council**

#### **1. Assembly Approved Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area "d")**

In February 2018, the Assembly approved [revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3](#) related to the area "d" (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission, proposed by BOARS to better align UC admission requirements with the Next Generation Science Standards and the Common Core curriculum. However, the Senate's recommendation on area "d" is not moving forward, because the Provost has reservations about one of its key elements – increasing the area "d" requirement from 2 units required (3 recommended) to 3 units required. The Administration supports implementing other elements of the policy, including changing the name of the requirement from "Laboratory Science" to "Science" to reflect a broader set of options for science disciplines proposed to fulfill the third unit under area "d," and modifying the A-G Guide to include specific examples of courses that may fulfill the requirements not explicitly mentioned in the Senate regulations, such as engineering, and computer science.

The Provost is concerned that increasing the area “d” requirement to three years will disproportionately affect underrepresented minorities in the eligibility pool, despite BOARS’ determination that the change will have minimal, if any, adverse effects on those populations. BOARS found that 95% of UC applicants already take three years of science. UC knows the handful of high schools that do not offer three years, and flags their applicants so that campuses do not penalize them during comprehensive review.

The Santa Cruz Division of the Senate requested a legislative ruling from the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction concerning the Administration’s actions, in the context of Regents Standing Order 105.2, which states that, *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.* UCRJ’s [ruling 11.18](#) affirms the Regents’ final authority over admissions policy articulated in SO 105.2 and states that the Administration does not have the authority to implement an admissions policy independently of the Regents.

BOARS does not support a partial roll out of the policy, but has agreed to consider new information, where appropriate, that could weigh on the appropriateness of the policy change. In addition, BOARS has approved expanding the courses eligible for area “d” listed in the A-G Guide. The Assembly will be asked at a later meeting to amend its policy to remove the elements of the policy related to the courses eligible for area “d”.

- An Assembly member urged the Academic Senate to push back against any suggestion emanating from internal or external sources that the University’s overall admission requirements are too stringent. The University should not bow to political pressure, real or perceived, to lower preparation standards. Others noted that campuses must also be prepared to support the academic success of the students they serve. Academic preparation programs like Summer Bridge as well as post-admission advising and counseling services contribute to the academic success and timely graduation of first-generation and other educationally at risk populations.

## **VII. SPECIAL ORDERS**

### **A. Consent Calendar [None]**

**B. Annual Reports.** [Bylaw 120.D.3](#) requires that standing committee annual reports be included in the first Assembly agenda of each academic year.

## **VIII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]**

## **IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]**

## **X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [None]**

## **XI. NEW BUSINESS [None]**

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Academic Senate Analyst

Attest: Robert May, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of December 12, 2018



## **Appendix A – 2018-2019 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of December 12, 2018**

### **President of the University:**

Janet Napolitano

Masashi Kitazawa

Amy Powell

### **Academic Council Members:**

Robert May, Chair

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Vice Chair

Barbara Spackman, Chair, UCB

Kristin Lagattuta, Chair, UCD

Linda Cohen, Chair, UCI

Joseph Bristow, Chair, UCLA

Kurt Schnier, Chair, UCM

John Cioffi, Vice Chair, UCR (alt for Dylan

Rodriguez, Chair, UCR)

Robert Horwitz, Chair UCSD

David Teitel, Chair, UCSF

Henning Bohn, Chair, UCSB

Kimberly Lau, Chair, UCSC

Eddie Comeaux, Chair, BOARS (absent)

Onyebuchi Arah, Chair, CCGA

Lok Siu, Chair, UCAADE

Daniel Farber, Chair, UCAP (absent)

Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, UCEP

Sean Malloy, Chair, UCFW

Andrew Baird, Chair, UCORP

James Steintrager, Chair, UCPB

### **Los Angeles (7)**

Noel Boyle

Jessica Cattelino

Ann Karagozian (alt for Mansoureh Eghbali)

Kym F. Faull

Sandra Loo

William Marotti

Peter Tontonoz

### **Merced (1)**

Shawn Newsam

### **Riverside (2)**

Thomas Cogswell

Manuela Martins-Green

### **San Diego (5)**

Amy Bridges (absent)

Seth Cohen

Robert Kluender

Elizabeth Komives

Joseph Pogliano (absent)

### **Berkeley (5)**

Danica Chen (alt for Victoria Frede-  
Montemayor)

Fai Ma

Suzanne Fleiszig

Richard Scheffler (absent)

R. Jay Wallace

### **San Francisco (5)**

Elena Flowers

Marek Brzezinski

Steven Cheung

Jacqueline Leung

Vineeta Singh (absent)

### **Davis (6)**

Anne Britt

Richard Grotjahn (absent)

George Mattay

Jeffrey Williams (absent)

S.J. Ben Yoo

TBD

### **Santa Barbara (3)**

Charles Akemann (absent)

Eric Matthys

F. Winddance Twine

### **Santa Cruz (2)**

David Brundage

Janette Dinishak

### **Irvine (4)**

Jacob Avery

Elliott Currie

### **Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Andrew Dickson

### **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

- Robert C. May

### **IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT**

- Janet Napolitano

### **V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PROVOST**

- Michael T. Brown

### **VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

#### **Academic Council**

- Robert C. May, Chair

#### **1. Nomination and election of the Vice Chair of the 2019-2020 Assembly [ACTION]**

Senate Bylaw 110.A., which governs the election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly, states: “The Assembly elects a Vice Chair who is a Senate member from a Division other than that of the incoming Chair, to assume office the following September. The Academic Council submits a nomination. Further nominations may be made by the Assembly members from the floor, and on written petition by twenty-five Senate members. The Vice Chair also serves as Vice Chair of the Academic Council. The following year the Vice Chair becomes Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council. Neither the Chair nor the Vice Chair may serve as a Divisional Representative.”

