NOTICE OF MEETING
Tuesday, October 15, 2019, 3:30 p.m.
Garren Auditorium, Biomedical Sciences Building, 1st Floor

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(1) Minutes of Meeting of June 4, 2019

(2-7) Announcements
(a) Chair Maripat Corr
(b) Executive Vice Chancellor Elizabeth Simmons
(c) Erik Mitchell, University Librarian
   Update on Elsevier Negotiations
(d) Robert Horwitz, Former Divisional Senate Chair
   Senate Overview

(8) Special Orders
(a) Consent Calendar
   Committee Annual Reports
      • Committee on Committees
      • Committee on Research & Research Grant Committees
      • Educational Policy
      • Graduate Council
      • Undergraduate Council
   Senate Special Election Fall 2019

(9) Reports of Special Committees [none]

(10) Reports of Standing Committees
(a) Educational Policy Committee, Geoffrey Cook, Chair
    • Policy on Distance Education Courses
(b) Graduate Council, Maho Niwa Rosen, Member
    Craig McIntosh, Professor, School of Global Policy & Strategy
    • Department of Political Science and School of Global Policy and Strategy,
      Proposal to Establish Five-Year Bachelor of Arts/Master of International Affairs
      (BA-MIA) Program

[Any member of the Academic Senate may attend and make motions at meetings of the Representative Assembly; however, only members of the Representative Assembly may second motions and vote.]
(11) Reports of Faculties

(a) Health Science Faculty Council, Elizabeth Winzeler, Chair
   • Proposed Revision to Divisional Senate Bylaw 503, Grading Policy–School of Medicine

(12) Petitions of Students [none]

(13) Unfinished Business [none]

(14) New Business
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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<td>SEND, UWE</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOLOGY</td>
<td>LEWIS, KEVIN M</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STALLING, VANESSA</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>POWELL, LORA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN STUDIES &amp; PLANNING</td>
<td>MARTIN, ISAAC WILLIAM</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UROLOGY</td>
<td>DERWEESH, ITHAAR H</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL ARTS</td>
<td>DOMINGUEZ, RICARDO RENE</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>BRYSON, WILLIAM N</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WARDWELL, MARIANA RAZO</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>STALBAUM, BRETT O</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVISORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH ADVISOR - GC</td>
<td>GARUDADRI, HARINATH</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
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<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH ADVISOR - HS</td>
<td>KING, CHARLES</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td>LI, SHENG</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>HAASE, JENNIFER</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
<td>JOHNSTON, T.M. SHAUN</td>
<td>2020/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE STUDENT ADVISOR</td>
<td>GRUBB, TOM</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ADVISOR</td>
<td>MANLUTAC, ANNIKA</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PARTHASARATHY, ADARSH</td>
<td>2019/2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chair Horwitz called the meeting to order. A quorum was present (see attached attendance sheet), along with other Academic Senate members and guests. Chair Horwitz welcomed everyone to the fifth and final Representative Assembly meeting of the academic year, and introduced Vice Chair Maripat Corr and Professor Gerry Mackie, Parliamentarian. Chair Horwitz introduced the Academic Senate staff present: Ray Rodriguez (Director); Alain Montgomery (Senate Analyst); Trevor Buchanan (Technical Support); Lori Hullings (Associate Director) and Andrew Flores (Executive Assistant). Chair Horwitz reviewed the Academic Senate Bylaws governing membership, privileges of the floor, and voting.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING ON APRIL 16, 2019
There were no objections and the minutes of the April 16, 2019 were approved as submitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR OF THE DIVISION
Chair Horwitz thanked Senate members for their participation and acknowledged the outstanding accomplishments of the Senate’s work this past year. Chair Horwitz emphasized the strength of shared governance and the importance of having an active senate faculty.

[The Chair’s comments are included with these minutes as Enclosure A].

At the close of the announcements, Chair Horwitz invited Chancellor Pradeep Khosla to address the Assembly.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHANCELLOR PRADEEP KHOSLA
Chancellor Khosla thanked Chair Horwitz and greeted the Assembly. Chancellor Khosla emphasized the importance of working together in order to move the campus forward and provided updates about the current fiscal health and financial forecast of the University. The Chancellor reported that the current campus budget is strong, ending the year ended with a $28 million surplus, and that the campus will break even next year. However, it is anticipated that by 2021 the campus will face a projected budget deficit of $24 million. The Chancellor explained that we have to be true to our mission and to who we are as a university and at the same time develop creative and innovative ways to generate revenue. He acknowledged that while there was initial resistance to the decision to grant masters degrees, the degrees generate $70M in revenue for the campus.

A member asked for more information about the forecasted budget deficit. The Chancellor explained that despite the hard work of the faculty, the strength of our reputation, and our $1.2 billion research volume, the campus will need $35 million in additional funding from the state each year to stay afloat.

At the close of questions, Chair Horwitz invited Cherie Scricca, Interim Director & Title IX Officer for Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) to address the Assembly.

PRESENTATION BY INTERIM DIRECTOR & TITLE IX OFFICER FROM THE OFFICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF HARASSMENT AND DISCRIMINATION (OPHD) CHERIE SCRICCA
Interim Director and Title IX Officer from the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD), Cherie Scricca, explained the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) edict to all
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university Presidents as part of its commitment to ensure that all NSF-funded research and learning environments are free from sexual harassment. The NSF has strict policy of intolerance for sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, and sexual assault that occur at awardee organizations, field sites or anywhere science or education is conducted. Interim Director Scricca explained the edict issued to university Presidents in Notice No. 144, February 8, 2018 by the NSF.

The purpose of the Notice is to protect the safety of all grant personnel and promote harassment-free workplaces. The Notice mandates Awardees to report any findings relating to harassment or sexual assault that result in administrative leave, suspension, termination, or replacement/removal of a Principal Investigator (PI) or co-PI.

Interim Director Scricca, described UC San Diego’s response protocols and the avenues of inquiry and investigation that occur when a complaint is initially filed with OPHD. Potential outcomes include everything from alternative resolution, to the adoption of interim or alternative measures which could result in a report to NSF, or to an investigation which could result in the imposition of discipline or sanctions as well as a report to NSF.

At the close of Cherie Scricca’s presentation, Chair Horwitz invited Professor Judith Varner, Chair of Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to address the Assembly.

[The slides and handout provided for this presentation are included with these minutes as Enclosure B]

PRESENTATION BY CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE (CPT)  
JUDY VARNER

Professor Judith Varner, Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT), presented an explanation of the Grievance and Disciplinary Actions processes for Senate members which are governed by UC Systemwide Senate Bylaws. Chair Varner provided a detailed description of the procedural steps involved in each type of case.

Chair Varner explained that a Grievance hearing occurs when the CPT makes a prima facie finding and determination that there is sufficient reason to believe that the grievant’s rights and privileges may have been violated. Chair Varner explained that while a formal process exists to handle a grievance, Deans and Chairs are encouraged to make every effort to resolve the matter informally. Chair Varner pointed out that grievances which allege sexual harassment/violence are immediately referred to the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD). In such a situation, the grievance is held in abeyance pending the outcome of the investigation.

In discussing the process that results in a Disciplinary hearing, Chair Varner explained that the CPT does not make any preliminary review findings (unlike in a grievance action). Currently, the steps involved in a disciplinary case require that the Senate member be notified of the charges by the Office of the Academic Senate. Also, a prehearing conference is held which serves as the preliminary step in planning for a disciplinary hearing. Chair Varner shared that the new process for Disciplinary Cases, effective July 01, 2019, will result in matters being resolved more quickly as the Administration (not the Senate Office) will send the charges directly to the Senate member and a hearing will be planned without a prehearing conference.

For Senate members who are interested in obtaining more information about the Senate Bylaws and relevant UC policies that pertain to the Grievances and Disciplinary Hearing processes Chair Varner directed members to the CPT’s webpage on the Senate’s website.
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[The slides and handout provided for this presentation are included with these minutes as Enclosure C]

**SPECIAL ORDERS**  
Consent Calendar [None]

**REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES**[None]

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Undergraduate Council: Anthony Burr, Chair; and John Moore, Dean, Undergraduate Education – 7th College Academic Plan
Chair Horwitz invited Dean Moore to provide an overview of the 7th College Academic Plan. This Academic year, the full proposal for the 7th College was approved by the San Diego Divisional Senate, the Systemwide Academic Council, UC Office of the President, and the UC Board of Regents. Dean Moore explained that consistent with UC San Diego’s college system, 7th College allows for a small liberal arts experience within UC San Diego’s large research setting. The 7th College brings together four aspects of the student experience which include general education, academic advising, student affairs, and residence life. The current action plan places an emphasis on making the plan available to prospective students, recruiting faculty, and appointing a Provost and an Executive Committee.

The intellectual and academic theme of 7th College’s is “A Changing Planet.” The intent behind the theme was to create a college identity that lends itself to work across multiple disciplines that extend beyond connections to climate change and the environment, such as, the Arts, Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science, and Quantitative Reasoning. It is anticipated that the “Changing Planet” theme will allow the College’s educational curriculum and emphasis to remain relevant to future generations. Dean Moore described how the 7th College Academic Plan promotes timely graduation as four-year completion plans are available for all majors. With respect to the 7th College coursework, The 7th College incorporates “Alternatives,” “Synthesis Courses,” and “High Impact Courses” into its curriculum. The three different course categorizations will afford students the opportunity to engage in collaborative, multidisciplinary, and experiential work. And, specific previously raised concerns around teaching obligations for those teaching outside a home department and the recruitment of faculty were addressed.

Undergraduate Council Chair Burr made a formal motion for the approval of the 7th College Academic Plan on behalf of Undergraduate Council. Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, no second motion was required. Senate Chair Horwitz opened the floor to questions and discussion.

An attendee asked how transfer students will be accommodated. Dean Moore explained that transfer students who have completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) will be permitted to use the experience from their previous institution to cover a portion of the 7th College general education.

At the close of the discussion, Chair Horwitz called for a vote on the 7th College Academic Plan. The proposal to approve the 7th College Academic Plan was approved unanimously.

Senate Council, Maripat Corr, Vice Chair; Isaac Martin, Professor, Department of Sociology – Urban Studies & Planning Department Proposal
Chair Horwitz invited Professor Martin to provide an overview of the Urban Studies & Planning Department Proposal. Professor Martin explained that UC San Diego has a successful undergraduate curriculum that includes Urban Studies & Planning and Real Estate Development and is located in the largest U.S. metro area that is a test bed for 21st century planning challenges, but does not yet have a
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department offering an accredited planning degree. The proposed department would be consistent with UC San Diego’s strategic plan. Professor Martin emphasized that there are already community partners and allied faculty supportive of a UC San Diego Urban Studies & Planning Department.

The proposal outlined a year-by-year growth plan through 2022 that focuses on the hiring of faculty. Professor Martin explained that the Department will focus on external hires rather than recruiting faculty from other departments. Also, there will be an emphasis on hiring faculty who hold a Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Planning and those with expertise in allied disciplines. Administrative Staff for the Department will be funded by the social sciences support model and will include one departmental manager, one student affairs officer, and one administrative staff position for AP, HR, financial and events; additionally, one GIS/Design lab manager will be provided through an instructional lab support line item. The department is expected to occupy space planned for the USP in the North Torrey Pines Living and Learning neighborhood.

Vice Chair Corr made a formal motion for the approval of the Urban Studies & Planning Department Proposal on behalf of Senate Council. Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, no second motion was required. Senate Chair Horwitz opened the floor to questions and discussion.

Senate members expressed enthusiasm for the creation of the Department and acknowledged the opportunity that the Department would have in attracting strong scholars and research grants, as well as, its potential to be a pedagogical powerhouse and serve as a model for how small academic fields can grow at UC San Diego.

At the close of the discussion, Chair Horwitz called for a vote on the Urban Studies & Planning Department Proposal. The proposal to approve the Urban Studies & Planning Department was approved unanimously.

Graduate Council, Sorin Lerner, Chair; and Yu Hwa Lo, Professor, Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering – Proposed MS & PhD Degrees in Electrical & Computer Engineering (Medical Imaging)

Chair Horwitz invited Professor Lo to provide an overview of the ECE Medical Imaging Graduate (MS/PhD) Degree proposal. The degree proposal was initiated by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) and the Department of Radiology. Ultimately, the proposed degree will result in a student receiving a degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering with a specialization in medical imaging. Professor Lo explained the tremendous advancement and growth in the field of medical imaging. Students who participate in the program will learn imaging process techniques from a mathematical and engineering perspective and will learn how to directly apply those techniques in a clinical environment. Since radiology is a discipline that relies extensively on knowledge and skills in the field of ECE, there is an expectation that the expertise of both departments to educate ECE MS and PhD students will meet the growing demand and fast changing world of medicine and medical technologies. Radiology faculty expressed a commitment to teaching courses for the program every year.

Graduate Council Chair Lerner made a formal motion for the approval of the proposed MS & Ph.D. Degrees in Electrical & Computer Engineering on behalf of Graduate Council. Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, no second motion was required. Senate Chair Horwitz opened the floor to questions and discussion.

An attendee asked whether or not the specialization should be offered by the school of Data Science. Professor Lo explained that while there are areas complementary to data processing that will be added to the degree, that the purpose of the specialization is not to understand data science as it is to understand how a new modality will impact patient management.
At the close of the discussion, Chair Horwitz called for a vote on the proposed MS & Ph.D. Degrees in Electrical & Computer Engineering, Medical Imaging. The proposal to approve the proposed MS & Ph.D. Degrees in ECE was approved unanimously.

Graduate Council, Sorin Lerner, Chair; and Sara Kaplan, Associate Professor, Department of Ethnic Studies, and Director, Critical Gender Studies Program – Proposed PhD Degree in Critical Gender Studies; Departments of Education Studies, Music and Visual Arts
Chair Horwitz invited Professor Sara Kaplan, from the Department of Ethnic Studies, to provide an overview of the proposal to create Ph.D. specializations in Critical Gender Studies (CGS) within the departments of Education Studies, Music, and Visual Arts. Professor Kaplan explained that the CGS Ph.D. was created to meet the needs of enrolled Ph.D. students to provide specialized and advanced training in gender and sexuality studies, to engage a cross-divisional & interdisciplinary cohort of students, and to improve job placement in departments and programs of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies.

Professor Kaplan noted the strong interest amongst students and faculty in the departments of Music, Education Studies, and Visual Arts to create a Ph.D. specialization in CGS. Each of these departments includes areas of research in which gender and sexuality studies play an important critical and methodological role. Students in these departments would greatly benefit from advanced and specialized training. Moreover, there are faculty in each of these departments who are already active contributors to the Critical Gender Studies Program who would benefit from stronger intellectual and pedagogical connections between their home departments and CGS.

Graduate Council Chair Lerner made a formal motion for the approval of the proposed degrees in CGS in the Departments of Education Studies, Music and Visual Arts on behalf of Graduate Council. Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, no second motion was required. Senate Chair Horwitz opened the floor to questions and discussion.

Their being none, Chair Horwitz called for a vote on the proposal to create specializations in CGS in the Departments of Education Studies, Music and Visual Arts. The proposal to create specializations in CGS in the Departments of Education Studies, Music and Visual Arts was approved unanimously.

Committee on Senate Awards, David Brink, Committee Member – Faculty Research Lecture Awards Nominations
Chair Horwitz invited Committee on Senate Awards Chair, Professor David Brink to present the nominees for the 2018-2019 Faculty Research Lecture Awards. Professor Brink explained that up to five members of the Academic Senate, three non-Senate members, and three graduate students are nominated to receive awards each spring. Awards for Senate members are $1,500 each, awards for non-Senate members are $1,000 each, and awards for graduate students are $500 each. The Academic Senate partners with the Chancellor and the Barbara and Paul Saltman Endowment funds to provide funds for the awards the reception. Professor Brink read names of the two nominees:

David Fitzgerald, Professor in the Department of Sociology for Faculty Research Lecturer Award 2019-2020.

Martin Yanofsky, Professor in Cell & Developmental Biology for Faculty Research Lecturer Award 2019-2020.
Professor Brink made a motion on behalf of the Committee on Senate Awards to approve the nominees. Chair Horwitz explained that no second is required for a motion made on behalf of a Senate committee. He opened the floor to questions and comments, there being none, Chair Horwitz called for a voice vote. The nominees were approved unanimously.