In accordance with Bylaw 110.A, the Academic Council submits its nomination of Professor Mary Gauvain of UC Riverside as 2019-2020 Assembly Vice Chair. Professor Gauvain was selected as the Council’s nominee at its March 20, 2019 meeting. Her qualifications and personal statement are as follows:

### **MARY GAUVAIN**

#### **EDUCATION**

Ph.D., 1982, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, Developmental Psychology

M. A., 1976, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, Sociology of Education

B. A., cum laude, 1975, University of California, Irvine, CA, Social Ecology

#### **PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT AND POSTS**

2018 -	Distinguished Professor of Psychology, University of California, Riverside
1988- 2018	Assistant, Associate, and Professor of Psychology, University of California, Riverside
2013-2014	Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Success, Equity, and Development, UCR
2013-2015	Co-Director, UC Global Health Institute CoE “One Health: Water, Animals, Food and Society”
1996-2004	Co-Director, UC Links Program, UC Riverside
1988-1992	Assistant Professor of Psychology, Scripps College (Tenure and Promotion awarded)
1986-1987	Senior Postdoctoral Fellow, Oregon Social Learning Center, Eugene, OR
1982-1983	Postdoctoral Associate, Developmental Psychology, CUNY Graduate Center

#### **ELECTED PROFESSIONAL OFFICES**

Executive Committee, APA Division 7: Developmental Psychology 1998-2001 and 2017-2019

Representative to the APA Council, Division 7: Developmental Psychology 2007-2010

Governing Council, Society for Research in Child Development, 2013-2019

Board of Directors, Jean Piaget Society, 2018-2021

## **PROFESSIONAL HONORS AND AWARDS**

Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), American Psychological Association (APA), American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Society (APS)

Affirmative Action Faculty Development Award, UCR, 1993-94, 1995-96

Sigma Xi Award, Outstanding Undergraduate Program at UCR (UC Links) 1998-99

Faculty of the Year Award, Psychology Department, UCR, 2003

Distinguished Campus Service Award, UCR Academic Senate, 2009-2010

## **RESEARCH FUNDING**

NIMH, NICHD, NSF, UCOP, Spencer Foundation, Haynes Foundation, Harvard Murray Center Fellowship

## **UC SENATE SERVICE**

Faculty Executive Committee, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (1996-98, 2002-03, Chair 2003-05)

Committee on Research (UCR, 1997-00, Chair 1999-00; UCOP, 1999-00)

UCR Representative to UC Academic Council (2003-05, 2014-16)

Planning and Budget (UCR, 2006-2009, Chair 2008-09; UCPB, 2008-09)

Academic Senate Vice-Chair (UCR, 2009-2010)

Academic Senate Chair (UCR) and UC Academic Council (2010-2012)

Academic Senate Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources (ACSCANR, Chair, 2011-2012)

Agriculture and Natural Resources Program Council (UCOP, Ex-Officio member, 2011-2012)

Academic Senate Distinguished Campus Service Committee (UCR, 2015-2018)

UC Negotiated Salary Trial Program Task Force, Chair (UCOP, 2016-2017)

UC President's ANR Advisory Committee (UCOP, 2018)

**RESEARCH AREA AND PUBLICATIONS** – Developmental psychology, sociocultural contributions to cognitive development

- 62 peer-reviewed articles (34 sole or first author) in top tier and highly regarded specialty journals in psychology, education, anthropology, and public health
- 14 handbook chapters (13 sole or first author) in developmental psychology and education
- 1 scholarly book (sole author), 2 textbooks
- 35 scholarly book chapters (27 sole or first author)
- 27 invited commentaries, reviews, and other publications including a commissioned report to the National Academies Board on Science Education

## **Statement of Challenges and Priorities**

**Mary Gauvain**

I received my undergraduate degree from the University of California (UCI) and have spent most of my professional career at UC Riverside. I have benefitted greatly from these experiences and I feel both fortunate and proud to have had these opportunities. The University of California is one of the premier institutions of higher learning in the world. It is a leader in all forms of scholarship, it contributes to the future direction of society through teaching and research, and its practice of shared governance is a model for institutions across the nation. Like many UC faculty and students, I am a first-generation college student. My mother was a high school graduate, my father did not finish high school. Both of them valued higher education tremendously and all four of their children received college degrees. In addition to a love of learning, they instilled in me a sense of commitment and responsibility to the settings where I learn and work. This approach to life has served me well as a member of the UC faculty and my experiences with the Academic Senate, in particular, have helped me realize these goals.

Involvement with the Senate has taught me much about the workings of the institution, but more importantly it has impressed upon me the significance of faculty engagement in issues and policies at the campus and systemwide level. I understand that faculty and administration must work together for the University to succeed. Over the years, my experiences working with the administration have been interesting, sometimes challenging, and mostly fruitful. My three years on the UCR Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (one year as Chair) during the recession was especially enlightening in terms of how campus resources are obtained and expended, the value of budget transparency, and the need to keep an eye on the mission of the institution in difficult times. In recognition of this work I received the UCR 2009-10 Distinguished Campus Service Award. In 2010, I was elected to a two-year term as Senate Chair of the UCR Division. In this role I worked closely with the faculty, Senate committees, the administration, and other UC Senate Chairs on the Academic Council. I was the first chair of the Academic Senate Special Committee on ANR and an Ex-Officio member of the ANR Program Council, experiences that enabled me to represent the faculty on the President's Special Committee on ANR in 2018. Serving as Senate Chair helped me to develop extensive knowledge about the UC – knowledge I believe would be useful if I have the chance to serve as Vice Chair and then Chair of the Senate.

Let me turn to the principles that guide my decision making in University matters. I am committed to maintaining and advancing the strengths of the University of California. This goal must be achieved by supporting excellence while never sidelining issues of equity, representation, and opportunity for faculty and students across the system. The UC is made up of ten research campuses with unique profiles and contributions – a remarkable achievement that must be protected and nurtured. Collectively, the campuses can be a monumental force in leading the state forward at a point in time that has left many unsure of where to head next. The opportunity to participate in a systemwide leadership role at this time would be an honor and a privilege.

I believe my experiences, which include sustained commitment to the University of California and extensive involvement in the Senate at the campus and systemwide levels, are strong preparation for the role of Vice Chair, and then Chair, of the Academic Senate. And personally, I am excited about this possibility. I not only expect that it is very interesting work, it would also give me the chance to give back to the University that has given me so much over the years.

**ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to elect the 2019-2020 Assembly Vice Chair.**

## **2. Ratification of Mid-Career Leadership Awardees**

An endowment has been created for an award for Mid-Career Leadership in the Academic Senate to honor individuals whose records demonstrate an exceptional ability to work effectively with different University constituents and exceptional promise for further service to the Senate. The award is planned to be given every other year. Nominations for the award are made through Divisional Committees on Committees to the University Committee on Committees (UCOC). UCOC, in turn, submits the names of two nominees to the Academic Council. At its March 20 meeting, the Academic Council chose to honor Onyebuchi Arah of UCLA and Sean Malloy of UC Merced with the 2019 Award. The Assembly is asked to ratify the Academic Council's choice of recipients.