**REPORTS OF FACULTIES** [None]

**PETITIONS OF STUDENTS** [None]

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS** [None]

**NEW BUSINESS** [None]

Chair Horwitz called for any new business, there being none the meeting was adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Recorded by: Alain L. Montgomery, Senior Senate Analyst
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- Robert Horwitz (Chair of Division)
- Pradeep Khosla (Chancellor)
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- Angela Booker / [StephanieMel] (Thurgood Marshall College)
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- Jerry Yang / [ShayaFainman] (Earl Warren College)
- Harvey Goldman / [HasanKayali] (Roosevelt College)
- Padmini Rangamani / [AlexSnoeren] (Roosevelt College)
- Christine Alvarado / [GeoffreyCook] (Sixth College)
- Robert Castro / [ShlomoDubnov] (Sixth College)
- Morton Printz / [MarkApplebaum] (Emeritus Faculty)
- Hemal Patel / [ ] (Anesthesiology)
- David Pedersen / [Saiba Varma] (Anthropology)
- Gert Cauwenberghs / [PrashantMal] (Bioengineering)
- Li-Fan Lu / [NanHao] (Biological Sciences)
- Eduardo Macagno / [JamesWilhelm] (Biological Sciences)
- Wendy Huang / [PradipNa] (Cellular & Molecular Med.)
- Patricia Jennings / [KatjaLindenberg] (Chemistry & Biochemistry)
- Mark Thiemens / [ ] (Chemistry & Biochemistry)
- Lera Boroditsky (FA) / [DougNitz] (Cognitive Science)
- Angela Yu (WI/SP) / [ ] (Cognitive Science)
- Morana Alac (FA) / [KeithPezzoli] (Communication)
- Lilly Irani (WI/SP) / [ ] (Communication)

#### Key
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name 1</th>
<th>Name 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rajesh Gupta</td>
<td>[Computer Science &amp; Engineering]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Vianu</td>
<td>[Computer Science &amp; Engineering]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Sun</td>
<td>[Anna Di Nardo] (Dermatology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Machina</td>
<td>[Jim Andreoni] (Economics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yixiao Sun</td>
<td>[Alex Gelber] (Economics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mica Pollock</td>
<td>[Makeba Jones] (Education Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Galton</td>
<td>[Shayan Moookherjea] (Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhaskar Rao</td>
<td>[Joseph Ford] (Electrical &amp; Computer Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Kahn</td>
<td>[Christian Tomaszewski] (Emergency Medicine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamala Visveswaran</td>
<td>[Kirstie Dorr] (Ethnic Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzi Hong</td>
<td>[Cinnamon Bloss] (Family Medicine and Public Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Garfein</td>
<td>[Wesley Thompson] (Family Medicine and Public Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Bowen</td>
<td>[Global Policy and Strategy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Graham</td>
<td>[History]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tal Golan</td>
<td>[History]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Kehler</td>
<td>[Rachel Mayberry] (Linguistics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O'Brien</td>
<td>[Luis Martin-Cabrera] (Literature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Lerer</td>
<td>[Gloria Chacon] (Literature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Ioana</td>
<td>[Cristian Popescu] (Mathematics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alireza Golsefidy</td>
<td>[Ioan Bejenaru] (Mathematics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bitmead</td>
<td>[Sonia Martinez] (Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Friend</td>
<td>[Prab Bandaru] (Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Conrad</td>
<td>[Bernd Schnabl] (Medicine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alison Moore</td>
<td>[Nai-Wen Chi] (Medicine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfrido Terrazas</td>
<td>[Natacha Diels] (Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ping Liu</td>
<td>[Kesong Yang] (NanoEngineering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takaki Komiyama</td>
<td>[Robert Rissman] (Neurosciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Ellis</td>
<td>[Eric Halgren] (Neurosciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwayne Stupack</td>
<td>[Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Wahlin</td>
<td>[Derrick Welsbie] (Ophthalmology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Hughes Austin</td>
<td>[Simon Schenk] (Orthopaedics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Calcutt</td>
<td>[Oluwole Fadare] (Pathology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Pride</td>
<td>[Shizhen (Emily) Wang] (Pathology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Butler</td>
<td>[Pediatrics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Magana</td>
<td>[Pediatrics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton Palmer</td>
<td>[Lilia Iakoucheva] (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Twamley</td>
<td>[Marc Schuckit] (Psychiatry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Vul</td>
<td>[Stephan Anagnostaras] (Psychology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Seibert</td>
<td>[Radiation Medicine &amp; Applied Sciences]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Lee</td>
<td>[Radiology]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang Du</td>
<td>[Radiology]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossen Valkanov</td>
<td>[Craig McKenzie] (Rady School of Management)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Eisenman</td>
<td>[James Day] (SIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Purkey</td>
<td>[Ryan Hechinger] (SIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Willenbring</td>
<td>[Lynn Russell] (SIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bowman</td>
<td>[Amato Evan] (SIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Pommier</td>
<td>[Chambers Hughes] (SIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiammetta Straneo</td>
<td>[Dick Norris] (SIO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At big Senate meetings such as this, I tend to take time — perhaps too much time for some — reviewing what Senate leadership has been doing and what is going on at Systemwide. I consider this report back part of my duty: Rep Assembly members need to know what the Senate leadership is doing. And it’s why I have cajoled members of Rep Assembly to do the same, to report back to their units.

To make this easy, we have provided a summary of the Representative Assembly minutes and have placed it on the Senate website for you to use to report back to your departments or colleges. We need to close the communication loop. We need to make it easy for rank and file faculty to know what’s happening on the campus and what the Senate is doing to facilitate shared governance. At the very least, please send an email to your unit’s listserv with the URL of the Rep Assembly minutes summary.

This is a campus with very high participation rates in Senate service, far higher than most of the other UC campuses. But that’s still only about 200, maybe 250, faculty at any given time, out of approximately 2,400 Senate members (a number that includes over 600 emeriti). Perhaps another 300 faculty pay attention, which underscores that Senate elections garner only about 25% of the faculty electorate. This percentage could be a lot higher, and better communication flow could help.

Why harp on this? Because shared governance is unusual. It’s the rare university that encodes faculty participation in the governance of the institution. The mere fact that we have a Committee on Academic Personnel, in which faculty evaluate their peers and recommend merits, tenure and promotion to the EVC, rather than a system where an EVC can consult with a Dean and arbitrarily decide a professor’s future, is testament to the importance of shared governance.

We must not take that for granted. The Senate’s business is important, if sometimes boring and often invisible—which is why it is so important to communicate back and increase awareness. We will soon annotate on the Senate website the many issues the Senate has dealt with this year. I’m not going to list those now; there are a lot. I urge you to examine them.

I would argue that the UC is the closest thing to a democratically governed institution as you will find. Mind you, I am not a starry-eyed naif about shared governance. We know that the Senate is the junior partner in the relationship. (After all, the faculty have full time jobs as researchers and teachers; the administration is paid to administer.) We know that most of the time, the administration sets the agenda. The administration proposes; the Senate reviews and considers and exercises due diligence, asking for more information or clarification, usually
adding a feature here, removing an item there. But in the end, the Senate largely winds up supporting most of the proposals offered by the administration.

The Senate’s due diligence is mostly productive, and makes the proposals better, but the process of Senate review takes time - which is a source of complaint on the part of the administration (and even from some faculty). People complain that it takes forever to get something through the Senate. But this is inevitable; due diligence takes time. The great sociologist Max Weber advised that democracy and bureaucracy go together.

Notwithstanding Weber’s axiom, I want to point out how responsibly and quickly the Senate can move when the administration engages the faculty in an early, open, and consultative way. Witness last year’s establishment of the Data Sciences Institute, in which the Senate and the administration worked hard to figure out how to create an essentially novel interdisciplinary, interdivisional academic unit – in less than a year, a remarkably short time. Think about the rapid approval of 7th College this year, replete with intellectual theme and academic plan. That was the result of Senate-administration collaboration. I can tell you about the almost concluded reform of the heretofore very clunky Organized Research Unit review protocols, a result of a collaboration between Senate leadership and the Vice Chancellor for Research.

And think about the Senate leadership’s intervention on the morale problem among the physicians in the Health Sciences. This may be the most important thing that Senate leadership did this year. We studied the problem, talked to a lot of people in HS, and put together an analysis and a set of action items. The Chancellor, to his great credit, acted with great speed to hold HS leadership to account. To be sure, solving the morale problem in HS is not a one-off; it’s going to take a lot of work and continued monitoring. But together, the Senate and the administration started a process that desperately needed to happen.

In short, when the consultative process is early and open, results tend to be good. When consultation is poor or late or top-down, outcomes tend to be poor: witness the current controversy over online degrees. Many of you are aware that Graduate Council, the Senate committee charged with considering new degree programs, recently demurred on approving two proposals for fully online masters degrees. Graduate Council felt it could not proceed without broader policy guidance from the Senate.

I expect the Chancellor may talk about this in his remarks; he has been talking about it in various forums this quarter. There may be good reasons for the campus to move into online degree programs. My point is that online degrees began as a top-down initiative from the administration; the faculty was not engaged early enough or seriously enough, and the result is the current impasse. The Senate continues to exercise due diligence. We will convene a special meeting of Senate Council this Thursday to discuss the issue and move to provide broader policy guidance for Graduate Council. But the lesson should not be lost: in a system of shared governance, early and serious consultation with the faculty is a must.
Before I invite the Chancellor to make some remarks, I want to tell you what a privilege it has been to serve as your chair this year. Vice-chair Maripat Corr and I have worked together as a solid team. With Steve Constable coming on board as Vice-chair, I foresee another good team. The Senate staff, led by Ray Rodriguez, is absolutely first-rate: knowledgeable, smart, dedicated; I can’t say enough good things about them. The Senate is in good hands. *Your* charge is to make the Senate stronger and to fortify shared governance.
UC Response Protocol

NSF Commitment to Respond to Incidents of Harassment and Discrimination
The National Science Foundation (NSF) will not tolerate sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, or sexual assault, within the agency, at awardee organizations, field sites or anywhere science or education is conducted. NSF has taken steps to help ensure all NSF-funded research and learning environments are free from sexual harassment.

- NSF Website
Notice No. 144

Issued to University Presidents
Feb. 8, 2018

- PI’s and co-PI’s “in a position of trust”

- On-site and off-site (field sites, conferences, workshops).

- Purpose – to protect safety of all grant personnel and promote harassment-free workplaces.

- Awardees must report “findings”, admin leave.
  - Includes suspension, termination or replacement/removal of personnel.

- Established a portal: NSF.gov/harassment
Terms and Condition for Awards

Sept. 1, 2018

• Any findings or determinations that an NSF-funded PI or co-PI committed harassment, including sexual harassment or sexual assault.

• Placement of the PI or co-PI on administrative leave, or of the imposition of any administrative action relating to a harassment or sexual assault finding or investigation.

• NSF action may include:
  • Substituting or removing PI or co-PI
  • Reducing award funding
  • Suspending or terminating awards
Term and Conditions apply to PI’s and co-PI’s who receive awards or funding amendments on or after Oct. 21, 2018, and also covers conduct by those PI’s or co-PI’s that may have occurred prior to receiving the awards.

Requires notification when a PI or co-PI is placed on admin leave or any admin action relating to any “finding/determination” related to policy, codes of conduct, statutes, regulations or executive orders related to harassment.

- Notification to occur 10 business days from date of “finding/determination” or admin action.
When NSF Reviews a Notification

- Safety and security of personnel supported by the NSF award.

- Overall impact to the NSF-funded activity.

- Continued advancement of taxpayer investments in science and scientists.

- Whether the awardee has taken appropriate action to ensure the continuity of science and continued progress under the funded project can be made.
“Administrative Leave/Administrative Action”

- Any temporary/interim suspension or permanent removal of the PI or co-PI, or any administrative action imposed on the PI or co-PI by the awardee under organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations or executive orders, relating to activities including but not limited to the following: teaching, advising, mentoring, research, mgmt./admin duties, or presence on campus.

“Finding/Determination”

- The final disposition of a matter involving sexual harassment or other forms of harassment under organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals exercised by the PI or co-PI, or a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court.

UC interpretation of “Finding/Determination”

- The final disposition of the matter under our own policies and procedures, including exhaustion of any appeal rights.
Complaint Received by OPHD → OPHD Conducts Initial Inquiry → Determines Resolution Process → Determines Need for Interim Measure

Alternative Resolution

Interim Measure
- NO Interim Measure Put in Place
- Interim Measure Put in Place

Investigation
- NO Finding of Responsibility
  - Finding of Responsibility
  - Discipline/Sanction Proposed
  - Exhaust all Grievance/Appeal Processes
  - Discipline/Sanction Implemented
  - Report to NSF

NO Report to NSF

NO Report to NSF

Report to NSF

Communicate NO Finding to NSF

NO Report to NSF
Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT)

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY PRESENTATION
JUNE 4, 2019
CPT Has Jurisdiction Over:

1) Grievances, and
2) Disciplinary Cases (Hearings)

For Senate Members.

Governed by UC Systemwide Senate Bylaws.
The Difference Between a “Grievance” and a “Disciplinary Case”

• **Grievance**: Allegation of violation of a Senate Member’s rights and privileges by the Administration.

• **Disciplinary Case (Hearing)**: The Administration charges a Senate Member with a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct.
Steps in the Grievance Process:

1) The grievance is filed with the Senate Office
   (Did you speak with your Chair or Dean to try to resolve the matter informally first?).

2) CPT makes a “prima facie” finding, or dismisses the grievance.

3) CPT makes a “sufficient reason” finding, or dismisses the grievance.

4) CPT notifies the Administration.

5) The Administration responds to the grievance.
Steps in the Grievance Process (cont.):

6) CPT encourages informal resolution.
7) A prehearing conference is held to plan for a hearing.
8) A hearing is held.
9) CPT makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.
10) The Chancellor meets with CPT if he/she is not going to follow CPT’s recommendation.
Two Notes Regarding Grievances

- First, grievances that allege sexual harassment/violence are immediately referred to the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD), and the grievance is held in abeyance pending the outcome of the investigation.
- Second, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) recommendations are not reevaluated by CPT. Only procedural violations and impermissible criteria may be grieved. CPT can recommend that the file be returned to the point where the procedural violation or impermissible criteria was introduced for reconsideration.
Steps in a Disciplinary Case (Hearing)

Pre-Senate
1. Complaint.
2. Investigation.
3. Findings by the investigator.
4. Possible settlement.
5. The Administration files disciplinary charges with CPT.
Current Steps in the Disciplinary Case (Hearing) Process:

1) The Senate member is notified of the charges by the Senate.
2) The Senate member responds to the charges.
3) CPT encourages informal resolution.
4) A prehearing conference is held to plan for a hearing.
5) A hearing is held.
6) CPT issues a report to the Chancellor.
7) The Chancellor meets with CPT if he/she is not going to follow CPTs recommendation.
The process moves much faster: The Administration sends the charges to the Senate and the Senate Member at the same time; the hearing is scheduled by the Senate right away; the hearing is planned without a prehearing conference; and the deadlines for each step are very tight.
Panel of Advisors

- For Senate members who are not represented by attorneys;
- Provide peer-to-peer counseling; and
- Do not serve as representatives or advocates

Referrals made by Senate Office.

CPT members cannot proved counseling because they cannot provide advice to a party on a case and simultaneously fulfill the role of a neutral evaluator of the case.
Resources on the CPT webpage:

- Flowcharts that outline the Grievance and Disciplinary Hearing processes
- Grievance Form
- Links to Senate Bylaws and relevant UC Policies.

http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/standing/privilege-and-tenure/
7th College – Timeline

Pre-Proposal – approved June 2018
- Divisional Senate, Academic Council, UCOP

Full Proposal – approved May 2019
- Divisional Senate, Academic Council, UCOP, UC Board of Regents

**Academic Plan – current action**
- Divisional Senate

Publicize in Admissions – Summer 2019

Implementation Plan – Fall 2019
- Undergraduate Council

Recruit Faculty, Provost, Executive Committee, and Begin Staffing – Fall 2019

By-Laws and Senate Regulation – Winter 2019
- College Faculty and Divisional Senate

Welcome Inaugural Class – Fall 2020
UC San Diego’s College System

Not discipline-specific

 Allows for a smaller liberal arts experience in a large R1 University

 Brings together four aspects of the student experience:
  •  General Education
  •  Academic Advising
  •  Student Affairs
  •  Residence Life

 The college system is an integral part of achieving student-centeredness
Each college has an intellectual theme that helps create a college identity

7th College’s theme: ‘A Changing Planet’

Provides structure to 7th College’s general education

This theme lends itself to work across multiple disciplines
ACADEMIC PLAN - CURRICULUM

Alternatives:
Two courses each from pre-curated selections from:

- Arts
- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Natural Sciences
- Quantitative Reasoning

Three Synthesis Courses

Year 1: Synthesis 1 (Lower Division):
- Introduces students to interdisciplinary inquiries related to “A Changing Planet” theme
- Writing intensive

Year 2: Synthesis 2 (Lower Division):
- Builds on skills from Synthesis 1
- Interdisciplinary research paper

Year 3 or 4: Synthesis 3 (Upper Division):
- More advanced collaborative interdisciplinary work
- Design Focused

High Impact Course
Experiential work in major or other areas; includes major capstones, academic internships, and study abroad
PROMOTING TIMELY GRADUATION: FOUR-YEAR PLANS

Four-year completion plans are available for all majors and colleges.