---

February 28, 2019

**ROBERT MAY**  
**ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR**

Dear Robert:

The University Committee on Committees (UCOC) is nominating Professor Sean Malloy (UCM) and Onyebuchi Arah (UCLA) for the 2019 Mid-Career Award in the Academic Senate. We selected these two names from a handful of nominations, all of which reflected extraordinary service on both the systemwide and divisional level, as well as stellar records of academic achievement.

### Sean Malloy (UCM)

Professor Sean Malloy, a founding faculty member of UC Merced, has been enthusiastically and unselfishly involved in building faculty governance both locally on his campus and systemwide, where he played an important role in integrating Merced into the UC system. Professor Malloy's Senate service has predominantly been at the systemwide level, where his record is one of continuous, deep engagement on many important initiatives. Specific examples include his service as a member of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), which he now chairs. Professor Malloy also served as the Merced representative of the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF), member of the UCFW Task Force on Investments and Retirements (TFIR) and Health Care Task Force (HCTF). In addition to these tireless efforts on standing committees, Professor Malloy has also participated on a number of other systemwide Senate groups and divisional committees.

Professor Malloy contributed to the growth of UC Merced and also worked on several important local and systemwide issues. These include the first and second Post-Employment Benefits (PEB I and II) processes, pushing to close the faculty salary gap with UC's comparator institutions, efforts to bring university policing in line with UC's principles of community, protection of faculty benefits (particularly for retirees), and examining the relationship between UC Health and religiously-affiliated providers.

### Onyebuchi A. Arah (UCLA)

Dr. Onyebuchi Arah is Professor of Epidemiology at the UCLA Fielding School of Public Health, who enthusiastically and effectively embraces service and faculty self-governance. He is dedicated to working with the Academic Senate at both the systemwide and divisional levels on maintaining the teaching excellence of programs. Dr. Arah's Senate service includes membership on the Academic Council, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), two joint Senate and administrative committees, Academic Planning Council, and the Graduate Education Working Group. At the divisional level, Dr. Arah was a member and vice chair of the Graduate Council, member of the Academic Council, chair and vice chair of CCGA at UCLA, and represented his department at the Undergraduate Programs Committee.

Please also find enclosed are Professors Malloy and Arah's nomination materials, as submitted by their respective Divisions.

Best wishes,



Kevin W. Plaxco  
Chair, University Committee on Committees

### 3. Amendment to Academic Senate Bylaw 336 [ACTION]

Following a systemwide Senate review, the Academic Council recommended at its March 20, 2019 meeting that Senate Bylaw 336 be amended to as noted below.

**Justification for Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336:** The revisions respond to the California State Auditor's recommendation that Senate bylaws be further defined to require that 1) hearings on SVSH complaints against faculty respondents be scheduled before the Senate P&T Committee no more than 60 days after the Chancellor files charges, unless an extension is granted for good cause; and that 2) P&T issue its recommendation to the Chancellor no more than 30 days after a hearing concludes. The revisions to Bylaw 336 significantly compress and streamline current divisional P&T processes. The revised bylaw also includes a clause allowing extensions for "good cause," defined as "material or unforeseen circumstances related to the complaint and sufficient to justify the extension sought." In addition, while the Auditor's recommendations pertain only to disciplinary cases involving SVSH, UCPT felt it would be important for Bylaw 336 to define a uniform procedure for handling all alleged violations of the faculty code of conduct, irrespective of their nature.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** The Assembly is asked to endorse the Academic Council's recommendation to amend Senate Bylaw 336 as noted below.

(<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/bylaws/blpart3.html#bl336>)

336. Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Disciplinary Cases (En 23 May 01) –  
Proposed Revisions

#### A. Right to a Hearing

In cases of disciplinary action commenced by the administration against a member of the Academic Senate, or against other faculty members in cases where the right to a hearing before a Senate committee is given by Section 103.9 or 103.10 of the Standing Orders of The Regents (Appendix I), proceedings shall be conducted before a Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure~~Privilege and Tenure Committee~~ (hereafter, the Committee). Under extraordinary circumstances and for good cause shown, on petition of any of the parties and with concurrence of the other parties, the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure~~Privilege and Tenure Committee~~ may constitute a Special Committee composed of Senate members from any Division to carry out the proceedings.

#### A.B. Time Limitation for Filing Disciplinary Charges

The Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when it is reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or, additionally, for an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment when the allegation is first reported to the campus Title IX Officer. The Chancellor must file disciplinary charges by delivering notice of proposed disciplinary action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation. There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation. (Am 9 March 05) (Am 14 Jun 17)

#### B-C. Prehearing Procedure in Disciplinary Cases

1. In cases of disciplinary ~~charges~~~~action~~ filed~~commenced~~ by the administration against a member of the Academic Senate, or termination of appointment of a member of the faculty in a case where the right to a hearing before a Senate committee is given under Section 103.9 or 103.10 of the Standing Orders of The Regents, ~~disciplinary charges~~~~proceedings~~ shall be ~~filed~~~~initiated~~ by the appropriate Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, once probable cause has been established. Procedures regarding the establishment of probable cause are determined by APM 015/016 and Divisional policies. The disciplinary charges shall be in writing and shall contain notice of proposed disciplinary ~~sanctions~~~~action~~ and a full statement of the facts underlying the charges.

- a. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall deliver the disciplinary charges to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, with a copy to the accused faculty member. If practicable, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall deliver the disciplinary charges at an in-person meeting with the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and the accused faculty member. If this is not practicable, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall deliver the disciplinary charges to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure electronically, with a copy to the accused sent electronically to the accused's official University email account and a courtesy copy by overnight delivery service to the accused's last known place of residence. The accused will be deemed to have received the disciplinary charges when they are sent to the accused's official University email account.

- b. Along with a copy of the charges, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall provide written notice to the accused of (i) the deadline for submitting an answer to the disciplinary charges (section C.2 below), and (ii) the deadline for commencing the hearing (section E.1 below).

~~Upon receipt of the charges, the Chair of the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee shall promptly deliver a copy to the accused faculty member or send it by registered mail to the accused's last known place of residence.~~

2. The accused shall have 1421 calendar days from the date of the receipt of the disciplinary charges in which to file an answer in writing with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall immediately provide a copy of the answer to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee. Upon

~~receipt of a written application, the chair of the Committee may grant a reasonable extension of time for filing of an answer and shall immediately notify the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee of the extension. (Am 14 Jun 17)~~

3. Within five business days after receiving the disciplinary charges, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall contact the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or their representatives in writing in order to schedule the hearing.
  - a. The Chair shall offer a choice of dates for the hearing and instruct the parties to provide their availability on the given dates within 14 calendar days.
  - b. Within five business days after receiving the information requested in section 3.a from the parties, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure will schedule the hearing and notify the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or their representatives in writing of the date(s). The accused shall be given either in person or by email or overnight delivery service, at least ten calendar days' notice of the time and place of the hearing.
  - c. All parties must give priority to the scheduling of a hearing and cooperate in good faith during the scheduling process. A hearing shall not be postponed because the accused faculty member is on leave or fails to appear.