Four-year plans have been created for all majors in 7th college.

Sample with fewer major course requirements: Linguistics

• fits easily with room for several electives outside major

Sample with more major course requirements: Bioengineering

• requires three quarters with > 16 units; compares favorably with the other colleges
RESPONSE FROM SENATE- SPECIFIC CONCERNS ADDRESSED

1. How does teaching outside a home department count towards a faculty member’s teaching load?
   - Each department determines which teaching assignments count toward a faculty member’s teaching obligations to the department.
   - The university’s budget model incorporates faculty teaching both outside and within the department, as noted below.

2. How does instruction in college general education courses factor into the campus faculty hiring plan?
   - Teaching in the college is counted in the budget model, and will continue to be counted this way. General education teaching will be part of the basis for future allocation of FTE.

3. How does teaching in the colleges figure into the departments Temp FTE and TA FTE allocations?
   - Teaching in the colleges is included in the TEMP FTE allocation.
   - The TA FTE allocation is based on courses taught in the department only.

4. Recruiting sufficient faculty to teach synthesis courses
   - Plan to hire a faculty director
   - Plan to hire an assistant director or directors
   - Plan to recruit senate faculty from departments
   - The director & assistant director(s) will teach approximately half of the synthesis courses.
Questions?
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING
A proposal for a new department
Urban Studies and Planning is an important research field with its own credentialing and accreditation bodies.

Our competitors have departments:
- UCLA
- UC Berkeley
- UC Irvine
- Harvard
- MIT
- Columbia
- University of Michigan
- University of Texas

and many more...
A FIT FOR UC SAN DIEGO

- World-class faculty in adjacent fields
- The largest U.S. metro area without any department offering an accredited planning degree
- A metro area that is a test bed for 21st century planning challenges
- A successful undergraduate curriculum
THE URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING PROGRAM

• Founded in 1972
• Two majors
  - BA in Urban Studies and Planning
  - BS in Real Estate and Development
• Aligned with strategic plan and UC mission
• Embedded in the civic life of San Diego
  - No permanent faculty
  - No faculty governance
  - Little visibility for faculty research
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING FACULTY RESEARCH

American Planning Association
Creating Great Communities for All
THE RIGHT TIME FOR A DEPARTMENT

- Our metro area has outgrown its dependence on Los Angeles
- Curriculum standards have changed in our favor
- We have space and resource commitments we need
- We have supportive community partners
A PLAN TO GROW BY HIRING FACULTY

- The Department will grow by hiring from the outside rather than poaching from within
- Our emphasis will be on faculty who hold the Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Planning
- The faculty hiring plan will be guided by curriculum standards for the field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2 Associate Teaching Professors</td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning, 1 real estate and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1 Associate Professor</td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2 Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1 urban data and spatial analytics, 1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2 Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1 urban planning, emphasis on sustainability, 1 real estate and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What you are *not* being asked to approve

- A new curriculum
- A new degree
- A new competitor
WHAT YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE

- Stronger faculty governance
- More institutional support for urban research at UC San Diego
- A department that can propose graduate degrees in urban and regional planning
- An institutional partner for engaged research in the community
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING

A proposal for a new department
The following staff FTE will be funded by the divisional support model:

- 1 departmental manager (MSO)
- 1 student affairs officer
- 1 administrative staff position for AP, HR, financial and events

The following staff will be provided through an instructional lab support line item:

- 1 GIS/Design lab manager
THE NORTH TORREY PINES LIVING AND LEARNING NEIGHBORHOOD

- The department will occupy space planned for USP in the North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Neighborhood:
  - GIS Visualization lab
  - USP Flex studio
  - 6 faculty offices
  - 1 TA office
  - 5 staff offices
  - 5 offices for lecturers and future faculty growth
- Until 2020, the department will occupy space currently allocated to USP in the Social Sciences Building
ECE Medical Imaging Graduate (MS/PhD) Program

- Initiated by the *Electrical and Computer Engineering Department* (ECE) from the Jacobs School of Engineering and the *Radiology Department* from the School of Medicine.

- The program draws the complementary expertise of both departments to educate **ECE MS and PhD students** that will meet the growing demand and fast changing world of *medicine and medical technologies*.

- Radiology is an area of increasing significance in medicine. It is also a discipline relying extensively on knowledge and skills in electrical and computer engineering. It is synergistic with major fields in ECE including data sciences, machine learning, artificial intelligence, image and signal processing, photonics, physical electronics and biomedical devices (sensors).

- **Radiology faculty is committed to teaching core (required) courses for the program every year** (Radiology Dept. Chair Letter of Support). They will also (co)advise MS/PhD students. Also received strong support from Bioengineering Department.
### MI Program

**Required**

Select 4 courses

- **ECE 207A/BENG 280A**
  - Principles of Medical Imaging I

- **ECE 207B/BENG 280B**
  - Principles of Medical Imaging II

- **ECE 217**
  - Molecular Imaging

- **BNEG 278**
  - Magnetic medical imaging

- **BENG 279**
  - Quantitative Cardiovascular Imaging

- **BENG 235**
  - Molecular Imaging and Quantitation in Living Cells

- **BENG 141**
  - Biomedical Optics and Imaging

- **SOMI 277A/B**
  - fMRI Foundations & Advanced Topics

**Courses to meet other ECE degree requirements**

1 course

- **ECE 247A**
  - Advanced Biophotonics

- **ECE 250**
  - Random Processes

- **ECE 253**
  - Fundamentals of Digital Image Processing

- **ECE 269**
  - Linear Algebra and Application

- **ECE 273**
  - Convex Optimization and Applications

- **ECE 275A**
  - Parameter Estimation I

Human physiology, pathology, or anatomy. BILD 26, human physiology for non-biologist
PhD Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Professor Sara Clarke Kaplan
Faculty Director of Critical Gender Studies
Representative Assembly Meeting / June 4, 2019
CGS Specialization Requirements

CGS 200 (pro-seminar)
CGS 299 (dissertation writing practicum)
3 applicable electives in any department

↓

FIVE total courses
~2 additional courses
Participating Departments

Anthropology
Communication
Ethnic Studies
History

Literature
Psychology
Sociology
Theater & Dance
Proposed Departments

Education Studies
PhD in Education with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Music
PhD in Music with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Visual Arts
PhD in Art, Theory and Criticism with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies
PhD in Art, Theory and Criticism with a Concentration in Art Practice and a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies
REMARKS BY DIVISIONAL ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIR ROBERT HORWITZ
San Diego Divisional Representative Assembly
June 4, 2019

At big Senate meetings such as this, I tend to take time – perhaps too much time for some – reviewing what Senate leadership has been doing and what is going on at Systemwide. I consider this report back part of my duty: Rep Assembly members need to know what the Senate leadership is doing. And it’s why I have cajoled members of Rep Assembly to do the same, to report back to their units.

To make this easy, we have provided a summary of the Representative Assembly minutes and have placed it on the Senate website for you to use to report back to your departments or colleges. We need to close the communication loop. We need to make it easy for rank and file faculty to know what’s happening on the campus and what the Senate is doing to facilitate shared governance. At the very least, please send an email to your unit’s listserv with the URL of the Rep Assembly minutes summary.

This is a campus with very high participation rates in Senate service, far higher than most of the other UC campuses. But that’s still only about 200, maybe 250, faculty at any given time, out of approximately 2,400 Senate members (a number that includes over 600 emeriti). Perhaps another 300 faculty pay attention, which underscores that Senate elections garner only about 25% of the faculty electorate. This percentage could be a lot higher, and better communication flow could help.

Why harp on this? Because shared governance is unusual. It’s the rare university that encodes faculty participation in the governance of the institution. The mere fact that we have a Committee on Academic Personnel, in which faculty evaluate their peers and recommend merits, tenure and promotion to the EVC, rather than a system where an EVC can consult with a Dean and arbitrarily decide a professor’s future, is testament to the importance of shared governance.

We must not take that for granted. The Senate’s business is important, if sometimes boring and often invisible–which is why it is so important to communicate back and increase awareness. We will soon annotate on the Senate website the many issues the Senate has dealt with this year. I’m not going to list those now; there are a lot. I urge you to examine them.

I would argue that the UC is the closest thing to a democratically governed institution as you will find. Mind you, I am not a starry-eyed naïf about shared governance. We know that the Senate is the junior partner in the relationship. (After all, the faculty have full time jobs as researchers and teachers; the administration is paid to administer.) We know that most of the time, the administration sets the agenda. The administration proposes; the Senate reviews and considers and exercises due diligence, asking for more information or clarification, usually
adding a feature here, removing an item there. But in the end, the Senate largely winds up supporting most of the proposals offered by the administration.

The Senate’s due diligence is mostly productive, and makes the proposals better, but the process of Senate review takes time - which is a source of complaint on the part of the administration (and even from some faculty). People complain that it takes forever to get something through the Senate. But this is inevitable; due diligence takes time. The great sociologist Max Weber advised that democracy and bureaucracy go together.

Notwithstanding Weber’s axiom, I want to point out how responsibly and quickly the Senate can move when the administration engages the faculty in an early, open, and consultative way. Witness last year’s establishment of the Data Sciences Institute, in which the Senate and the administration worked hard to figure out how to create an essentially novel interdisciplinary, interdivisional academic unit – in less than a year, a remarkably short time. Think about the rapid approval of 7th College this year, replete with intellectual theme and academic plan. That was the result of Senate-administration collaboration. I can tell you about the almost concluded reform of the heretofore very clunky Organized Research Unit review protocols, a result of a collaboration between Senate leadership and the Vice Chancellor for Research.

And think about the Senate leadership’s intervention on the morale problem among the physicians in the Health Sciences. This may be the most important thing that Senate leadership did this year. We studied the problem, talked to a lot of people in HS, and put together an analysis and a set of action items. The Chancellor, to his great credit, acted with great speed to hold HS leadership to account. To be sure, solving the morale problem in HS is not a one-off; it’s going to take a lot of work and continued monitoring. But together, the Senate and the administration started a process that desperately needed to happen.

In short, when the consultative process is early and open, results tend to be good. When consultation is poor or late or top-down, outcomes tend to be poor: witness the current controversy over online degrees. Many of you are aware that Graduate Council, the Senate committee charged with considering new degree programs, recently demurred on approving two proposals for fully online masters degrees. Graduate Council felt it could not proceed without broader policy guidance from the Senate. I expect the Chancellor may talk about this in his remarks; he has been talking about it in various forums this quarter. There may be good reasons for the campus to move into online degree programs. My point is that online degrees began as a top-down initiative from the administration; the faculty was not engaged early enough or seriously enough, and the result is the current impasse. The Senate continues to exercise due diligence. We will convene a special meeting of Senate Council this Thursday to discuss the issue and move to provide broader policy guidance for Graduate Council. But the lesson should not be lost: in a system of shared governance, early and serious consultation with the faculty is a must.
Before I invite the Chancellor to make some remarks, I want to tell you what a privilege it has been to serve as your chair this year. Vice-chair Maripat Corr and I have worked together as a solid team. With Steve Constable coming on board as Vice-chair, I foresee another good team. The Senate staff, led by Ray Rodriguez, is absolutely first-rate: knowledgeable, smart, dedicated; I can’t say enough good things about them. The Senate is in good hands. Your charge is to make the Senate stronger and to fortify shared governance.
UC Response Protocol

NSF Commitment to Respond to Incidents of Harassment and Discrimination
The National Science Foundation (NSF) will not tolerate sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, or sexual assault, within the agency, at awardee organizations, field sites or anywhere science or education is conducted. NSF has taken steps to help ensure all NSF-funded research and learning environments are free from sexual harassment.

- NSF Website
Notice No. 144

Issued to University Presidents

Feb. 8, 2018

- PI’s and co-PI’s “in a position of trust”

- On-site and off-site (field sites, conferences, workshops).

- Purpose – to protect safety of all grant personnel and promote harassment-free workplaces.

- Awardees must report “findings”, admin leave.
  - Includes suspension, termination or replacement/removal of personnel.

- Established a portal: NSF.gov/harassment
Terms and Condition for Awards
Sept. 1, 2018

- Any findings or determinations that an NSF-funded PI or co-PI committed harassment, including sexual harassment or sexual assault.

- Placement of the PI or co-PI on administrative leave, or of the imposition of any administrative action relating to a harassment or sexual assault finding or investigation.

- NSF action may include:
  - Substituting or removing PI or co-PI
  - Reducing award funding
  - Suspending or terminating awards
• Term and Conditions apply to PI’s and co-PI’s who receive awards or funding amendments on or after Oct. 21, 2018, and also covers conduct by those PI’s or co-PI’s that may have occurred prior to receiving the awards.

• Requires notification when a PI or co-PI is placed on admin leave or any admin action relating to any “finding/determination” related to policy, codes of conduct, statutes, regulations or executive orders related to harassment.

  o Notification to occur 10 business days from date of “finding/determination” or admin action.
When NSF Reviews a Notification

- Safety and security of personnel supported by the NSF award.

- Overall impact to the NSF-funded activity.

- Continued advancement of taxpayer investments in science and scientists.

- Whether the awardee has taken appropriate action to ensure the continuity of science and continued progress under the funded project can be made.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSF Definitions</th>
<th>UC Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### "Administrative Leave/Administrative Action"
- Any temporary/interim suspension or permanent removal of the PI or co-PI, or any administrative action imposed on the PI or co-PI by the awardee under organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations or executive orders, relating to activities including but not limited to the following: teaching, advising, mentoring, research, mgmt./admin duties, or presence on campus.

### "Finding/Determination"
- The final disposition of a matter involving sexual harassment or other forms of harassment under organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals exercised by the PI or co-PI, or a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court.

**UC interpretation of “Finding/Determination”**
- *The final disposition of the matter under our own policies and procedures, including exhaustion of any appeal rights.*
Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT)

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY PRESENTATION
JUNE 4, 2019
CPT Has Jurisdiction Over:

1) Grievances, and
2) Disciplinary Cases (Hearings)

For Senate Members.

Governed by UC Systemwide Senate Bylaws.
The Difference Between a “Grievance” and a “Disciplinary Case”

- **Grievance**: Allegation of violation of a Senate Member’s rights and privileges by the Administration.

- **Disciplinary Case (Hearing)**: The Administration charges a Senate Member with a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct.
Steps in the Grievance Process:

1) The grievance is filed with the Senate Office
   (Did you speak with your Chair or Dean to try to resolve the matter informally first?).

2) CPT makes a “prima facie” finding, or dismisses the grievance.

3) CPT makes a “sufficient reason” finding, or dismisses the grievance.

4) CPT notifies the Administration.

5) The Administration responds to the grievance.
Steps in the Grievance Process (cont.):

6) CPT encourages informal resolution.
7) A prehearing conference is held to plan for a hearing.
8) A hearing is held.
9) CPT makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.
10) The Chancellor meets with CPT if he/she is not going to follow CPT’s recommendation.
Two Notes Regarding Grievances

• First, grievances that allege sexual harassment/violence are immediately referred to the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD), and the grievance is held in abeyance pending the outcome of the investigation.

• Second, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) recommendations are not reevaluated by CPT. Only procedural violations and impermissible criteria may be grieved. CPT can recommend that the file be returned to the point where the procedural violation or impermissible criteria was introduced for reconsideration.
Steps in a Disciplinary Case (Hearing)

Pre-Senate

1. Complaint.
2. Investigation.
3. Findings by the investigator.
4. Possible settlement.
5. The Administration files disciplinary charges with CPT.
Current Steps in the Disciplinary Case (Hearing) Process:

1) The Senate member is notified of the charges by the Senate.
2) The Senate member responds to the charges.
3) CPT encourages informal resolution.
4) A prehearing conference is held to plan for a hearing.
5) A hearing is held.
6) CPT issues a report to the Chancellor.
7) The Chancellor meets with CPT if he/she is not going to follow CPTs recommendation.
New Process for Disciplinary Cases (Hearing)

**Effective July 01, 2019**

- The process moves much faster: The Administration sends the charges to the Senate and the Senate Member at the same time; the hearing is scheduled by the Senate right away; the hearing is planned without a prehearing conference; and the deadlines for each step are very tight.
Panel of Advisors

- For Senate members who are not represented by attorneys;
- Provide peer-to-peer counseling; and
- Do not serve as representatives or advocates

Referrals made by Senate Office.