~~The Privilege and Tenure committee shall consider the matter within 21 calendar days after receipt of an answer or, if no answer is received, after the deadline for receipt of an answer. The Committee shall evaluate the case and establish time frames for all subsequent procedures. The committee may suggest mediation (SBL 336.C.2) or appoint a hearing committee (SBL 336.D). All parties are expected to give priority to scheduling of the hearing. A hearing shall not be postponed because the faculty member is on leave or fails to appear. As a general guide, a prehearing conference (SBL 336.D.2) shall be scheduled (though not necessarily held) within 30 calendar days and a hearing (SBL 336.D) shall be scheduled (though not necessarily held) within 90 calendar days of the appointment of a hearing committee. Ideally, a hearing should be scheduled within 90 days of the date on which the accused faculty member was notified of the intent to initiate a disciplinary proceeding. The accused shall be given, either personally or by registered mail, at least ten calendar days' notice of the time and place of the hearing. The Chancellor, Chancellor's designee, or Chair of the Privilege and Tenure Committee may for good reason grant an extension of any of these time limits. (Am 14 Jun 17)~~

~~The Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when it is reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or, additionally, for an allegation of sexual violence or~~



sexual harassment, when the allegation is first reported to the campus Title IX Officer. The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation. There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation. (Am 9 March 05) (Am 14 Jun 17)

#### D. Early Resolution

##### 2. Negotiation:

1. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and the accused may attempt to resolve the disciplinary charges through negotiations. A negotiated resolution is permissible and appropriate at any stage of these disciplinary procedures. Such negotiations may proceed with the assistance of impartial third parties, including one or more members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. However, such negotiation shall not extend any deadline in this Bylaw. If such negotiation takes place after the charges have been filed, timelines for completing the hearing process may be extended to accommodate such negotiations only if the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the accused faculty member agree. (Am 14 Jun 17)

~~Such negotiations may proceed with the assistance of impartial third parties, including one or more members of the Committee.~~

- a. ~~A negotiated resolution is permissible and appropriate at any stage of these disciplinary procedures. If a negotiated resolution is reached after disciplinary written charges are filed, then the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee is encouraged to consult with the chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement and should inform the Committee on Privilege and Tenure Privilege and Tenure Committee if the matter is resolved.~~ (Am 14 Jun 17)

##### Mediation:

~~The disciplinary charges may also be resolved through mediation in cases where such mediation is acceptable to the administration and the accused. With the consent of the administration and the accused, the Committee may assist in the selection of an appropriate mediator. Other relevant parties, including members of the Committee, may participate in the mediation.~~

2. If a negotiated resolution is reached after disciplinary charges are filed, then the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee is encouraged to consult with the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement. The Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure should make a request for such a consultation oOnce disciplinary charges have been filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee should inform the Committee on Privilege and Tenure if the matter is resolved. , the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure Privilege and Tenure Committee should request that the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee consult with the Committee or its chair prior to the completion of any early resolution.

#### E. Time Frame for Hearing Process in Disciplinary Cases

1. The hearing shall begin no later than 60 calendar days from the date disciplinary charges are filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
2. Any deadline in this Bylaw may be extended by the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure or the Chair of the Hearing Committee, but only for good cause shown, requested in writing in advance. Good cause consists of material or unforeseen circumstances sufficient to justify the extension sought. A request to delay the start of the hearing beyond the 60 days mandated by this Bylaw must include adequate documentation of the basis for the request.
3. Within three business days of receiving an extension request, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure or the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall notify the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives in writing of the approval or denial of the request. If the request is approved, the notification shall include the reason for granting it, the length of the extension, and the projected new timeline.

#### C.F. Hearing and Post-hearing Procedures

1. The ~~Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure~~ ~~Privilege and Tenure Committee~~ shall appoint a Hearing Committee for each ~~disciplinary case in which disciplinary charges have been filed that is not resolved through a negotiated resolution or mediation.~~ The Hearing Committee must include at least three ~~should consist of at least three Division~~ members.
  - a. A majority of the Hearing Committee members shall be current or former members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall be a current member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. In exceptional circumstances, the Hearing Committee may include one member from another Divisional Academic Senate.
  - b. The Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure may not appoint a member of the department or equivalent administrative unit of any of the parties to the Hearing Committee.
  - c. Hearing Committee members shall disclose to the Hearing Committee any circumstances that may interfere with their objective consideration of the case and recuse themselves as appropriate.
  - d. A quorum for the conduct of the hearing shall consist of a majority of the Hearing Committee, including at least one member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.  
~~At least two of the members shall be members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, one of whom shall chair the Hearing Committee.~~

~~The Committee may not appoint a member of the department or equivalent administrative unit of any of the parties to the Hearing Committee. Hearing Committee members shall disclose to the Hearing Committee any circumstances that may interfere with their objective consideration of the case and recuse themselves as appropriate. A quorum for the conduct of the hearing shall consist of at least half but not less than three members of the Hearing Committee, including at least one member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.~~

2. Within two business days after the hearing has been scheduled the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall notify the accused, the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives in writing of the Hearing Committee's decisions on the following prehearing matters:

Prior to the formal hearing, the chair of the Hearing Committee shall schedule a conference with the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives. This conference should attempt to:

- a. The Hearing Committee's initial determination of the issues to be decided at the hearing. The Chair of the Hearing Committee shall invite the parties to inform the Committee of any other issues they believe to be important. The final determination of the issues to be decided shall be made by the Hearing Committee.

Determine the facts about which there is no dispute. At the hearing, these facts may be established by stipulation.

- b. The deadline for the parties to determine the facts about which there is no dispute. At the hearing, these facts may be established by stipulation.  
Define the issues to be decided by the Hearing Committee.

- c. The deadline for both sides to exchange a list of witnesses and copies of exhibits to be presented at the hearing. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to limit each party to those witnesses whose names are disclosed to the other party prior to the hearing and to otherwise limit evidence to that which is relevant to the issues before the Hearing Committee.