CPT members cannot provide counseling because they cannot provide advice to a party on a case and simultaneously fulfill the role of a neutral evaluator of the case.
Resources

Resources on the CPT webpage:

• Flowcharts that outline the Grievance and Disciplinary Hearing processes
• Grievance Form
• Links to Senate Bylaws and relevant UC Policies.

http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/standing/privilege-and-tenure/
7th College – Timeline

Pre-Proposal – approved June 2018
- Divisional Senate, Academic Council, UCOP

Full Proposal – approved May 2019
- Divisional Senate, Academic Council, UCOP, UC Board of Regents

Academic Plan – current action
- Divisional Senate

Publicize in Admissions – Summer 2019

Implementation Plan – Fall 2019
- Undergraduate Council

Recruit Faculty, Provost, Executive Committee, and Begin Staffing – Fall 2019

By-Laws and Senate Regulation – Winter 2019
- College Faculty and Divisional Senate

Welcome Inaugural Class – Fall 2020
UC San Diego’s College System

Not discipline-specific

Allows for a smaller liberal arts experience in a large R1 University

Brings together four aspects of the student experience:

- General Education
- Academic Advising
- Student Affairs
- Residence Life

The college system is an integral part of achieving student-centeredness
Each college has an intellectual theme that helps create a college identity

7th College’s theme: ‘A Changing Planet’

Provides structure to 7th College’s general education

This theme lends itself to work across multiple disciplines
ACADEMIC PLAN - CURRICULUM

Alternatives:
Two courses each from pre-curated selections from:
- Arts
- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Natural Sciences
- Quantitative Reasoning

Year 1: Synthesis 1
Lower Division:
- Introduces students to interdisciplinary inquiries related to “A Changing Planet” theme
- Writing intensive

Year 2: Synthesis 2
Lower Division:
- Builds on skills from Synthesis 1
- Interdisciplinary research paper

Year 3 or 4: Synthesis 3
Upper Division:
- More advanced collaborative interdisciplinary work
- Design Focused

High Impact Course
Experiential work in major or other areas: includes major capstones, academic internships, and study abroad
PROMOTING TIMELY GRADUATION: FOUR-YEAR PLANS

Four-year completion plans are available for all majors and colleges.

Four-year plans have been created for all majors in 7th college.

Sample with fewer major course requirements: Linguistics
- fits easily with room for several electives outside major

Sample with more major course requirements: Bioengineering
- requires three quarters with > 16 units; compares favorably with the other colleges
How does teaching outside a home department count towards a faculty member’s teaching load?

- Each department determines which teaching assignments count toward a faculty member’s teaching obligations to the department.
- The university’s budget model incorporates faculty teaching both outside and within the department, as noted below.

How does instruction in college general education courses factor into the campus faculty hiring plan?

- Teaching in the college is counted in the budget model, and will continue to be counted this way. General education teaching will be part of the basis for future allocation of FTE.

How does teaching in the colleges figure into the departments Temp FTE and TA FTE allocations?

- Teaching in the colleges is included in the TEMP FTE allocation.
- The TA FTE allocation is based on courses taught in the department only.

Recruiting sufficient faculty to teach synthesis courses:

- Plan to hire a faculty director
- Plan to hire an assistant director or directors
- Plan to recruit senate faculty from departments

The director & assistant director(s) will teach approximately half of the synthesis courses.
Questions?
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING

A proposal for a new department
• Urban Studies and Planning is an important research field with its own credentialing and accreditation bodies

• Our competitors have departments
  UCLA
  UC Berkeley
  UC Irvine
  Harvard
  MIT
  Columbia
  University of Michigan
  University of Texas

  and many more...
A FIT FOR UC SAN DIEGO

• World-class faculty in adjacent fields

• The largest U.S. metro area without any department offering an accredited planning degree

• A metro area that is a test bed for 21st century planning challenges

• A successful undergraduate curriculum
THE URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING PROGRAM

• Founded in 1972
• Two majors
  - BA in Urban Studies and Planning
  - BS in Real Estate and Development
• Aligned with strategic plan and UC mission
• Embedded in the civic life of San Diego
  o No permanent faculty
  o No faculty governance
  o Little visibility for faculty research
THE RIGHT TIME FOR A DEPARTMENT

• Our metro area has outgrown its dependence on Los Angeles

• Curriculum standards have changed in our favor

• We have space and resource commitments we need

• We have supportive community partners
### A PLAN TO GROW BY HIRING FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2 Associate Teaching Professors</td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning 1 real estate and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1 Associate Professor</td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2 Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1 urban data and spatial analytics 1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2 Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1 urban planning, emphasis on sustainability 1 real estate and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Department will grow by hiring from the outside rather than poaching from within
- Our emphasis will be on faculty who hold the Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Planning
- The faculty hiring plan will be guided by curriculum standards for the field
What you are *not* being asked to approve

- A new curriculum
- A new degree
- A new competitor
WHAT YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE

- Stronger faculty governance
- More institutional support for urban research at UC San Diego
- A department that can propose graduate degrees in urban and regional planning
- An institutional partner for engaged research in the community
THE UC SAN DIEGO DEPARTMENT OF URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING
A proposal for a new department
The following staff FTE will be funded by the divisional support model:

- 1 departmental manager (MSO)
- 1 student affairs officer
- 1 administrative staff position for AP, HR, financial and events

The following staff will be provided through an instructional lab support line item:

- 1 GIS/Design lab manager
The North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Neighborhood

- The department will occupy space planned for USP in the North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Neighborhood:
  - GIS Visualization lab
  - USP Flex studio
  - 6 faculty offices
  - 1 TA office
  - 5 staff offices
  - 5 offices for lecturers and future faculty growth

- Until 2020, the department will occupy space currently allocated to USP in the Social Sciences Building
ECE Medical Imaging Graduate (MS/PhD) Program

- Initiated by the *Electrical and Computer Engineering Department* (ECE) from the Jacobs School of Engineering and the *Radiology Department* from the School of Medicine.

- The program draws the complementary expertise of both departments to educate *ECE MS and PhD students* that will meet the growing demand and fast changing world of *medicine and medical technologies*.

- Radiology is an area of increasing significance in medicine. It is also a discipline relying extensively on knowledge and skills in electrical and computer engineering. It is synergistic with major fields in ECE including data sciences, machine learning, artificial intelligence, image and signal processing, photonics, physical electronics and biomedical devices (sensors).

- *Radiology faculty is committed to teaching core (required) courses for the program every year* (Radiology Dept. Chair Letter of Support). They will also (co)advise MS/PhD students. Also received strong support from Bioengineering Department.
**MI Program**

**Required**

Select 4 courses

- **ECE 207A/BENG 280A**
  Principles of Medical Imaging I
- **ECE 207B/BENG 280B**
  Principles of Medical Imaging II

**Select 4 courses**

- **ECE 217**
  Molecular Imaging
- **BNEG 278**
  Magnetic medical imaging
- **BENG 279**
  Quantitative Cardiovascular Imaging
- **BENG 235**
  Molecular Imaging and Quantitation in Living Cells
- **BENG 141**
  Biomedical Optics and Imaging
- **SOMI 277A/B**
  fMRI Foundations & Advanced Topics
- **ECE 247A**
  Advanced Biophotonics
- **ECE 250**
  Random Processes
- **ECE 253**
  Fundamentals of Digital Image Processing
- **ECE 269**
  Linear Algebra and Application
- **ECE 273**
  Convex Optimization and Applications
- **ECE 275A**
  Parameter Estimation I

Courses to meet other ECE degree requirements

1 course

Human physiology, pathology, or anatomy. BILD 26, human physiology for non-biologist.
PhD Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Professor Sara Clarke Kaplan
Faculty Director of Critical Gender Studies
Representative Assembly Meeting / June 4, 2019
CGS Specialization Requirements

CGS 200 (pro-seminar)
CGS 299 (dissertation writing practicum)
3 applicable electives in any department

↓

FIVE total courses
~2 additional courses
Participating Departments

Anthropology  Literature
Communication  Psychology
Ethnic Studies  Sociology
History  Theater & Dance
Proposed Departments

Education Studies
  PhD in Education with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Music
  PhD in Music with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Visual Arts
  PhD in Art, Theory and Criticism with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies
  PhD in Art, Theory and Criticism with a Concentration in Art Practice and a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies
adding a feature here, removing an item there. But in the end, the Senate largely winds up supporting most of the proposals offered by the administration.

The Senate’s due diligence is mostly productive, and makes the proposals better, but the process of Senate review takes time - which is a source of complaint on the part of the administration (and even from some faculty). People complain that it takes forever to get something through the Senate. But this is inevitable; due diligence takes time. The great sociologist Max Weber advised that democracy and bureaucracy go together.

Notwithstanding Weber’s axiom, I want to point out how responsibly and quickly the Senate can move when the administration engages the faculty in an early, open, and consultative way. Witness last year’s establishment of the Data Sciences Institute, in which the Senate and the administration worked hard to figure out how to create an essentially novel interdisciplinary, interdivisional academic unit – in less than a year, a remarkably short time. Think about the rapid approval of 7th College this year, replete with intellectual theme and academic plan. That was the result of Senate-administration collaboration. I can tell you about the almost concluded reform of the heretofore very clunky Organized Research Unit review protocols, a result of a collaboration between Senate leadership and the Vice Chancellor for Research.

And think about the Senate leadership’s intervention on the morale problem among the physicians in the Health Sciences. This may be the most important thing that Senate leadership did this year. We studied the problem, talked to a lot of people in HS, and put together an analysis and a set of action items. The Chancellor, to his great credit, acted with great speed to hold HS leadership to account. To be sure, solving the morale problem in HS is not a one-off; it’s going to take a lot of work and continued monitoring. But together, the Senate and the administration started a process that desperately needed to happen.

In short, when the consultative process is early and open, results tend to be good. When consultation is poor or late or top-down, outcomes tend to be poor: witness the current controversy over online degrees. Many of you are aware that Graduate Council, the Senate committee charged with considering new degree programs, recently demurred on approving two proposals for fully online masters degrees. Graduate Council felt it could not proceed without broader policy guidance from the Senate.

I expect the Chancellor may talk about this in his remarks; he has been talking about it in various forums this quarter. There may be good reasons for the campus to move into online degree programs. My point is that online degrees began as a top-down initiative from the administration; the faculty was not engaged early enough or seriously enough, and the result is the current impasse. The Senate continues to exercise due diligence. We will convene a special meeting of Senate Council this Thursday to discuss the issue and move to provide broader policy guidance for Graduate Council. But the lesson should not be lost: in a system of shared governance, early and serious consultation with the faculty is a must.
Before I invite the Chancellor to make some remarks, I want to tell you what a privilege it has been to serve as your chair this year. Vice-chair Maripat Corr and I have worked together as a solid team. With Steve Constable coming on board as Vice-chair, I foresee another good team. The Senate staff, led by Ray Rodriguez, is absolutely first-rate: knowledgeable, smart, dedicated; I can’t say enough good things about them. The Senate is in good hands. Your charge is to make the Senate stronger and to fortify shared governance.
UC Response Protocol

NSF Commitment to Respond to Incidents of Harassment and Discrimination
The National Science Foundation (NSF) will not tolerate sexual harassment, other forms of harassment, or sexual assault, within the agency, at awardee organizations, field sites or anywhere science or education is conducted. NSF has taken steps to help ensure all NSF-funded research and learning environments are free from sexual harassment.

- NSF Website
Notice No. 144

Issued to University Presidents

Feb. 8, 2018

- PI’s and co-PI’s “in a position of trust”

- On-site and off-site (field sites, conferences, workshops).

- Purpose – to protect safety of all grant personnel and promote harassment-free workplaces.

- Awardees must report “findings”, admin leave.
  - Includes suspension, termination or replacement/removal of personnel.

- Established a portal: NSF.gov/harassment
• Any findings or determinations that an NSF-funded PI or co-PI committed harassment, including sexual harassment or sexual assault.

• Placement of the PI or co-PI on administrative leave, or of the imposition of any administrative action relating to a harassment or sexual assault finding or investigation.

• NSF action may include:
  • Substituting or removing PI or co-PI
  • Reducing award funding
  • Suspending or terminating awards

Terms and Condition for Awards
Sept. 1, 2018
FAQ

Sept. 19, 2018

- Term and Conditions apply to PI’s and co-PI’s who receive awards or funding amendments on or after Oct. 21, 2018, and also covers conduct by those PI’s or co-PI’s that may have occurred prior to receiving the awards.

- Requires notification when a PI or co-PI is placed on admin leave or any admin action relating to any “finding/determination” related to policy, codes of conduct, statutes, regulations or executive orders related to harassment.
  
  - Notification to occur 10 business days from date of “finding/determination” or admin action.
When NSF Reviews a Notification

- Safety and security of personnel supported by the NSF award.

- Overall impact to the NSF-funded activity.

- Continued advancement of taxpayer investments in science and scientists.

- Whether the awardee has taken appropriate action to ensure the continuity of science and continued progress under the funded project can be made.
“Administrative Leave/Administrative Action”
- Any temporary/interim suspension or permanent removal of the PI or co-PI, or any administrative action imposed on the PI or co-PI by the awardee under organizational policies or codes of conduct, statutes, regulations or executive orders, relating to activities including but not limited to the following: teaching, advising, mentoring, research, mgmt./admin duties, or presence on campus.

“Finding/Determination”
- The final disposition of a matter involving sexual harassment or other forms of harassment under organizational policies and processes, to include the exhaustion of permissible appeals exercised by the PI or co-PI, or a conviction of a sexual offense in a criminal court.

UC interpretation of “Finding/Determination”
- The final disposition of the matter under our own policies and procedures, including exhaustion of any appeal rights.
Committee on Privilege and Tenure (CPT)

REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY PRESENTATION
JUNE 4, 2019
CPT Has Jurisdiction Over:

1) Grievances, and
2) Disciplinary Cases (Hearings)

For Senate Members.

Governed by UC Systemwide Senate Bylaws.
The Difference Between a “Grievance” and a “Disciplinary Case”

• **Grievance**: Allegation of violation of a Senate Member’s rights and privileges by the Administration.

• **Disciplinary Case (Hearing)**: The Administration charges a Senate Member with a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct.
Steps in the Grievance Process:

1) The grievance is filed with the Senate Office
   (Did you speak with your Chair or Dean to try to resolve the matter informally first?).

2) CPT makes a “prima facie” finding, or dismisses the grievance.

3) CPT makes a “sufficient reason” finding, or dismisses the grievance.

4) CPT notifies the Administration.

5) The Administration responds to the grievance.
Steps in the Grievance Process (cont.):

6) CPT encourages informal resolution.
7) A prehearing conference is held to plan for a hearing.
8) A hearing is held.
9) CPT makes a recommendation to the Chancellor.
10) The Chancellor meets with CPT if he/she is not going to follow CPT’s recommendation.
Two Notes Regarding Grievances

- First, grievances that allege sexual harassment/violence are immediately referred to the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD), and the grievance is held in abeyance pending the outcome of the investigation.

- Second, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) recommendations are not reevaluated by CPT. Only procedural violations and impermissible criteria may be grieved. CPT can recommend that the file be returned to the point where the procedural violation or impermissible criteria was introduced for reconsideration.
Steps in a Disciplinary Case (Hearing)

Pre-Senate
1. Complaint.
2. Investigation.
3. Findings by the investigator.
4. Possible settlement.
5. The Administration files disciplinary charges with CPT.
Current Steps in the Disciplinary Case (Hearing) Process:

1) The Senate member is notified of the charges by the Senate.
2) The Senate member responds to the charges.
3) CPT encourages informal resolution.
4) A prehearing conference is held to plan for a hearing.
5) A hearing is held.
6) CPT issues a report to the Chancellor.
7) The Chancellor meets with CPT if he/she is not going to follow CPTs recommendation.
New Process for Disciplinary Cases (Hearing)

*Effective July 01, 2019*

- The process moves much faster: The Administration sends the charges to the Senate and the Senate Member at the same time; the hearing is scheduled by the Senate right away; the hearing is planned without a prehearing conference; and the deadlines for each step are very tight.
Panel of Advisors

- For Senate members who are not represented by attorneys;
- Provide peer-to-peer counseling; and
- Do not serve as representatives or advocates

Referrals made by Senate Office.

CPT members cannot proved counseling because they cannot provide advice to a party on a case and simultaneously fulfill the role of a neutral evaluator of the case.
Resources

Resources on the CPT webpage:

- Flowcharts that outline the Grievance and Disciplinary Hearing processes
- Grievance Form
- Links to Senate Bylaws and relevant UC Policies.

http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/standing/privilege-and-tenure/
7TH COLLEGE
ACADEMIC PLAN DISCUSSION
ACADEMIC SENATE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
June 4, 2019
7th College – Timeline

Pre-Proposal – approved June 2018
• Divisional Senate, Academic Council, UCOP

Full Proposal – approved May 2019
• Divisional Senate, Academic Council, UCOP, UC Board of Regents

Academic Plan – current action
• Divisional Senate

Publicize in Admissions – Summer 2019

Implementation Plan – Fall 2019
• Undergraduate Council

Recruit Faculty, Provost, Executive Committee, and Begin Staffing – Fall 2019

By-Laws and Senate Regulation – Winter 2019
• College Faculty and Divisional Senate

Welcome Inaugural Class – Fall 2020
UC San Diego’s College System

Not discipline-specific

Allows for a smaller liberal arts experience in a large R1 University

Brings together four aspects of the student experience:

• *General Education*
• *Academic Advising*
• *Student Affairs*
• *Residence Life*

The college system is an integral part of achieving student-centeredness
Each college has an intellectual theme that helps create a college identity

7th College’s theme: ‘A Changing Planet’

Provides structure to 7th College’s general education

This theme lends itself to work across multiple disciplines
ACADEMIC PLAN - CURRICULUM

Alternatives:
Two courses each from pre-curated selections from:

- Arts
- Humanities
- Social Sciences
- Natural Sciences
- Quantitative Reasoning

Three Synthesis Courses

Year 1: Synthesis 1
Lower Division:
- Introduces students to interdisciplinary inquiries related to “A Changing Planet” theme
- Writing intensive

Year 2: Synthesis 2
Lower Division:
- Builds on skills from Synthesis 1
- Interdisciplinary research paper

Year 3 or 4: Synthesis 3
Upper Division:
- More advanced collaborative interdisciplinary work
- Design Focused

High Impact Course
Experiential work in major or other areas: includes major capstones, academic internships, and study abroad
PROMOTING TIMELY GRADUATION: FOUR-YEAR PLANS

Four-year completion plans are available for all majors and colleges.

Four-year plans have been created for all majors in 7th college.

Sample with fewer major course requirements: Linguistics
- fits easily with room for several electives outside major

Sample with more major course requirements: Bioengineering
- requires three quarters with > 16 units; compares favorably with the other colleges
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| How does teaching outside a home department count towards a faculty member’s teaching load? | - Each department determines which teaching assignments count toward a faculty member’s teaching obligations to the department.  
- The university’s budget model incorporates faculty teaching both outside and within the department, as noted below.                                                                                                                                                                      |
| How does instruction in college general education courses factor into the campus faculty hiring plan? | - Teaching in the college is counted in the budget model, and will continue to be counted this way. General education teaching will be part of the basis for future allocation of FTE.                                                                                                                                                   |
| How does teaching in the colleges figure into the departments Temp FTE and TA FTE allocations? | - Teaching in the colleges is included in the TEMP FTE allocation.  
- The TA FTE allocation is based on courses taught in the department only.                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Recruiting sufficient faculty to teach synthesis courses               | - Plan to hire a faculty director  
- Plan to hire an assistant director or directors  
- Plan to recruit senate faculty from departments  
- The director & assistant director(s) will teach approximately half of the synthesis courses.                                                                                                                                           |
Questions?
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING
A proposal for a new department
Urban Studies and Planning is an important research field with its own credentialing and accreditation bodies.

Our competitors have departments:
- UCLA
- UC Berkeley
- UC Irvine
- Harvard
- MIT
- Columbia
- University of Michigan
- University of Texas

...and many more...
A FIT FOR UC SAN DIEGO

- World-class faculty in adjacent fields
- The largest U.S. metro area without any department offering an accredited planning degree
- A metro area that is a test bed for 21st century planning challenges
- A successful undergraduate curriculum
THE URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING PROGRAM

- Founded in 1972
- Two majors
  - BA in Urban Studies and Planning
  - BS in Real Estate and Development
- Aligned with strategic plan and UC mission
- Embedded in the civic life of San Diego
  - No permanent faculty
  - No faculty governance
  - Little visibility for faculty research
THE RIGHT TIME FOR A DEPARTMENT

- Our metro area has outgrown its dependence on Los Angeles
- Curriculum standards have changed in our favor
- We have space and resource commitments we need
- We have supportive community partners
A PLAN TO GROW BY HIRING FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Specialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2 Associate Teaching Professors</td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 real estate and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1 Associate Professor</td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2 Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1 urban data and spatial analytics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 urban and regional planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2 Assistant Professors</td>
<td>1 urban planning, emphasis on sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 real estate and development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Department will grow by hiring from the outside rather than poaching from within
- Our emphasis will be on faculty who hold the Ph.D. in Urban and Regional Planning
- The faculty hiring plan will be guided by curriculum standards for the field
What you are *not* being asked to approve

- A new curriculum
- A new degree
- A new competitor
WHAT YOU ARE BEING ASKED TO APPROVE

- Stronger faculty governance
- More institutional support for urban research at UC San Diego
- A department that can propose graduate degrees in urban and regional planning
- An institutional partner for engaged research in the community
URBAN STUDIES AND PLANNING

A proposal for a new department
The following staff FTE will be funded by the divisional support model:

- 1 departmental manager (MSO)
- 1 student affairs officer
- 1 administrative staff position for AP, HR, financial and events

The following staff will be provided through an instructional lab support line item:

- 1 GIS/Design lab manager
The department will occupy space planned for USP in the North Torrey Pines Living and Learning Neighborhood:

- GIS Visualization lab
- USP Flex studio
- 6 faculty offices
- 1 TA office
- 5 staff offices
- 5 offices for lecturers and future faculty growth

Until 2020, the department will occupy space currently allocated to USP in the Social Sciences Building
ECE Medical Imaging Graduate (MS/PhD) Program

- Initiated by the *Electrical and Computer Engineering Department* (ECE) from the Jacobs School of Engineering and the *Radiology Department* from the School of Medicine.

- The program draws the complementary expertise of both departments to educate **ECE MS and PhD students** that will meet the growing demand and fast changing world of *medicine and medical technologies*.

- Radiology is an area of increasing significance in medicine. It is also a discipline relying extensively on knowledge and skills in electrical and computer engineering. It is synergistic with major fields in ECE including data sciences, machine learning, artificial intelligence, image and signal processing, photonics, physical electronics and biomedical devices (sensors).

- **Radiology faculty is committed to teaching core (required) courses for the program every year** (Radiology Dept. Chair Letter of Support). They will also (co)advise MS/PhD students. Also received strong support from Bioengineering Department.
## MI Program

**Required**

Select 4 courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ECE 207A/</td>
<td>Principles of Medical Imaging I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG 280A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG 217</td>
<td>Molecular Imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG 278</td>
<td>Magnetic medical imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG 279</td>
<td>Quantitative Cardiovascular Imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG 235</td>
<td>Molecular Imaging and Quantitation in Living Cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG 141</td>
<td>Biomedical Optics and Imaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*SOMI 277A/B</td>
<td>fMRI Foundations &amp; Advanced Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 247A</td>
<td>Advanced Biophotonics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 250</td>
<td>Random Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 253</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Digital Image Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 269</td>
<td>Linear Algebra and Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 273</td>
<td>Convex Optimization and Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE 275A</td>
<td>Parameter Estimation I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 course

- Human physiology, pathology, or anatomy. BILD 26, human physiology for non-biologist.
PhD Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Professor Sara Clarke Kaplan
Faculty Director of Critical Gender Studies
Representative Assembly Meeting / June 4, 2019
CGS Specialization Requirements

CGS 200 (pro-seminar)
CGS 299 (dissertation writing practicum)
3 applicable electives in any department

\[ \text{FIVE total courses} \]
\[ \sim 2 \text{ additional courses} \]
Participating Departments

Anthropology  Literature
Communication  Psychology
Ethnic Studies  Sociology
History      Theater & Dance
Proposed Departments

Education Studies
   PhD in Education with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Music
   PhD in Music with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Visual Arts
   PhD in Art, Theory and Criticism with a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies
   PhD in Art, Theory and Criticism with a Concentration in Art Practice and a Specialization in Critical Gender Studies
Responsibilities and Duties
Pursuant to Bylaw 185, the Committee on Committees (ConC) is responsible for appointing members to the standing Senate committees, nominating candidates for Divisional Senate Vice Chair and Divisional Representatives to the Systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate, recommending Senate faculty members for membership on UCSD Administrative committees, and making nominations to the University Committee on Committees for service on systemwide committees. ConC met 26 times in 2018-2019.

Appointments to the Senate’s Standing Committees
The Committee on Committees filled 26 standing committees of the Divisional Senate with 217 Senate faculty members. ConC also nominated two candidates to run for Divisional Senate Vice Chair and six candidates to run for Divisional Representative to the systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate. Divisional Senate Vice Chair and the Divisional Representatives to the systemwide Assembly of the Academic Senate were elected by the Divisional Senate faculty in spring 2019.

Recommendations to UCSD’s Administrative Committees
The Committee on Committees received and responded to 64 Administrative committee requests. ConC recommended 838 Senate faculty to the Administration for potential membership on the various Administrative committees. In most cases, the Administration followed the recommendations of ConC, but nine Administrative committee appointments (on four Administrative committees) were not selected from the recommendations provided by ConC.

Nominations to Systemwide Senate Committees and Special Committees
The Committee on Committees received 18 requests from the University Committee on Committees for nominations to serve on systemwide Senate committees, subcommittees, task forces, and special committees. ConC forwarded 30 nominees to the University Committee on Committees for consideration for appointment. Additionally, ConC nominated 16 Division members to serve on the 16 Assembly of the Academic Senate committees. The nominations were forwarded to the University Committee on Committees for confirmation.

Other ConC Activities
The Committee on Committees proposed an amendment to Bylaw 185 – Committee on Committees. ConC proposed an amendment to the bylaw to clarify the process for removal of any appointed member of a standing or special committee of the Division for cause before the end of that member’s appointment. The amendment was approved at the April 16, 2019 Representative Assembly meeting.

Submitted by:

Stefan Llewellyn Smith, Chair
Committee on Committees
The Committee on Research (COR) met monthly during the academic year to consider a number of issues. During the course of these meetings, the following principal issues were addressed and reports were prepared accordingly.

1. Annual Report, Committee on Research, FY 2017/18 - No action needed/taken.
2. By Laws and Charge of COR – No action needed/taken.
3. Role of the Lead Discussant in an Organized Research Unit (ORU) Review – Identified ORU lead discussants for the five ORUs reviewed this academic year. Subsequently, the review of CDDI was delayed this year.
4. Overview of the Organized Research Unit (ORU) Review Process – AVC Miroslav Krstic provided an informative slide presentation on the role of the Academic Senate and COR in the review process.
5. Research Support Services (fee-for-service) – Together with Shelley Halpain, Chair of Faculty Welfare, COR took an active role in exploring what research support services are available to faculty on campus and what are the unmet needs. The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) and Committee on Research (COR), in partnership with the Office of Research Affairs (ORA), developed a core facilities survey to solicit information from deans, department chairs, directors, and MSOs to determine what services are currently available on a recharge basis that would meet these needs. Response rates for the survey were too low to provide actionable information for ORA and the committees to develop plans to provide the desired services.
7. Open Access Theses & Dissertations Review II – COR endorsed implementation of the policy and recommended a bi-annual review of the policy by the graduate dean.
8. Export Control of Emerging Technologies – For information/discussion. No action needed/taken.
9. Proposal to Convert USP into an Academic Department - COR endorsed the proposal to convert USP into an Academic Department.
10. Proposed Campus Policy to Incentivize Completion of Mandatory Systemwide Trainings – COR agreed that faculty should be accountable for completion of UC-mandated and/or federally mandated training and was not against implementing a policy to improve compliance. However, COR opined that a more universal method targeted at processes that affect all faculty would improve compliance while not adversely affecting the research mission of the University.
11. Proposed Increase in Animal Cage Fees – Chair Engler met with Director Phil Richer to discuss the ACP budget. Dr. Richter provided insight relative to the proposed animal cage fee increases and its impact on the research mission of UCSD. A 1.5% (mouse) to 15% (select larger animals) increase in cage fees will go in to effect in AY19-20. No action needed/taken.
12. UCCS Assessment Report Review – Because the research mission of UCCS was minimal, COR did not take a position on the review.
13. UC Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) Review – COR committee did not formally vote to on the report due to significant concerns about the report. Awaiting responses to queries before rendering a decision on the report.
15. Proposed New APM on Academic Freedom for Non-Faculty Appointees – COR favored adopting the proposed new APM on Academic Freedom for Non-Faculty Academic Appointees.
16. Organized Research Unit – Five Year Review of CARTA (Center for Academic Research Training in Anthropology – CARTA provides an impressive program and COR strongly supported its continuation as an ORU for another five years.
17. Organized Research Unit: Multi-Year Review of CMRR (Center for Memory Recording Research – CMRR is financially stable COR recommended continuation of CMRR for another five years noting that the leadership needs to work on enhancing intellectual diversity and expanding research within the unit.
18. Organized Research Unit: Multi-Year Review of INC (Institute for Neural Computation) – Given INC’s excellent educational and outreach activities as well as its significant research output and fund raising for its activities, COR strongly recommended its continuation as ORU for another five years.

19. Organized Research Unit: Multi-Year Review of CCB (Center for Circadian Biology) – CCB provides excellent outreach activities and is an asset to both UCSD and the general public. COR strongly supported its continuation as ORU for another five years.

20. Organized Research Unit: Multi-Year Review of BCI (Biocircuits Institute) – The BCI has strong financial support and outreach activities as well as outstanding research accomplishments and impressive publication record. COR strongly recommended its continuation as an ORU for another five years.

21. COR Chair Engler met with Senate Council Chair, Chair-Elect, CPB Chair, and with VC Brown to discuss streamlining ORU reviews. Subsequent years will feature reviews that involve fewer meetings, meetings where all COR members participate and discuss reviews with ad hoc committee members, and have reports that address continuous changes and improvements to ORUs based on Senate feedback, i.e. “closing the loop.”

22. UCORP representative provided reports on the following main issues discussed at the monthly UCORP meetings; no action needed/taken:
   - MRU Review of the Institute of Transportation (ITS)
   - MRU Review of the UCHRI (UC Humanities Research Institute
   - MRU Review of the INPAC (Institute for Nuclear & Particle Astrophysics & Cosmology
   - MRU Review of Astrophysics
   - 4% Salary Increase & composite benefits rates (9 standard tiers; 4 flex tiers
   - National Labs: 1) Fire and Water, 2) Data Science, 3) Additive Advance Manufacturing and Materials, 4) Quantum Information Science, and (5) Accelerator Research
   - National Labs – UC will continue to run the labs
   - Tiger Teams Update: 1) international student issues, 2) sensitive materials
   - Open Access Negotiations/Elsevier Contract
   - Open Access for Thesis & Dissertations
   - Task Force for standardized testing
   - Task Force for Academic Freedom
   - Sexual Harassment
   - Federal Funding Accountability
   - China Data Sovereignty
   - Politicization of Science
   - Data Analytics Companies
   - Vehicle Operations
   - Retirement of VP for Research Art Ellis

GENERAL CAMPUS RESEARCH GRANT COMMITTEE

The General Campus Research Grant Committee met on November 19, 2018, March 12, 2019, and May 16, 2019 to review research and bridge grant applications for FY 2018/19. Three calls for bridge funding applications were transmitted. Six Bridge Funding program applications were reviewed and four were funded, totaling $129K. Applicants were required to demonstrate strong proposals for continuing research programs that had received peer-reviewed extramural funding for at least four of the last five years and, that despite efforts to re-establish funding, were without any funding between June 30 and December 31, 2018. The Committee’s evaluation of proposals emphasized the quality of the research, past publication record, and the likelihood of future funding.

The existing policies regarding awards for bridge funding, individual research proposals, travel to scholarly meetings, and the intercampus exchange program were thoroughly reviewed by the Committee and a few notable modifications were incorporated in the application call letters on the Committee’s website at http://senate.ucsd.edu/grants-awards/grant-funding/. The Committee agreed to continue its policy limiting the ceiling for bridge funding to $40,000, as well as the ceiling for individual grants to $15,000, and to maintain the maximum cumulative support figure at $60,000 over a ten-year period. Effective 7/1/18, the policy for Travel to Scholarly Meetings changed as follows: awards may cover any combination of a standard economy airfare, registration fee, and/or hotel for all faculty. Domestic travel awards will be limited to $700; foreign travel awards will be limited to $1200.
Effective February 1, 2018 the committee announced the launching of an electronic application process for travel grants. The new software, e-Grants, replaced the former paper application process. Developed in partnership with campus Information Technology Services, the new software will save PIs and department administrators’ time by enabling them to prepare and submit travel applications more efficiently online. The new software, e-Grants, replaced the current paper application for Research and Bridge Funding process effective Fall Quarter 2018.