~~Set a time consistent with the timelines laid out in 336.B.3 for both sides to exchange a list of witnesses and copies of exhibits to be presented at the hearing. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to limit each party to those witnesses whose names were disclosed to the other party prior to the hearing and to otherwise limit evidence to that which is relevant to the issues before the Hearing Committee. (Am 14 Jun 17)~~

- d. Specify whether prehearing and post-hearing briefs will be submitted by the parties and, if so, the deadline for submitting those briefs.  
as well as the deadlines for those briefs.

- e. Attain agreement about whether any person other than the Chancellor, the Chancellor's designee, the accused, and their representatives, may be present during all or part of the hearing. In order to preserve the confidentiality of the hearing, persons whose presence is not essential to a determination of the facts shall, as a general rule, be excluded from the hearing.

After the prehearing letter has been sent, the Chair of the Hearing Committee may at his or her discretion schedule a conference with the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives, to resolve any questions concerning items (a) through (e) above. Such a conference should take place as soon as possible. The scheduling of such a conference shall not result in an extension of the hearing date.

3. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, the accused, and/or their representatives shall be entitled to be present at all sessions of the Hearing Committee when evidence is being received. Each party shall have the right to be represented by counsel, to present its case by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.
4. The hearing need not be conducted according to the technical legal rules relating to evidence and witnesses. The Hearing Committee may, upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, request files and documents under the control of the administration. All confidential information introduced into evidence shall remain so within the Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee may call witnesses or make evidentiary requests on its own volition. The Hearing Committee also has the discretion to require that all witnesses affirm the veracity of their testimony and to permit witnesses to testify by videoconferencing. (Am 14 Jun 17)
5. Prior discipline imposed on the same accused faculty member after a hearing or by negotiation may be admitted into evidence if the prior conduct for which the faculty member was disciplined is relevant to the acts alleged in the current disciplinary matter. Under these conditions, prior hearing reports and records of negotiated settlements are always admissible. (Am 14 Jun 17)
6. No evidence other than that presented at the hearing shall be considered by the Hearing Committee or have weight in the proceedings, except that the Hearing Committee may take notice of any judicially noticeable facts that are commonly known. Parties present at the hearing shall be informed of matters thus noticed, and each party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to object to the Hearing Committee's notice of such matters.
7. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure may, at its discretion, request the appointment of a qualified person or persons, designated by the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to provide legal advice and/or to assist in the organization and conduct of the hearing.
8. At the hearing, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee has the burden of proving the allegations by clear and convincing evidence.

9. The Hearing Committee shall not have power to recommend the imposition of a sanction more severe than that proposed in the notice of proposed disciplinary action. In determining the appropriate sanction to recommend, the Hearing Committee may choose to consider previous charges against the accused if those charges led to prior sanctions either after a disciplinary hearing or pursuant to a negotiated or mediated resolution.
10. ~~At the conclusion of the hearing,~~ the Hearing Committee shall ~~promptly~~ make its findings of fact, conclusions supported by a statement of reasons based on the evidence, and recommendation. These shall be forwarded and forward these to the parties in the case, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, not more than 30 calendar days after the conclusion of the hearing. The conclusion of the hearing shall be the date of the Committee's receipt of (a) the written transcript of the hearing; or (b) if post-hearing briefs are permitted, the post-hearing briefs from the parties in the case, whichever is later. The findings, conclusions, recommendations, and record of the proceedings shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law and UC policy. The Hearing Committee may, however, with the consent of the accused, authorize release of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations to other individuals or entities, to the extent allowed by law.
11. The hearing shall be recorded. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to use a certified court reporter ~~(whose cost is borne by the administration)~~ for this purpose, and the parties and their representatives shall have the right to a copy of the recording or transcript. The cost of the court reporter as well as other costs associated with the hearing will be borne by the administration. ~~copy shall be assumed by the requesting party.~~
12. The Hearing Committee may reconsider a case if either party presents, within a reasonable time after the decision, newly discovered facts or circumstances that might significantly affect the previous decision and that were not reasonably discoverable at the time of the hearing.

#### D.G. Relation to Prior Grievance Cases

A disciplinary Hearing Committee shall not be bound by the recommendation of another hearing body, including the findings of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure in a grievance case involving the same set of incidents. However, the Hearing Committee may accept into evidence the findings of another hearing body or investigative agency. The weight to be accorded evidence of this nature is at the discretion of the Hearing Committee and should take account of the nature of the other forum. In any case, the accused faculty member must be given full opportunity to challenge the findings of the other body.

#### 4. Revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area “d”)

**Background and Justification for Revisions:** In February 2008, the Assembly approved [revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3](#), proposed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools related to the area “d” (laboratory science) requirement for freshman admission. The revisions increase the existing minimum area “d” requirement from 2 units to 3 units (3 units are currently recommended), while continuing to require 2 units of coursework that “provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics”. The amendments also change the name of the area “d” requirement from “Laboratory Science” to “Science” to reflect the broader range of science disciplines to be accepted for the third unit under area “d”. BOARS also approved a modification to the A-G Guide to include specific examples of courses that may fulfill the third unit requirement not explicitly mentioned in the Senate regulations, such as engineering, and computer science. These changes are consistent with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) developed to stimulate students’ interests in science and prepares them for college, careers, and citizenship, and the direction taken by the State of California.

The Regents have delegated the authority to set admissions policy to the Senate, subject to their approval; however, the Senate’s recommendation on area “d” has been placed on hold, because the Administration has reservations about one of its key elements – increasing the “d” requirement from 2 to 3 units. While BOARS supports further study of concerns raised, it wants to move ahead with approval of the other components of the proposal. BOARS has resubmitted proposed revisions as separate items for Council and Assembly approval. This course of action will allow for additional study while enabling renaming of the requirement and expansion of approved courses to proceed. In the meantime, UC’s area “d” requirement will remain at two years of laboratory science coursework required; three years recommended.

BOARS’ approval of updated evaluation guidelines in the A-G Guide expand the courses eligible for approval in area “d” as the third recommended year of the laboratory science subject requirement. Under the expanded course list, students will continue to be required to take two courses from biology, chemistry, physics, or integrated versions of these foundational disciplines. They can then take a recommended third science course from any and all approved area “d” courses, which now includes the expanded list.