Research – Of 121 individual applications reviewed, 107 were funded for a total of $1,023,881. Two awards totaling $46,873 were made possible by the Earl C. Anthony Endowment Trust Fund. Fourteen requests totaling $151,581 were denied primarily due to budget constraints. Six bridge funding program applications were reviewed and four were funded, totaling $129K. Two bridge funding requests totaling $63,126 were denied because they did not meet the bridge funding criteria. The breakdown of awards by faculty rank is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>31 (1 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>23 (1 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>51 (6 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPSOE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown by department and discipline is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$78,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>$302,530</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>125,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>49,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>96,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Humanities and Arts</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>$451,164</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell &amp; Developmental Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology, Behavior &amp; Evolution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Biology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Division of Biological Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Division of Physical Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,192</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanoengineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,925</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rady School of Management  7  76,049
Roosevelt College  1  9,869
School of GPS  4  49,710
Total Schools/Centers  12  $ 135,628

Total Individual Research Awards:  107  $ 1,023,881

Bridge Funding Awards
Communication  1  14,999
Molecular Biology  1  36,873
Nanoengineering  1  40,000
Structural Engineering  1  37,448
Total Bridge Funding Awards:  4  $ 129,320

GRAND TOTAL:  111  $1,153,201

Intercampus Exchange Program (FY 2018/19) - Eleven academic departments received grants totaling $22,653 in support of the University's Intercampus Exchange Program. A formula of $75 per Academic Senate member plus $11 per registered graduate student was used to determine the total amount of this award.

Travel to a Scholarly Meeting – Of 332 applications reviewed, 320 were funded totaling $277,175; $14,774 was returned for redistribution; twelve requests totaling $15,149 were denied because applicants were ineligible. One hundred thirty of the trips funded were for foreign travel and 190 for domestic travel. The breakdown of awards by faculty rank is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSOE/LPSOE</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrLSOE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown by discipline and department is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$ 11,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Science</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Social Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 75,948</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre &amp; Dance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Humanities &amp; Arts</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 59,098</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell &amp; Developmental Biology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology, Behavior &amp; Evolution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Biology</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurobiology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Biological Sciences</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 18,211</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Health Sciences Research Grant Committee met on December 3, 2018, February 13, 2019, and May 22, 2019 to review applications for FY 2018/19. The existing policies regarding awards for bridge funding, individual research proposals and travel to scholarly meetings were thoroughly reviewed by the Committee, and the modifications were incorporated in the application call letters on the Committee’s website at http://senate.ucsd.edu/grants-awards/grant-funding/. The Committee agreed to change its policy limiting the ceiling for individual grants from $10,000 to $15,000 and to allow for a cumulative total of pilot grant support of $60,000 over a ten-year period per investigator. The policy limiting the ceiling on bridge funding to $25,000 was changed to $40,000. Because of budget constraints, they also agreed to limit Travel to a Scholarly Meeting grants to Academic Senate members only, maintaining the ceiling of $750 for payment towards the cost of an economy airfare and/or registration fee every other fiscal year.

Effective February 1, 2018 the committee announced the launching of an electronic application process for travel grants. The new software, e-Grants, replaced the former paper application process. Developed in partnership with campus Information Technology Services, the new software will save PIs and department administrators’ time by enabling them to prepare and submit travel applications more efficiently online. The new software, e-Grants, replaced the current paper application for Research and Bridge Funding process effective Fall Quarter 2018.

Research – Of 54 research applications reviewed, 40 were funded, totaling $563,205; fourteen requests totaling $197,251 were denied primarily due to budget constraints. The Committee reviewed nine and funded eight bridge program applications, totaling $297,294; one request for $39,620 was denied because it did not meet the criteria for bridge funding. The breakdown of the awards by rank is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof/Assistant Prof-in-Res</td>
<td>9 (1 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof of Clinical X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Clinical Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Scientist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof/Associate Prof-in-Res</td>
<td>10 (3 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Adjunct Professor</td>
<td>2 (1 bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof/Prof-in Res</td>
<td>5 (2 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof of Clinical X</td>
<td>2 (1 Bridge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The breakdown by department is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Molecular Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine/Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$116,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$14,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pediatrics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$69,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$39,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$26,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$42,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSPPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Individual Research Awards:</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>$563,205</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bridge Funding Awards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosciences</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$38,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$19,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$39,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$79,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSPPS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bridge Funding Awards:</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$297,294</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td><strong>$860,499</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Travel to a Scholarly Meeting* – Of 68 applications reviewed, 53 were funded totaling $35,218; $1,049 was returned for redistribution, and 14 applications totaling $17,126 were denied because applicants were ineligible. Twenty-four of the trips were for foreign travel and 29 were for domestic travel. The breakdown of the awards by rank is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst Professor/Asst Prof-in-Res</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor of Clinical X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Professor/Assoc Prof-in Res</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Clinical X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor/Prof-in-Res</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Clinical X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of the awards by department is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anesthesiology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Molecular Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Medicine/Public Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Marine Sciences Research Grant Committee met on November 20, 2018, February 6, 2019, and April 26, 2019 to review applications for FY 2018/19. The existing policies regarding awards for research and travel to scholarly meetings were thoroughly reviewed by the Committee. The Committee agreed to continue its policy to maintain the ceiling for individual grants at $15,000 and the maximum cumulative support figure at $45,000 over a ten-year period. The modifications were incorporated in the application call letters on the Committee’s website at http://senate.ucsd.edu/grants-awards/grant-funding/. The ceilings for payment towards the cost of airfare on economy/coach tickets for Travel to a Scholarly Meeting will remain at $1500 for foreign travel and $1000 for domestic travel. The Committee reminds applicants who have previously received Academic Senate funding that they can strengthen their requests by showing evidence of results from prior funding. This could include, for example, a completed manuscript or a larger award stemming from a “seed” money grant.

Effective February 1, 2018 the committee announced the launching of an electronic application process for travel grants. The new software, e-Grants, replaced the former paper application process. Developed in partnership with campus Information Technology Services, the new software will save PIs and department administrators’ time by enabling them to prepare and submit travel applications more efficiently online. The new software, e-Grants, replaced the current paper application for Research and Bridge Funding process effective Fall Quarter 2018.

Research – Of 15 research applications reviewed, 14 were funded totaling $147,274. One request for $12,916 was denied because the proposal was not well-justified for seed funding. The breakdown of the awards by rank is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Scientist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist Emeritus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown by division is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASPO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$ 5,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMBB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGPP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBRD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$ 147,274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Research Awards: 14 $ 147,274
Travel to a Scholarly Meeting – Of 21 applications reviewed, 20 were funded totaling $16,364; $840 was returned for redistribution. One application was denied because the request was for an unallowable expense. Eight awards were for foreign travel and twelve awards were for domestic travel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Research Scientist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown by division is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASPO</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMBB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGPP</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBRD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Travel Awards: 20 $16,364

Respectfully submitted,

Division Committee
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Tannishtha Reya
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Brian Eliceiri, UCORP Representative
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Lucy Allais (W/S)
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Eric Watkins (F)
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The Educational Policy Committee makes recommendations to the Division concerning educational policy matters; it establishes policies and procedures related to undergraduate and graduate education, and it reviews and approves or disapproves all petitions requesting exceptions to the Regulations of the Academic Senate (see Divisional Bylaw 200). A brief enumeration of the items considered by the Educational Policy Committee during 2018-19 is presented here.

Senate Regulations and Appendices
- **San Diego Senate Regulation 500.D.1**
  The Committee submitted a request to the Systemwide Academic Senate seeking a variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 782. The variance, which was approved by the Systemwide Academic Senate, allows the San Diego Division to revise San Diego Senate Regulation 500(D)(1). The revision exempts the units earned in upper division independent study courses (all courses numbered 199) from the calculation of an undergraduate’s total P/NP units. No more than one fourth of an undergraduate student’s total UCSD course units may be taken on a P/NP basis. The change is effective Fall Quarter 2019.

- **Appendix II. UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship**
  The Committee proposed amendments, approved by the Divisional Representative Assembly, to the Division Manual’s Appendix II: UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship. The proposed changes clarify the policy, separate the procedural components of a resolution process from Appendix II, streamline the process for resolving academic integrity violations, and update and modernize the policy’s language and format. The revisions are effective Fall Quarter 2019.

Educational Policies
- The Committee approved revisions to the 2011 Policy on Remote and Distance Instruction and renamed it the Policy on Distance Education Courses. The Committee will present the revisions to Representative Assembly in Fall 2019.

Petitions Requesting Exceptions to the Regulations of the Academic Senate
- The Committee received 202 undergraduate student petition requests and 121 graduate student petition requests. Of these requests, 93.5% were approved, 0.3% were denied, 2.2% required no action or were returned for additional information, and 4.0% were referred to the Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council for action.
- The Committee reviewed the criteria for approval and the process for requesting exceptions to the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Requirement (Senate Regulation 600.G). The Committee did not reach a conclusion on whether to revise the criteria and will continue its discussions in 2019-20.

Grade Appeals
- The Committee considered and denied three grade appeals.

Endowed Chair Proposals
- The Committee reviewed and endorsed four proposals submitted by the Executive Vice Chancellor to establish endowed chairs at UC San Diego.

Senate Business
- The Committee was asked by the Division Chair to comment on the following:
  - Department of Urban Studies and Planning Proposal
  - Organized Research Unit: BioCircuits Institute (BCI)
- Organized Research Unit: Center for Academic Research and Training in Anthropogeny (CARTA)
- Organized Research Unit: Center for Circadian Biology (CCB)
- Organized Research Unit: Center for Memory and Recording Research (CMRR)
- Organized Research Unit: Institute for Neural Computation (INC)
- Proposed Revision to Systemwide Senate Regulation 636. Entry Level Writing Requirement
- Proposed Revision to San Diego Senate Regulation 503. SOM Grading Policy
- School of Public Health Proposal
- Seventh College Proposal
- Seventh College Academic Plan

Other Business
- EPC endorsed the eight proposed Academic and Administrative Calendars for 2023-2031.
- EPC approved a revision to its Bylaw to designate that a member of EPC serve on the Systemwide Academic Senate’s University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), rather than have a member of the Undergraduate Council designated as the representative. The proposal will be considered by Representative Assembly in Fall 2019.
- EPC approved revisions to the Administrative Sanctioning Guidelines for academic integrity violations.

Respectfully Submitted,

Timothy Rickard, Chair
Geoffrey Cook, Vice Chair
Anthony Burr (Spring, Summer)
Thandeka Chapman
R. Sekhar Chivukula
Ben Doller
John Eggers (Fall, Winter)
James Golden
Nancy Guy (Spring, Summer)
Sorin Lerner
Ursula Meyer (Fall, Winter)
The Graduate Council of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate has a variety of responsibilities regarding the oversight of graduate education at UCSD (see Divisional Bylaw 220). The majority of the business handled by the Council this year fell into the following areas: proposals for new degree programs, modifications to existing programs, reviews of existing programs, and student petitions requesting exceptions to Graduate Council policies. In addition, the Council’s opinion was sought on a number of other issues, such as reviews of Organized Research Units (ORUs). A brief enumeration of the issues considered by the Graduate Council in 2018-19 is presented here.

Proposals for New Degree Programs
The Graduate Council considered nine proposals to establish new degree programs. Five proposals were approved. The Council’s consideration of three proposals is still in process and will carry forward to the 2019-20 academic year.

One proposal requesting the establishment of an online professional Master’s degree program was not approved. The Council concluded that it could not support the proposal in the absence of a strong academic rationale for establishing online degree programs at UC San Diego. During the Council’s review of the proposal, it became clear that no single degree program could be expected to provide such a rationale. The Graduate Council judged that the evaluation of future proposals would benefit from a more general discussion of online degree programs at UC San Diego, independent of any specific proposal, and involving a wider array of Senate faculty and campus stakeholders. Therefore, the Council recommended that the Academic Senate initiate a discussion regarding the future of online degree programs at UC San Diego to determine what role online degree programs have in the academic mission of UC San Diego. In response, a Senate Online Degrees Ad Hoc was convened in Summer 2019 by Division Chair Robert Horwitz to develop a framework and set of guidelines for implementing online degrees at UC San Diego.

New degree program proposals approved by the Graduate Council:
- Department of Anthropology and Science Studies Program proposal to establish PhD in Anthropology (Science Studies)
- Department of Economics and School of Global Policy and Strategy proposal to establish a five-year Bachelor of Arts/Master of Public Policy (BA-MPP) program
- Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering proposal to establish MS and PhD program areas in Medical Imaging
- Department of Political Science and School of Global Policy and Strategy proposal to establish a five-year Bachelor of Arts/Master of International Affairs (BA-MIA) program
- Proposal to establish PhD degrees in the Departments of Education Studies, Music, and Visual Arts with a specialization in Critical Gender Studies

Proposals for Modifications to Existing Graduate Degree Programs
The Graduate Council considered 21 proposals to modify existing graduate degree programs. Nineteen proposals were approved. One proposal was withdrawn by proposers. One proposal is still in process and will be carried forward to the 2019-20 academic year.

Modifications to Existing Graduate Degree Programs approved by the Graduate Council:
- Bioinformatics and Systems Biology proposal to update the graduate section of the General Catalog
- Clinical Research proposal to update the curriculum for the MAS degree
- Department of Bioengineering proposal to update the curriculum for the MS in Bioengineering with a Medical Specialization
- Department of Cognitive Science proposal to update the curriculum for the PhD in Cognitive Science
- Department of Economics proposal to update the graduate section of the General Catalog
- Department of Family Medicine and Public Health proposal to add a General Public Health (GPH) track of specialization to the Master of Public Health and revise the requirements for the Epidemiology and Health Behavior tracks of specialization
- Department of Family Medicine and Public Health proposal to add a Public Mental Health concentration to the Master of Public Health
- Department of Mathematics proposal to waive the GRE Math Subject test requirement for qualified applicants for two years
- Department of Political Science proposal to update the requirements for the PhD degrees in Political Science and Political Science and International Affairs
- Department of Sociology proposal to update the graduate section of the General Catalog
- Department of Structural Engineering proposal to update the graduate section of the General Catalog
- Division of Biological Sciences proposal to update the curriculum for the PhD degree
- Division of Biological Sciences proposal to waive the GRE admissions requirement
- Leadership of Healthcare Organizations proposal to update the curriculum for the MAS degree
- Neurosciences Graduate Program proposal to waive the GRE admissions requirement
- Rady School of Management proposal to establish Senate Regulation 701. Requirements for the Master of Professional Accountancy
- School of Global Policy and Strategy proposal to update the requirements for Master of International Affairs and Master of Public Policy
- Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences proposal to reduce the total number of required units to 48 for the MS in Drug Development and Product Management effective Fall 2018
- Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences proposal to reduce the total number of required units to 36 for the MS in Drug Development and Product Management effective Fall 2019

Reviews of Graduate Degree Programs
Graduate programs are reviewed by the Graduate Council once every eight years. An external committee visits the program or department under review, and submits its findings to the Graduate Council for consideration. The program or department under review has an opportunity to respond to issues raised by the external review committee prior to the Graduate Council’s review. After considering both the external committee report and the program’s response, the Graduate Council provides recommendations to the program or department during its initial review. Progress towards achieving those recommendations and goals set forth in the initial review is examined in a follow-up review conducted by the Graduate Council. The following programs and departments were reviewed:

Graduate Program Reviews (initial review):
- Bioinformatics and Systems Biology Graduate Program
- Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program
- Computational Science, Mathematics and Engineering Graduate Program
- Department of Ethnic Studies
- Department of Linguistics
- Department of Visual Arts

Graduate Program Reviews (follow-up review):
- Department of Computer Science and Engineering
- Department of Mathematics
- Department of Music
- Department of Philosophy
- Joint Doctoral Program in Public Health
- Rady School of Management (MBA degree)
Graduate Fellowship (Block Grant) Reviews
Graduate programs’ graduate fellowship (block grant) allocations are reviewed by the Graduate Council every four years. The Graduate Council reviews each program to adjust the merit component of the block grant allocation. The following programs were reviewed:

- Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program
- Department of Linguistics
- Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
- Department of Sociology
- Department of Visual Arts
- Materials Science and Engineering Graduate Program
- School of Global Policy and Strategy
- Scripps Institution of Oceanography

Organized Research Units (ORUs)
The Graduate Council opined on the reviews of the following Organized Research Units:

- BioCircuits Institute (BCI)
- Center for Academic Research and Training in Anthropogeny (CARTA)
- Center for Circadian Biology (CCB)
- Center for Memory and Recording Research (CMRR)
- Institute for Neural Computation (INC)

Other Business
- The Graduate Council updated the process for considering exception requests to allow Teaching Professors to chair MS committees or PhD committees.
- The Graduate Council updated the rules for conducting PhD qualifying exams and defenses to allow doctoral committee members to participate via teleconference.
- The Graduate Council reviewed and supported the proposal to establish the School of Public Health.
- The Graduate Council commented on the Graduate Division’s student evaluation form for doctoral and MFA students.
- The Graduate Council commented on the proposal to establish the Department of Urban Studies and Planning.