At its March 20, 2019 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed BOARS’ request to separate the three elements of the policy. The Assembly is asked to amend its policy to remove the elements of the policy related to the courses eligible for area “d”.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** The Assembly is asked to endorse the following three action:

1. **Rename the area d requirement from “laboratory science” to “science”.**
2. **Endorse the expanded course list approved by BOARS at their 12/1/18 and 1/4/19 meetings**
3. **Encourage the administration to increase the course requirements from 2 + 1 recommended, to 3, in keeping with the NGSS.**



**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**

**Eddie Comeaux, Chair**

[eddie.comeaux@ucr.edu](mailto:eddie.comeaux@ucr.edu)

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 5, 2019

**ROBERT MAY, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: Area d revisions**

Dear Robert,

As you know, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has worked diligently over the past few years to revise the University's area d admission requirement for freshman applicants. Area d covers instruction in "laboratory sciences." In late 2017, BOARS submitted revisions to the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly, which were endorsed by both bodies. BOARS proposed 1) to change the name from "laboratory science" to "science"; 2) to expand the approved course listings under area d; and 3) to increase the required number of courses from 2 + 1 recommended, to 3 required, in keeping with the Next Generation Science Standards the California State Board of Education has adopted.

Notwithstanding Council and Assembly support for this package of revisions, the proposal has not moved forward over the past several months. Provost Brown disputed some of the findings cited in support of the recommendation to require 3 science courses, asserting that the change would impact eligibility negatively for certain vulnerable populations. He declined to support the proposal in its entirety and recommended additional analysis of potential effects on eligibility. In considering how best to proceed, BOARS discussed resubmitting proposed revisions as separate items for Council and Assembly ratification. This course allows for additional study of concerns raised about moving to a 3-course requirement—a change that would need Regental approval—while enabling renaming of the requirement and expansion of approved courses to proceed.

Accordingly, BOARS now submits the following items as three separate actions for the Council and the Assembly to ratify:

1. To rename the area d requirement from "laboratory science" to "science".
2. To endorse the expanded course list approved by BOARS at their 12/1/18 and 1/4/19 meetings (enclosed).
3. To encourage the administration to increase the course requirements from 2 + 1 recommended, to 3, in keeping with the NGSS.

The rationale and supporting documents remain unchanged.

Thank you for your assistance with this important matter.

Sincerely,

Eddie Comeaux  
BOARS Chair

cc: Members of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)  
Executive Director Baxter



### Summary of CA NGSS-Aligned Course Models & Options for BOARS Approval

California has approved three high school course models aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards (CA NGSS) for K-12. *The courses in each model are not required to be taught in a specific sequence.* The **yellow highlighted** rows provide examples of how the three NGSS course models can be implemented at a school site, which in turn, provide examples of how students might fulfill the 2-year area D requirement for admissions.

**Approved (as of 12/7/18):** Options 1.1-5.1, as described below.

	Types of Course Models	Course Options			
1	Former CA Science Standards (CSS) Core Discipline + Core Discipline	Biology	Chemistry	Physics	NOTE: These options reflect how UC has evaluated fulfillment of area D, pre-NGSS.
2	CSS Core + CSS Integrated Science	Bio / Chem / Physics	Integrated Science		
3	CSS Core + CSS Interdisciplinary Science	Bio / Chem / Physics	Interdisciplinary Science (e.g., AP Environmental Sci)		
4	CSS Integrated Science + CSS Integrated Science	Integrated Science	Integrated Science		
5	CSS Integrated Science + CSS Interdisciplinary Science	Integrated Science	Interdisciplinary Science		
1	Former CA Science Standards (CSS) Core Discipline + Core Discipline	Biology	Chemistry	Physics	
1.1	NGSS 4-Course Model Core Discipline + Core Discipline / ESS	Biology/Life Sciences	Chemistry	Physics	Earth & Space Sciences
1.2	NGSS 3-Course Model Core-ESS + Core-ESS	Biology-Earth & Space Sciences	Chemistry-Earth & Space Sciences	Physics-Earth & Space Sciences	
2	CSS Core + CSS Integrated Science	Bio / Chem / Physics	Integrated Science		
2.1	NGSS Core + NGSS Integrated Science	Bio / Chem / Physics	Integrated Science 1 / 2 / 3		
2.2	NGSS ESS + NGSS Integrated Science	Earth & Space Sciences	Integrated Science 1 / 2 / 3		
2.3	NGSS Core-ESS + NGSS Integrated Science	Bio-ESS / Chem-ESS / Physics-ESS	Integrated Science 1 / 2 / 3		

3	<i>CSS Core + CSS Interdisciplinary Science</i>	<i>Bio / Chem / Physics</i>	<i>Interdisciplinary Science (e.g., AP Environmental Sci)</i>		
3.1	NGSS Core + NGSS Interdisciplinary Science	Bio / Chem / Physics	Interdisciplinary Science		
3.2	NGSS Core-ESS + NGSS Interdisciplinary Science	Bio-ESS / Chem-ESS / Physics-ESS	Interdisciplinary Science		
4	<i>CSS Integrated Science + CSS Integrated Science</i>	<i>Integrated Science</i>	<i>Integrated Science</i>		
4.1	<b>NGSS Every Science, Every Year Integrated Model</b> Integrated Science + Integrated Science	Integrated Science 1	Integrated Science 2	Integrated Science 3	
5	<i>CSS Integrated Science + CSS Interdisciplinary Science</i>	<i>Integrated Science</i>	<i>Interdisciplinary Science</i>		
5.1	NGSS Integrated Science + NGSS Interdisciplinary Sci	Integrated Sci 1 / 2 / 3	Interdisciplinary Science		

**Approved (as of 1/4/19)**

6.1 and 6.2 will allow students the option to complete a Computer Science/Engineering/Applied Science course approved in area D as one of the courses above and beyond the current two-year area D requirement.

	<b>Types of Course Models</b>	<b>Course Options</b>			
6.1	NGSS Core / Core-ESS + NGSS CS / Engineering / Applied Science	Bio / Bio-ESS Chem / Chem-ESS Physics/Physics-ESS	Bio / Bio-ESS Chem / Chem-ESS Physics/Physics-ESS	Computer Science / Engineering / Applied Science	
6.2	NGSS Integrated Science + NGSS CS / Engineering / Applied Science	Integrated Sci 1 / 2 / 3	Integrated Sci 1 / 2 / 3	Computer Science / Engineering / Applied Science	

## **5. Proposed Policy on Awarding Degrees Posthumously**

At its January 23, 2019 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed a proposal from the University Committee on Educational Policy for a systemwide policy for awarding undergraduate and graduate degrees to students who pass away close to the completion of the degree. The Council asks the Assembly to recommend it to the President as a Regents Policy, which would make it binding on all campuses.