Respectfully submitted,

Sorin Lerner, Chair
David Barner, Vice Chair
Benjamin Cowan
Francesco Lanza Di Scalea
Aneesh Manohar
Curtis Marez
Luis Martin-Cabrera
Maho Niwa Rosen
Lynn Russell
Ronghui (Lily) Xu
Paul Yu, Interim Dean of the Graduate Division
The Undergraduate Council of the UCSD Academic Senate has a variety of responsibilities regarding the oversight of undergraduate education at UCSD (see Divisional Bylaw 210). The majority of the business handled by the Council during the year is divided into the following areas: proposals for new majors and minors, modifications to existing majors and minors, modifications to existing College curriculum, modifications to Senate Regulations, reviews of existing undergraduate programs, and course approvals. In addition, the opinion of the Council was sought on a number of other Systemwide and Divisional issues. A brief enumeration of the issues considered by the Undergraduate Council is presented here.

Proposals for New Majors and Minors
The Undergraduate Council considered ten requests to establish a new major and six requests to establish a new minor. Nine major proposals and six minor proposals were approved by the Council in 2018-2019. One major proposal was returned seeking more information.

New proposals approved by the Undergraduate Council:
- B.A. in Biological Anthropology
- B.S. in Global Health
- B.A. in Anthropology with Concentration in Climate Change and Human Solutions
- B.S. in Human Developmental Sciences with a Specialization in Equity and Diversity
- B.S. in Human Developmental Sciences with a Specialization in Healthy Aging
- B.S. in Education Sciences
- B.A. in Economics – Public Policy
- B.A. in Latin American Studies with a concentration in Mexico and Latin American Studies with a concentration in Migration and Border Studies
- B.S. in Political Science – International Affairs
- Minor in South Asian Studies
- Minor in Climate Change and Human Solutions
- Minor in Equity and Diversity
- Minor in Healthy Aging
- Minor in Political Science/Data Analytics
- Minor in Computational Social Science

Proposals for Modifications to Existing Majors and Minors
The Undergraduate Council considered fifty-three requests to modify existing majors and minors. Forty-nine proposals were approved as proposed and four proposals were returned seeking more information.

Reviews of Undergraduate Degree Programs
Undergraduate programs are reviewed by the Undergraduate Council once every seven to eight years. A review committee, including one member of the Council, visits the college, program, or department under review, and submits its findings to the Undergraduate Council for consideration. The college, program, or department under review has an opportunity to respond to issues raised by the review committee prior to the review and recommendation of the Undergraduate Council. After considering both the committee report and the program’s response, the Undergraduate Council provides recommendations to the college, program, or department. Progress towards achieving those recommendations and goals set forth in the initial review is examined in a follow-up review conducted by the Undergraduate Council.
Undergraduate Program Reviews conducted in 2018-19:

- Music
- Political Science
- Third World Studies
- Classical Studies
- SIO Earth Sciences and Marine Biology
- Visual Arts
- Public Health

Undergraduate Council Review and Recommendations issued in 2018-19:

- Linguistics
- Thurgood Marshall College
- Third World Studies
- Scripps Institution of Oceanography
- Music
- Public Health
- Visual Arts
- Health Care – Social Issues Minor Program
- Middle East Studies Minor Program
- Science, Technology and Society Minor Program
- Rady School of Management Minor Program
- Human Rights Minor Program
- European Studies Minor Program
- Bioengineering (one-year follow-up)
- Mathematics (one-year follow-up)
- Computer Science and Engineering (one-year follow-up)
- Ethnic Studies (one-year follow-up)
- Latin American Studies (one-year follow-up)
- Physics (one-year follow-up)
- Program for the Study of Religion (one-year follow-up)
- Theatre and Dance (one-year follow-up)
- Philosophy (delinquent follow-up)
- Chinese Studies (delinquent follow-up)
- Economics (delinquent follow-up)
- International Studies (delinquent follow-up)
- NanoEngineering (delinquent follow-up)
- Russian, Eastern European, Eurasian Studies (delinquent follow-up)
- Revelle College (delinquent follow-up)
- Sociology (delinquent follow-up)
- Italian Studies (delinquent follow-up)
- Thurgood Marshall College (delinquent follow-up)
- Sixth College (delinquent follow-up)
- Anthropology (delinquent follow-up)
- Biology (delinquent follow-up)
- Human Developmental Sciences (delinquent follow-up)
- Cognitive Science (delinquent follow-up)
- Academic Internship Program (delinquent follow-up)
- Eleanor Roosevelt College (delinquent follow-up)
Course Approvals
The Undergraduate Council considered 190 requests to establish new courses and 300 requests to revise existing courses.

Respectfully submitted,
John Eggers, Chair (F18, W19)
Anthony Burr, Vice Chair and Chair (SP19)
Stacey Brydges
Marc Garellek
Paul Goldstein
Ranjit Jhala
Amy Kiger
Jane Teranes
Edward Watts
Haim Weizman
REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) approved the UC San Diego Policy on Distance Education Courses (attached). The purpose of this policy is to specify the standards and review requirements for individual proposals to establish distance education courses. This policy replaces the CEP Policy on Remote and Distance Instruction (enacted July 13, 2011).

Currently, distance education courses must adhere to the requirements specified in the 2011 policy. EPC developed the Policy on Distance Education Courses over the course of 2018-19 after determining the current policy was in need of updating to better accommodate today’s distance education landscape. EPC consulted with Digital Learning in the Teaching + Learning Commons during development of the new policy. The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils reviewed and endorsed the new policy in June 2019. The revisions:

1. Provide a standard definition for distance education courses, which refers to a mode of instruction in which some or all students are separated from the instructor based on course design. Recognizing that distance education can employ several different mechanisms of instruction, EPC eliminated the distinctions made in the current policy between synchronous and asynchronous modes of instruction.

2. Clearly define the standards, proposal requirements, and review procedures that apply to all distance education courses.

3. Require that all distance education courses, whether offered synchronously or asynchronously, bear the letter R (for Remote) at the end of the course code.

EPC is bringing the Policy on Distance Education Courses to Representative Assembly to inform members that it will take effect November 1, 2019. All requests for new distance education courses or changes to existing distance education courses submitted by departments and programs on or after November 1, 2019 are required to follow the UC San Diego Policy on Distance Education Courses.

Geoffrey Cook, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

*****************************************************************************
UC San Diego Policy on Distance Education Courses

All courses offered at UC San Diego should meet the same high standards in terms of the educational experience they offer to students, regardless of the mode of instruction. Hallmarks of these standards include:

- Active engagement of a qualified instructor who has significant expertise in the subject of the course;
- Frequent instructor guided activity to support student learning;
- A means for students to periodically assess their progress towards achievement of course learning goals.

Courses that meet these standards and employ (primarily or exclusively) technologically-mediated formats may be offered at UC San Diego via Distance Education courses (sometimes also referred to as remote or online courses).

DEFINITION

Distance Education refers to a mode of instruction in which some or all students are separated from the instructor. A Distance Education course must support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously (live but remote) or asynchronously (on demand and remote). Many technologies can be used to deliver Distance Education, including the internet, recorded videos, online audio/video conferencing, online discussion forums, and online Learning Management Systems. Distance Education courses can employ several mechanisms of instruction, including online lectures, online discussion sections, online office hours, and online discussion forums, each of which can be synchronous, asynchronous or a combination of both. A course will be considered a Distance Education course if (for some or all students) less than 50% of student-instructor interaction time was designed to occur face-to-face (meaning physically in the same room).

I. STANDARDS FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES

Distance Education courses must meet the following standards:

1. Instructors and Instructional Assistants of Distance Education courses must have the required expertise and qualifications to offer courses that utilize teaching strategies and technologies for distance education. Departments and programs offering Distance Education courses are responsible for ensuring the Instructor’s and the Instructional Assistant’s qualifications.

2. Departments offering Distance Education courses must have processes in place to verify that each registered student is the same student who participates in and completes the course and receives academic credit. Examples of processes that can achieve this goal include:
   a. A secure log-in and password
   b. Proctored examinations
   c. New or other technologies or practices that are effective in verifying student identity

3. Instructors must apply strict procedures to ensure that credibility and integrity are maintained at the highest level. Instructors must have a plan to monitor student progress and evaluate student learning outcomes through graded activities mediated through technology.
4. All campus policies and regulations for courses and instruction (registration deadlines, academic integrity, etc.) that apply to conventional courses also apply to distance education courses. As with in-person courses, distance education courses must accommodate students with disabilities.

5. Any synchronous interaction (for example in lectures, discussion sections, office hours, or any other setting) must meet the following minimum set of standards:
   a. Students must be able to both see and hear the instructor and view the instruction materials (for example, physical or electronic whiteboard, computer slides, experimental setups, etc.) with sufficient fidelity that no significant information is lost. Courses made available to students in off-campus sites may only be taught in facilities capable of sustaining a synchronous, two-way video and audio connection between UC San Diego and off-campus sites.
   b. Students must have appropriate and effective ways of asking questions.
   c. Student should be able to hear questions asked by other students and the instructor’s answers.
   d. When a class has some students remote and some students in-person, all students must have equal opportunity to participate in classroom discussions, and all students must have equal access to office hours.

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSES

1. Distance Education courses must bear the letter R (for Remote) at the end of the course code.
   a. For a course that is already offered at UCSD in a conventional (non-distance) format, a new course proposal must be submitted for the Distance Education version (e.g. to offer BILD 1 using Distance Education, Biology would have to propose a new course, BILD 1R).
   b. Course approval forms should include a statement under the “Other Catalog Information” section regarding the course delivery format, e.g. “This course is a Distance Education course”.

2. Departments must notify students of any additional fees associated with the verification of student identity.

3. Departments and programs are required to submit a proposal to the Academic Senate (Undergraduate Council for undergraduate courses, or Graduate Council for graduate courses) for approval to offer a Distance Education course.

4. Prior to Senate review, proposers are required to consult with the Teaching + Learning Commons to ensure a Distance Education course meets the quality assurance standards set forth by the Quality Matters Rubric (https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric).

III. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION FOR DISTANCE EDUCATION COURSE PROPOSALS

Distance Education course proposals submitted to the Undergraduate or Graduate Councils must include the following:

1. Draft course approval form.
2. Responses to the supplementary questions listed below.
3. Evidence of review by the Teaching + Learning Commons.
4. For undergraduate courses developed for UC’s Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI), a copy of the ILTI proposal. Courses must be approved through ILTI prior to submission to the Undergraduate Council.
Supplementary Questions (to be answered as part of the course proposal):

(In the following, IA refers to Instructional Assistant)

1. How will the course content be delivered (e.g. Learning Management System, online textbook/videos, video hosting platforms, lecture formats, etc.)?

2. What technologies/tools will be used for student-instructor interaction, student-IA interaction, student-student interaction, and instructor-IA interactions? Indicate: a. the frequency of these interactions; b. whether the interactions are required or optional; and c. whether the interactions are asynchronous or synchronous.

3. How will students be evaluated (e.g. quizzes, written assignments, problems sets, final exam, final paper, final presentation)? Describe the frequency of the evaluations and the type of feedback students receive.

4. Describe how student identity will be verified, especially for high stake assessments like midterms and final exams. How will academic integrity be handled?

5. If the course employs IAs, describe how the IAs will interact with the students and provide the student/IA ratio. Describe how the IAs will be trained, and how the IAs will interact with instructors.

Approved by the Educational Policy Committee on July 3, 2019. This policy supersedes the CEP Policy on Remote and Distance Instruction (enacted July 13, 2011).
June 20, 2019

PROFESSOR TIMOTHY RICKARD, Chair  
Educational Policy Committee

SUBJECT: UC San Diego Policy on Distance Education Courses

Dear Professor Rickard,

At its June 14, 2019 meeting, the Undergraduate Council reviewed the proposed Policy on Distance Education Courses. The Council endorsed the proposed changes to the policy and had no additional comments or concerns.

Sincerely,

Anthony Burr, Chair  
Undergraduate Council

cc: M. Corr  
L. Hullings  
R. Horwitz  
S. Lerner  
J. Moore  
R. Rodriguez  
J. Teranes
June 17, 2019

PROFESSOR TIMOTHY RICKARD, Chair
Educational Policy Committee

SUBJECT: UC San Diego Policy on Distance Education Courses

At its June 10, 2019 meeting, the Graduate Council endorsed the proposed UC San Diego Policy on Distance Education Courses developed by the Educational Policy Committee to replace the current CEP Policy on Remote and Distance Instruction. The Council had no comments on the policy updates and recommends that EPC move forward with approval.

Sincerely,

Sorin Lerner, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: A. Burr
    G. Cook
    M. Corr
    R. Horwitz
    L. Hullings
    R. Rodriguez
    L. Vong
REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

The Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council approved a joint proposal from the Department of Political Science and the School of Global Policy and Strategy to establish a new five-year Bachelor of Arts in Political Science-International Affairs/Master of International Affairs (BA-MIA) program.

The Graduate Council is supportive of this academic endeavor and recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the proposal.

Lynn Russell, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review: https://senate.ucsd.edu/media/393306/gps-politicalsci-proposed-five-year-ba-mia-program.pdf

**********************************************************************

Executive Summary

The curriculum of the School of Global Policy and Strategy (GPS) is rooted in the disciplines of Political Science, Economics, and Management. As such, it made sense that its first partnership for the development of a five-year Bachelor/Master’s program was with the International Studies Program (ISP), as it, too, is interdisciplinary and focused on the study of the world outside of the United States. The Bachelor of Arts in International Studies/Master of International Affairs (BA/MIA) has been successful along a number of important measures: In assuring GPS an additional qualified pool of applicants to its graduate program; providing undergraduates with the opportunity of a two-year degree with only one additional year of study; retaining skilled students on the UCSD campus; and, finally, encouraging achievement among ISP students in such a fashion that the BA/MIA has grown well-beyond the original estimates of admission.

Following the model of our successful combined Bachelor/Master’s program, the School of Global Policy and Strategy and the Department of Political Science are proposing a new five-year program, allowing the completion of a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) in Political Science-International Affairs and a Master of International Affairs (MIA). Students will first declare themselves as Political Science majors and follow the curriculum requirements outlined in this proposal. In the spring of their junior year, they may apply to the five-year program and, upon admission, change to the Political Science-International Affairs major. As in the existing BA/MIA and BA/MPP, students will take master’s level GPS courses in their senior year, completing their undergraduate degree. Upon graduating in good standing, applicants will be nominated for matriculation to the graduate year.

Only students admitted to the five-year BA/MIA will be allowed to declare the Political Science-International Affairs major. This is administratively necessary for tracking completion of requirements for both staff and uAchieve, it simplifies management of both the Degree and Diploma Application (DDA) and time to degree data. Should someone opt out or prove ineligible during the senior year to matriculate to graduate standing, they will be asked to return to a major track in the Department of Political Science. Academic advisers will assist them with determining remaining undergraduate requirements. Successfully completed course work at GPS will be considered toward fulfillment of their degree.
This program will require the creation of a new undergraduate major code in the Political Science Department. Students who matriculate to the graduate year will be transferred to the existing code used for the master’s year of the program with the International Studies Program (IR75 Master of International Affairs). The graduate year for the new program is identical to that for students who enter GPS through ISP. No new courses or faculty, and no changes in the regular scheduling of courses will be necessary. The proposal does not create a new graduate degree and does not require changes in the existing regulation. The only innovation is on the undergraduate side— the requirement of taking GPS graduate core courses, and the use of three of them of them in place of upper division Political Science Department electives.

GPS and the Department of Political Science would like to open the admissions process to students with junior standing in Spring Quarter, 2020, allowing the first class to begin senior year, GPS core coursework in Fall Quarter, 2020.