**Background and Justification:** First developed as a set of guidelines for campuses, a re-draft as an integrative systemwide policy was requested by Academic Council. The resulting policy reflects collaboration with CCGA to include graduate as well as baccalaureate degrees. To compose the policy, UCEP and CCGA collected and reviewed campus policies to develop a shared statement of priorities and processes. UCEP found that requirements for awarding posthumous degrees vary across campuses and the University should have a consistent systemwide policy, given that students receive University of California degrees, not campus degrees. Overall, the focus of this policy is to provide common definitions, parameters, and process guidelines to inform what are unusual and often tragic circumstances, while also allowing for some exercise of judgement given specific circumstances. These degrees and certificates acknowledge the established and potential achievements of UC students. To that end, this policy provides criteria and procedures to campus leadership, while encouraging generosity. It can be a significant consolation for friends and families of a deceased student to receive formal recognition of the student's pathway to degree completion.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** The Assembly is asked to endorse the policy and forward to the president with a recommendation for review and final approval by the Board of Regents.



**PROPOSED MODEL SYSTEMWIDE POLICY  
FOR THE  
AWARDING OF POSTHUMOUS BACCALAUREATE & GRADUATE DEGREES  
December 2018**

UCEP recommends the following model for a systemwide policy to regulate the posthumous awarding of baccalaureate and graduate degrees. For families of a deceased student, it may be a significant consolation that the student's near completion of a degree is formally recognized. Students who fall too far short of the criteria to merit an exception, should receive a "Certificate of Attendance" that details the student's progress toward the degree.

**Policy on the Posthumous Awarding Of Degrees And Certificates Of Attendance**

**Purpose**

The University of California seeks to extend sympathy and compassion to the families of students who pass away near the completion of their degrees and to recognize the academic achievement of students who would have fulfilled the requirements of the degree. These actions must be balanced with attention to academic and institutional integrity.

**Criteria**

Normally, the posthumous conferral of the degree is granted to students currently enrolled or on leave at the time of death. The following specify a common threshold to be eligible for a posthumous conferral of a degree as what is termed near completion of a degree:

- For a baccalaureate degree, the deceased student should have senior-level standing and have at least a 2.0 GPA.
- For a doctoral degree, the deceased student should have advanced to candidacy and have demonstrated a sufficiently high level of scholarly achievement that, in the opinion of their advisor and one other member of their doctoral committee, they were more likely than not to have successfully completed their doctorate.
- For a master's degree, the deceased student should either have completed a draft of the master's thesis (or a substantial portion thereof) or, for programs that do not require a thesis, have completed all the final term of their coursework for the degree.

A near completion of degree, as defined above, is a standard level for eligibility for posthumous conferral of a degree; however, circumstances are not predictable or simple, and thus benefitting from discretion through an appeal process. For students who pass away before achieving near completion of the degree (as defined above), the home campus may: consider an exception to

confer the degree posthumously or offer a Certificate of Attendance detailing the student's progress toward the degree.

Appeals for exceptions for students who narrowly fail to reach these thresholds will be considered by the local senate council responsible for relevant educational policy. Appeals for exceptions can be made by anyone.

## **Procedure**

The process for identifying and considering candidates for the posthumous conferring of undergraduate degrees will vary from campus to campus, but will include the following features:

1. A formal request for the awarding of the degree may be initiated by any of the following: a family member, a faculty member, a dean, or a fellow student. If the request is not made by a family member, the family should be contacted, if possible, and consulted about the possible award.
2. The decision to award the degree should not be based solely on whether the student meets the criteria. A group (such as the Executive Committee of the student's school) or individual (such as the Dean of the student's school) must be tasked with assessing each case on its merits. Degrees should not be awarded to students whose actions at the time of their death would have lead to expulsion from the university or similar disciplinary action. Similarly, students who died in notably heroic circumstances should be considered potentially eligible for the degree even if they do not meet all the criteria.
3. Degrees awarded posthumously will be noted on the commencement program. The student's diploma or certificate will be released or mailed to the person legally authorized to manage the deceased student's affairs. The posthumous nature of the award will be indicated on the diploma and in the student's official transcript. Any fees associated with the administration of the degree or certificate of attendance shall be waived.

## **VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

### **B. Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs**

#### **1. CCGA Recommendation to Approve New Flexible Master of Social Welfare self-supporting graduate degree program at UCB [ACTION]**

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) recommends approval of a new Flexible Master of Social Welfare self-supporting graduate degree program at UC San Berkeley. The Flex-MSW will be a new degree program at UCB. As required by Senate Bylaw 116.C and Standing Order of the Regents 110.1, CCGA submits its recommendation to the Assembly for consideration. According to Senate Bylaw 116.C, “The Assembly shall consider for approval proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees received from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs and requiring approval by the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval. Proposals approved by the Assembly shall be submitted to the President.”

**ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the Flex MSW as a new degree program offered by UCB; forward recommendation to Provost Brown for approval by the President.**



## COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)

Onyebuchi A. Arah, Chair

[arah@ucla.edu](mailto:arah@ucla.edu)

## ACADEMIC SENATE

University of California

1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 25, 2019

**ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR ROBERT MAY**

Dear Robert,

At its March 6 meeting, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) voted 9-0-1 to approve a new Flexible Master of Social Welfare (“Flex-MSW”) self-supporting graduate degree program on the Berkeley campus.

The Berkeley division proposes using this Flex-MSW degree program to supplement their existing state-assisted professional Master of Social Welfare (MSW) degree program and attend to audiences not currently reached by the traditional MSW program. The Flex-MSW will specifically target qualified working professionals and otherwise qualified students who cannot attend a full-time professional degree program due to employment, family caregiving, or other obligations. The new program aims to address a critical and growing shortage of professional social workers in California and nationwide by increasing the size of Berkeley Social Welfare graduate student population and train more social workers at the master’s level.

The Flex-MSW will have two-tracks with courses offered taught by a mix of faculty members that will generally mirror the mix of faculty in its current state-assisted MSW program. Berkeley Social Welfare is a fully accredited program that is already permitted to offer the MSW degree in different tracks, including advanced standing and part-time ones. All courses for the Flex-MSW already exist as approved courses. To accommodate increased enrollment of Flex-MSW students and additional class sections needed to offer alternative timing of courses, the School plans to hire up to 4.0 FTEs (non-Senate practice faculty) to teach additional sections of some courses and field seminars. Berkeley expects that the new program will have limited impact on the existing state-assisted program.

The proposal was reviewed by two experts in the field. The lower than usual number was because CCGA determined that the academic aspects of the program were not that different from the existing MSW program. Both external reviewers were very positive about the program and recommended approval. Concerns raised about tuition/costs have been adequately addressed by the proposing team from UCB. CCGA, therefore, recommends approval of the proposal.