The partnership between GPS and the Political Science Department in the establishment of this five-year program is a natural evolution of our longstanding relationship. Most of the political scientists in the School have formal relationships with the Department; many teach courses at the graduate and/or undergraduate level. Ladder rank faculty in Political Science also teach in GPS. Our faculties collaborate on research, sit on dissertation committees together, and share programming obligations in research units. Finally, Political Science is the most common degree listed by domestic applicants to our two-year programs. Students in this new BA/MIA will be on equal footing from the outset.

The program we propose is a natural ‘next step’ for undergraduates who want an advanced degree that does not stint on graduate level skills training. It will provide students with interdisciplinary studies beyond their undergraduate major, making them competitive for employment in both the private and public sectors, and for which there is demonstrated demand.
April 22, 2019

PROFESSOR ROBERT HORWITZ, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

Dear Robert,

The Health Sciences Faculty Council on February 5, 2019 has approved amendments to Regulation 503, which we now submit to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction for review.

The grading policy is being updated to include the new Residency Transition course. This is a new course offered in the fourth year of the medical school curriculum and was offered for the first time in spring 2019. The grading options for this course are Pass or Fail.

Please let me know if additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

Giovanna Casola, M.D.
Chair, Health Sciences Faculty Council

c: Steve Garfin, M.D., Interim Dean, School of Medicine
REPORT OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES FACULTY COUNCIL

On February 5, 2019 the Health Sciences Faculty Council (HSFC) voted to approve proposed revisions to the UC San Diego School of Medicine (SOM) Grading Policy (Divisional Regulation 503). The SOM Committee on Educational Policy has also endorsed these proposed revisions.

1) The new Residency Transition course which will be offered in the fourth year of the curriculum beginning in Spring 2019 will have the grading option as P (pass) or F (fail).

Giovanna Casola, M.D.
Chair, Health Sciences Faculty Council

Attachment: Regulation 503 - Grading Policy - School of Medicine. Proposed revisions are noted.

***************************************************************************

MANUAL OF THE SAN DIEGO DIVISION
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

REGULATION

503 GRADING POLICY - SCHOOL OF MEDICINE [En 10/29/85, Rt by Assembly 3/4/86, Am 1/28/14]

A) Beginning in fall quarter, 2010, the work of all students in those courses designated by the Faculty of the School of Medicine as constituting the Preclerkship Core Curriculum, as well as in the Principles to Practice course, will be graded P (pass) or F (fail). In the Residency Transition course, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). Beginning in summer quarter, 2014, the work of all students in core clinical clerkships will be reported in terms of four grades: H (honors); NH (near honors); P (pass); F (fail). The work of all students in all other required courses will be reported in terms of three grades: H (honors); P (pass); F (fail). [Am 4/25/95, Am 1/29/02, Am 12/1/09, Am 1/28/14]

B) In all preclerkship elective courses, grades shall be reported on a S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale. [Am 12/1/09]

C) In all third year selective courses, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). [En 12/29/11]

D) In all fourth year elective courses, grades shall be reported as H (honors); P (pass); F (fail) unless the course director has designated a mandatory S (satisfactory) or U
(unsatisfactory) grading scale and this has been approved by the Electives Committee. [En 12/1/09, Am 1/25/11]

E) No grade points per unit shall be assigned.

F) Grade Changes
All grades except Incomplete (I), In Progress (IP), and Provisionally Unsatisfactory (Y) are final when filed by an instructor in the end of term course report. However, a final grade may be corrected at any time when a clerical or procedural error is discovered. No term grades except I and Y may be revised by further examination.

G) Grade Appeals
A medical student may appeal a course grade by following procedures described in the UCSD School of Medicine Advisor and Student Handbook.

H) Definitions of Grades. Student evaluation is based on the following:

1) The H Grade:
The grade H (Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship or a fourth-year elective is considered to be outstanding. Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core or preclerkship elective courses or third-year selective courses nor in the Independent Study Project.

2) The NH Grade:
The grade NH (Near Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship is significantly higher than a Pass grade, but lower than an Honors grade. Near Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core courses, preclerkship elective courses, third-year selective courses, fourth-year elective and core courses, or in the Independent Study Project.

3) The P Grade:
The grade P (Pass) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is satisfactory.

4) The F Grade:
The grade F (Fail) is assigned to those students who overall performance in a required course is unsatisfactory. The assigned F (Fail) grade will remain on the transcript. When an F grade is remediated by examination, a memorandum to that effect will be posted to the transcript. If the F grade is remediated by repetition of
the course, the course will appear chronologically a second time on the transcript.

5) The S Grade:
The grade S (Satisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a preclerkship elective course is satisfactory.

6) The U Grade:
The grade U (Unsatisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a preclerkship elective course is unsatisfactory. The assigned U (Unsatisfactory) grade will remain on the transcript.

7) The Y Grade:
The grade Y (Provisionally Unsatisfactory) is assigned as an initial grade. A Y grade is replaced either by a P (Pass) or S (Satisfactory) grade when the requirements for the course have been satisfied; or, if a student fails to complete the requirements satisfactorily within a period of time determined by the course instructor, an F (Fail) or U (Unsatisfactory) grade is assigned. The Y grade cannot be replaced by a Near Honors or an Honors grade.

8) The I Grade:
The grade I (Incomplete) is assigned when a student’s work is of passing quality but is incomplete for good cause (illness or family emergency, for example). The grade I will be replaced with a grade when the remaining course work is completed. The instructor shall make arrangements with the student for completion of the work required at the earliest possible date, but no later than one year following the course. An extension to this deadline may be granted by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education, if there are extenuating circumstances.

9) The IP Grade:
For courses extending over more than one quarter, and in which evaluation of a student’s performance is deferred until the end of the final quarter, a grade of “In Progress” (IP) shall be assigned and replaced by a final grade when the student completes the course sequence.

10) The W Grade:
The grade W (Withdraw) is assigned when a student has completed some portion of the course and for personal, medical, or other reasons must withdraw from the course. Students are not generally permitted to withdraw after the midpoint of a
course. If a student withdraws after the midpoint of a course, the W grade will remain on the transcript. If the course is repeated at a later date, it will appear a second time on the transcript. The Withdraw grade must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education may approve exceptions to the assignment of the W grade, including allowing a student to withdraw after the midpoint of a course if there are extenuating circumstances. [Am 12/9/14]

11) Blank on a Student's Transcript: [En 12/9/14]

(1) If a student's name appears on the end of quarter course list (or roster) for a course, but no grade is reported, the Registrar will leave a blank for that course on the student's transcript.

(2) If a blank on a student's transcript is not replaced by a grade that is assigned by the course instructor, then it will be automatically replaced by an F or U grade at the end of the following quarter.
A) Beginning in fall quarter, 2010, the work of all students in those courses designated by the Faculty of the School of Medicine as constituting the Preclerkship Core Curriculum, as well as in the Principles to Practice course, will be graded P (pass) or F (fail). Beginning in summer quarter, 2014, the work of all students in core clinical clerkships will be reported in terms of four grades: H (honors); NH (near honors); P (pass); F (fail). The work of all students in all other required courses will be reported in terms of three grades: H (honors); P (pass); F (fail). [Am 4/25/95, Am 1/29/02, Am 12/1/09, Am 1/28/14]

B) In all preclerkship elective courses, grades shall be reported on a S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale. [Am 12/1/09]

C) In all third year selective courses, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). [En 1/25/11]

D) In all fourth year elective courses, grades shall be reported as H (honors); P (pass); F (fail) unless the course director has designated a mandatory S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale and this has been approved by the Electives Committee. [En 12/1/09, Am 1/25/11]

E) No grade points per unit shall be assigned.

F) Grade Changes
All grades except Incomplete (I), In Progress (IP), and Provisionally Unsatisfactory (Y) are final when filed by an instructor in the end of term course report. However, a final grade may be corrected at any time when a clerical or procedural error is discovered. No term grades except I and Y may be revised by further examination.

G) Grade Appeals
A medical student may appeal a course grade by following procedures described in the UCSD School of Medicine Advisor and Student Handbook.

H) Definitions of Grades. Student evaluation is based on the following:

1) The H Grade:
The grade H (Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship or a fourth-year elective is considered to be outstanding. Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core or preclerkship elective courses or third-year selective courses nor in the Independent Study Project.

2) The NH Grade:
The grade NH (Near Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship is significantly higher than a Pass grade, but lower than an Honors grade. Near Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core courses, preclerkship elective courses, third-year selective courses, fourth-year elective and core courses, or in the Independent Study Project.
3) **The P Grade:**
The grade P (Pass) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is satisfactory.

4) **The F Grade:**
The grade F (Fail) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is unsatisfactory. The assigned F (Fail) grade will remain on the transcript. When an F grade is remediated by examination, a memorandum to that effect will be posted to the transcript. If the F grade is remediated by repetition of the course, the course will appear chronologically a second time on the transcript.

5) **The S Grade:**
The grade S (Satisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a preclerkship elective course is satisfactory.

6) **The U Grade:**
The grade U (Unsatisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a preclerkship elective course is unsatisfactory. The assigned U (Unsatisfactory) grade will remain on the transcript.

7) **The Y Grade:**
The grade Y (Provisionally Unsatisfactory) is assigned as an initial grade. A Y grade is replaced either by a P (Pass) or S (Satisfactory) grade when the requirements for the course have been satisfied; or, if a student fails to complete the requirements satisfactorily within a period of time determined by the course instructor, an F (Fail) or U (Unsatisfactory) grade is assigned. The Y grade cannot be replaced by a Near Honors or an Honors grade.

8) **The I Grade:**
The grade I (Incomplete) is assigned when a student's work is of passing quality but is incomplete for good cause (illness or family emergency, for example). The grade I will be replaced with a grade when the remaining course work is completed. The instructor shall make arrangements with the student for completion of the work required at the earliest possible date, but no later than one year following the course. An extension to this deadline may be granted by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education, if there are extenuating circumstances.

9) **The IP Grade:**
For courses extending over more than one quarter, and in which evaluation of a student's performance is deferred until the end of the final quarter, a grade of “In Progress” (IP) shall be assigned and replaced by a final grade when the student completes the course sequence.
10) The W Grade:

The grade W (Withdraw) is assigned when a student has completed some portion of the course and for personal, medical, or other reasons must withdraw from the course. Students are not generally permitted to withdraw after the midpoint of a course. If a student withdraws after the midpoint of a course, the W grade will remain on the transcript. If the course is repeated at a later date, it will appear a second time on the transcript. The Withdraw grade must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education may approve exceptions to the assignment of the W grade, including allowing a student to withdraw after the midpoint of a course if there are extenuating circumstances. [Am 12/9/14]

11) Blank on a Student's Transcript: [En 12/9/14]

(1) If a student's name appears on the end of quarter course list (or roster) for a course, but no grade is reported, the Registrar will leave a blank for that course on the student's transcript.

(2) If a blank on a student's transcript is not replaced by a grade that is assigned by the course instructor, then it will be automatically replaced by an F or U grade at the end of the following quarter.
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A) Beginning in fall quarter, 2010, the work of all students in those courses designated by the Faculty of the School of Medicine as constituting the Preclerkship Core Curriculum, as well as in the Principles to Practice course, will be graded P (pass) or F (fail). In the Residency Transition course, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). Beginning in summer quarter, 2014, the work of all students in core clinical clerkships will be reported in terms of four grades: H (honors); NH (near honors); P (pass); F (fail). The work of all students in all other required courses will be reported in terms of three grades: H (honors); P (pass); F (fail). [Am 4/25/95, Am 1/29/02, Am 12/1/09, Am 1/28/14]

B) In all preclerkship elective courses, grades shall be reported on a S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale. [Am 12/1/09]

C) In all third year selective courses, grades shall be reported as P (pass) or F (fail). [En 1/25/11]

D) In all fourth year elective courses, grades shall be reported as H (honors); P (pass); F (fail) unless the course director has designated a mandatory S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory) grading scale and this has been approved by the Electives Committee. [En 12/1/09, Am 1/25/11]

E) No grade points per unit shall be assigned.

F) Grade Changes

All grades except Incomplete (I), In Progress (IP), and Provisionally Unsatisfactory (Y) are final when filed by an instructor in the end of term course report. However, a final grade may be corrected at any time when a clerical or procedural error is discovered. No term grades except I and Y may be revised by further examination.

G) Grade Appeals

A medical student may appeal a course grade by following procedures described in the UCSD School of Medicine Advisor and Student Handbook.

H) Definitions of Grades. Student evaluation is based on the following:

1) The H Grade:

The grade H (Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third-year core clerkship or a fourth-year elective is considered to be outstanding. Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core or preclerkship elective courses or third-year selective courses nor in the Independent Study Project.
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2) The NH Grade:
The grade NH (Near Honors) is assigned to those students whose overall academic performance in a third year core clerkship is significantly higher than a Pass grade, but lower than an Honors grade. Near Honors grades are not granted in preclerkship core courses, preclerkship elective courses, third-year selective courses, fourth-year elective and core courses, or in the Independent Study Project.

3) The P Grade:
The grade P (Pass) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is satisfactory.

4) The F Grade:
The grade F (Fail) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a required course is unsatisfactory. The assigned F (Fail) grade will remain on the transcript. When an F grade is remediated by examination, a memorandum to that effect will be posted to the transcript. If the F grade is remediated by repetition of the course, the course will appear chronologically a second time on the transcript.

5) The S Grade:
The grade S (Satisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a preclerkship elective course is satisfactory.

6) The U Grade:
The grade U (Unsatisfactory) is assigned to those students whose overall performance in a preclerkship elective course is unsatisfactory. The assigned U (Unsatisfactory) grade will remain on the transcript.

7) The Y Grade:
The grade Y (Provisionally Unsatisfactory) is assigned as an initial grade. A Y grade is replaced either by a P (Pass) or S (Satisfactory) grade when the requirements for the course have been satisfied; or, if a student fails to complete the requirements satisfactorily within a period of time determined by the course instructor, an F (Fail) or U (Unsatisfactory) grade is assigned. The Y grade cannot be replaced by a Near Honors or an Honors grade.

8) The I Grade:
The grade I (Incomplete) is assigned when a student’s work is of passing quality but is incomplete for good cause (illness or family emergency, for example). The grade I will be replaced with a grade when the
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remaining course work is completed. The instructor shall make arrangements with the student for completion of the work required at the earliest possible date, but no later than one year following the course. An extension to this deadline may be granted by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education, if there are extenuating circumstances.

9) The IP Grade:
For courses extending over more than one quarter, and in which evaluation of a student's performance is deferred until the end of the final quarter, a grade of “In Progress” (IP) shall be assigned and replaced by a final grade when the student completes the course sequence.

10) The W Grade:
The grade W (Withdraw) is assigned when a student has completed some portion of the course and for personal, medical, or other reasons must withdraw from the course. Students are not generally permitted to withdraw after the midpoint of a course. If a student withdraws after the midpoint of a course, the W grade will remain on the transcript. If the course is repeated at a later date, it will appear a second time on the transcript. The Withdraw grade must be approved by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education. The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Medical Education may approve exceptions to the assignment of the W grade, including allowing a student to withdraw after the midpoint of a course if there are extenuating circumstances. [Am 12/9/14]

11) Blank on a Student's Transcript: [En 12/9/14]
(1) If a student's name appears on the end of quarter course list (or roster) for a course, but no grade is reported, the Registrar will leave a blank for that course on the student's transcript.
(2) If a blank on a student's transcript is not replaced by a grade that is assigned by the course instructor, then it will be automatically replaced by an F or U grade at the end of the following quarter.
May 23, 2019

PROFESSOR ROBERT HORWITZ, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

SUBJECT: Request to amend San Diego Senate Regulation 503. Grading Policy – School of Medicine

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) reviewed the proposal to amend San Diego Senate Regulation 503. Grading Policy – School of Medicine. EPC has no objections to the proposed change and recommends approval.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Cook, Vice Chair
Educational Policy Committee

cc: M. Corr
    A. Montgomery
    T. Rickard
    R. Rodriguez
May 15, 2019

GIOVANNA CASOLA
Chair, Health Sciences Faculty Council

SUBJECT: Review of the Proposed Amendment to San Diego Divisional Senate Regulation 503

Dear Giovanna,

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the proposed amendment to *San Diego Divisional Senate Regulation 503, Grading Policy – School of Medicine*, and found the proposed amendment consonant with the code of the Academic Senate.

Sincerely,

Professor Andrew Dickson, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Enclosure

cc: C. Caisip
M. Corr
S. Garfin
R. Horwitz
T. Mallis
R. Rodriguez
A. Welch