As you know, CCGA’s approval is the last stop of the Academic Senate side of the Systemwide review and approval process except when the new degree title must be approved by the President, under delegated authority from The Board of Regents. I submit this for your review and have enclosed the proposer’s response. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further questions regarding the proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Onyebuchi A. Arah', written in a cursive style.

Onyebuchi A. Arah  
Chair, Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)

cc: Kum-Kum Bhavnani Academic Council Vice Chair  
CCGA Members  
Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director  
Jocelyn Banaria, Academic Senate Assistant Director  
Chris Procello, Academic Planning and Research Analyst  
Fiona M. Doyle, UCB Graduate Dean  
Andrea Greenrush, UCB Senate Executive Director  
Sumei Quiggle, UCB Senate Associate Director  
Sumali Tuchrello, UCB Senate Analyst

Enclosures (1)





March 5, 2019

To: Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)  
From: Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Lead Reviewer

### **Proposal for a Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Program for the Flexible Master of Social Welfare (“Flex-MSW”) Degree**

In this report, I summarize my reading of the proposal. This was written after consultation with two external reviewers whose comments were shared with the proposers who were given an opportunity to respond to the concerns raised. The reviewer comments were largely positive, if not laudatory. I am satisfied with the way the program has addressed the concerns raised by the reviewers and responded to the reviewers. My recommendation is to approve the regular offering of the proposal.

#### **Introduction**

Berkeley Social Welfare aims to address a critical and growing shortage of professional social workers, in California and nationwide, by increasing the size of their graduate student population in order to train more social workers at the master’s level. They propose supplementing the existing, state-assisted professional Master of Social Welfare (MSW) degree program with a self- supporting Flexible MSW (“Flex-MSW”) degree program specifically targeted to audiences not previously reached through our traditional MSW program. These include qualified working professionals, and otherwise qualified students who cannot attend a full-time professional degree program due to employment, family caregiving, or other obligations. **The Flex MSW is not a new degree.** Berkeley Social Welfare currently offers a state-assisted professional MSW program, fully accredited and delivered in a traditional two-year, full-time format. The MSW is considered the terminal professional degree for social work and the field of social welfare. Educational policies and accreditation standards for the MSW are governed by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the sole accrediting body for social work education in the United States. Under these policies and standards, traditional MSW degree programs commonly require the general equivalent of two years of matriculation and study, inclusive of foundational and specialized coursework, and field education (primarily agency- based field placement practicums) for students. The current Berkeley MSW requires a minimum total of 54 units, including 25 units of field education.

#### **Need for the program**

1. Evidence of **continuing and increasing nationwide demand for social work majors and graduates**, students seeking admission to MSW programs with advanced standing status, and students seeking admission to part-time MSW programs.
2. **Strong support from critical employer stakeholders**, who recognize an urgent need for professionalization of the workforce.

3. Increasing access to the professional MSW by offering flexible degree tracks will subsequently **increase the pipeline of professional MSW-level social workers into leadership positions in California** state and local government and nonprofit human services agencies.
4. **Berkeley Social Welfare can increase its competitive advantage by entering the established market** through offering the high-demand professional MSW degree with approved flexible degree tracks that include part-time enrollment.
5. Social work is a growth profession in the United States, driven both by an ever-increasing demand for social work services, and a simultaneously emergent shortfall in the workforce projected to sufficiently meet this growing demand. **Opportunities for placement of graduates thus continue to be strong and continuously growing.**

## Faculty

All courses offered within the two Flex-MSW tracks will be taught by a mix of faculty members that generally parallels the mix of faculty in our current state-assisted MSW program. As a fully accredited program, UCB is already permitted to offer the MSW degree in different tracks, including advanced standing and part-time. All courses for the Flex-MSW already exist as approved courses. To accommodate increased enrollment from Flex-MSW students and any additional class sections needed to offer alternative timing of courses, the School expects to hire up to 4.0 FTEs (Non-Senate practice faculty) to teach additional sections of some courses and field seminars. Impact on the existing state-assisted program is expected to be limited.

## Degree requirement & enrollment plan

The unit requirement of programs is consistent with other market offerings, as per the analysis provided by the proposing team. The enrollment plan is provided below.

Academic Year	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
<b>Projected Advanced Standing Track Enrollment</b>	20	25	30
<b>Projected Extended (Part-time) Track Enrollment</b>	10	20	30

## SSP nature of the program

The UCPB report on the SSP budget seems adequate, although they raised some concerns about the differences between the state- and self-supported students. The UCPB report was shared with the proposal team at UCB and their response has been uploaded to the CCGA drive on UCOP's Share point site.

The program proposes to use the income from the SSGPDP to cover all expenses, including additional staff (such as additional field consultants, important for advising) and additional teachers. Those teaching in the SSGPDP are expected to have approximately the same mix of Senate faculty and non-senate faculty as the current MSW.

The budget includes a small percentage of return-to-aid for a few fellowships for students in the SSGPDP. These awards are said to be "in an amount consistent with average awards made to students in state-assisted programs." Fundraising is planned, which may provide more fellowship funding. The proposal also lists the other possible sources of support: employer-based financial support, long-term low-interest federal loans, possible federal and state Public Service Loan Forgiveness options.

At the current rate, the cost for four semesters of the state-assisted MSW is \$46,855 for a resident and \$71,345 for a non-resident. By Fall 2020 these figures will probably be higher. The cost of the Flex MSW is based on a per-unit fee of \$1850 as of Fall 2020. The accelerated 12-month program will cost \$49,950 and the three-year part-time program will come to a total of twice as much, \$99,900. The table of costs at comparable institutions on p. 27 of the proposal shows that these are competitive rates in comparison to 5 of the 7 comparanda (U. of Washington is considerably less expensive, and Washington U. in St. Louis is somewhat less expensive).

### **External reviews**

I had the proposal reviewed by two experts in the field. The lower than usual number was because the academic aspects of the program are not that different from the existing MSW program. Both external reviewers were very positive about the program and recommend approval. Some questions were raised about tuition/costs and they have been adequately addressed by the proposing team from UCB.

### **Reviewer Summary**

Overall, I believe that this is a good proposal and I endorse moving forward with the approval process for the flex MSW degree at UCB.

Sincerely,



Ramesh Balasubramaniam, PhD  
Professor, Cognitive & Information Sciences  
University of California  
Merced, CA 95343 USA  
Phone: +1-209-228-2314  
Web: <http://www.rameshlab.com>  
Email: [ramesh@ucmerced.edu](mailto:ramesh@ucmerced.edu)

**VII. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]**

**A. Consent Calendar**

**VIII. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]**

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**