# Meeting of the Legislative Assembly

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**Thursday, November 29, 2018, 2:00 - 4:00 p.m.**

**California Room, Faculty Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I.    | 2:00-2:05 | Approval of Draft Minutes of June 7, 2018  
Approval of the Consent Calendar  
(Items denoted with an “**” are included on the Consent Calendar.)  

*In Memoriam – Professor Leobardo F. Estrada, Academic Senate Chair 2015-16*
| II.   | 2:05-2:10 | Welcome & Brief Announcements – Joseph Bristow, Chair, Academic Senate |
| III.  | 2:10-2:40 | Announcements by Chancellor Gene Block |
| IV.   | 2:40-2:55 | Other Announcements / Presentations  
• Centennial Celebration Update – Professor Carole Goldberg |
| V.    | 2:55-3:00 | Consent Calendar – Joseph Bristow, Chair, Academic Senate  
A. 2018-19 Committee on Committees Slate Updates *  
B. Proposed Bylaw Revisions *  
• Chemistry & Biochemistry Department Bylaws Revisions  
• Department of Surgery Bylaw Revisions  
• College Faculty Executive Committee Bylaws Revisions  
• Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) Revised Bylaws  
C. Department of Biomathematics Proposal to Change its Name to the Department of Computational Medicine *  
D. Special Orders |
| VI.   | Special Orders – Annual Reports (Consent Calendar)  
A. 2018-19 Committee on Committees Slate *  
B. 2017-18 Annual Reports *  
• Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools  
• Committee on Committees  
• Committee on Continuing and Community Education  
• Committee on Development  
• Committee on Diversity, Equity & Inclusion  
• Committee on Emeriti Affairs  
• Committee on Instruction and Technology  
• Committee on International Education  
• Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication  
• Committee on Teaching  
• Council on Planning & Budget  
• Council on Research  
• Faculty Research Lectureship  
• Faculty Welfare Committee  
• Graduate Council  
• Intercollegiate Athletics Committee  
C. Undergraduate Degree Awardees 2017-2018 |
| VII.  | Reports of Special Committees – NONE |

---

*Note: Items denoted with an “**” are included on the Consent Calendar.*
### VIII. 3:00-3:10
Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties:
A. Graduate Council – Willeke Wendrich, Chair
   Appendix V Proposal to Discontinue PhD Program in Cellular and Molecular Pathology

### IX. Petitions of Students – NONE

### X. Unfinished Business – NONE

### XI. 3:10-3:50
University and Faculty Welfare
Updates on UC and Campus Issues – Joseph Bristow, Chair, Academic Senate
- WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) Institutional Review
- Other Updates

### XII. 3:50-4:00
New Business

---

*Tim Malloy, Secretary – November 29, 2018*

Agenda items for the Legislative Assembly deemed non-controversial by the Chair, in consultation with the Secretary and the chairs of the committees concerned, may be placed on the Consent Calendar. Approval of all Consent Calendar items requires a single unanimous vote at the Assembly meeting; however, at the request of any Assembly member, any Consent Calendar item must be withdrawn and considered in its regular order on the agenda [from Bylaw 140(a)(2)].
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# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**MINUTES**

**JUNE 7, 2018**

**2:00 P.M. – 4:00 P.M.**

**CALIFORNIA ROOM**

**UCLA FACULTY CENTER**

---

**WITH A QUORUM PRESENT MEETING CALLED BY**

Sandra Graham, Academic Senate Chair at 2:06 p.m.

**TYPE OF MEETING**

Legislative Assembly

**GUESTS**

Chief Financial Officer – Steve Olsen, Vice Chancellor – Michael Levine, Chancellor Gene Block

---

## I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

**CHAIR GRAHAM**

- Approval of April 19, 2018 Minutes
  - Minutes approved as written.
- Approval of Consent Calendar
  - Approved

---

## II. WELCOME & BRIEF ANNOUNCEMENTS

**CHAIR GRAHAM**

- Welcome & Brief Announcement
  - Chair Graham announced the new members for Committee on Committees, Dinesh Chhertri (Surgery and Related), and Christopher Colwell (Neurology/Pscyh/Ophthal).
- Executive Board Voting Announcement
  - Chair Graham announced the in-meeting voting for Executive Board members. LgA members received ballots that were collected during the meeting.
- Chair Graham invited all members to attend the award recipient reception in the Rose Garden once the meeting concluded.

---

## III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR

- None

---

## IV. OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATION

**CFO STEVEN OLSEN**

- Presentation by Chief Financial Officer – Steve A. Olsen
  - Managing large needs with limited resources
  - UCLA currently has a strong balance sheet and maintain operations
  - Provided challenges for new CFO
    - Maintain UCLA as leading public research University
    - Manage Core Operating Budget while expanding student access and affordability
    - Continue Seismic Safety Program
    - Housing for faculty
Connecting UCLA to the Metro Purple Line Extension Project
- California’s Economy within the Global Market & Research/Technology
- Current political climate in California and potential impact on UCLA and higher education
- Possible Questions for future Governor and Lieutenant Gov.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

The following items were approved on the Consent Calendar:
1. 2018-19 Committee on Committees Slate
2. Proposed Bylaw Revisions
   a. Luskin School Proposed Changes to Faculty Executive Committee Bylaws
   b. Comparative Literature Department Bylaws
   c. Asian Languages and Cultures, Department Bylaws
   d. Anesthesiology Department Bylaws
   e. Epidemiology Department Bylaws
   f. OBGYN Department Bylaws
3. Global Jazz Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (IDP) – New Proposed Regulation & Proposed Bylaws
4. Proposed Changes to Bylaws of the Graduate Council (Appendix III)
5. Proposed Changes to Divisional Bylaw Appendix VI: Appeals, Part I. Graduate Disqualification and Appeals Procedures

VI. SPECIAL ORDERS

- 2018-19 Committee on Committees Slate was approved on the Consent Calendar

VII. REPORT ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Immediate Past Senate Chair Susan Cochran chaired the workgroup to identify necessary changes to Appendix XII, Faculty Code of Conduct Implementing Procedures, of the Academic Senate Manual. Professor Cochran presented the proposed revisions, providing background to the changes, including:
- UCOP’s request for revisions of Appendix XII
- UCLA Consultation Process – Working Group revisions and distribution to Academic Senate Committees and Executive Board Approval
The motion to approve the revisions to Appendix XII was seconded and passed with the results as follows:
- YES: 63
- NO: 3
- Abstain: 4

VIII. OTHER ANNOUNCEMENTS/PRESENTATION

Vice Chancellor Michael Levine presented on OPUS and Interfolio. VC mentioned there will be training and support for Faculty 180. Chair Graham thanked VC Levine and APO for the new program and their support for the faculty.
VC Levine discussed Faculty Salary Increases for the new year.
VC Levine stated that UCLA Retention Packages are competitive with other Colleges and Universities. Faculty asked if there are any issues regarding security and data breaches for Faculty 180. VC Levine said there are no issues and most information on Faculty 180 is public knowledge. APO is validating data in Opus and Faculty 180 and it requires that faculty sign off on information in file. Faculty files are protected and are read only.

IX. PETITION OF STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XI. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAHAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

  Updates on UC and Campus Issues – Senate Chair Sandra Graham

XII. NEW BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

XIII. ELECTION RESULTS ANNOUNCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIM MALLOY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

  Election Results Announcement
    o Senate Secretary Tim Malloy announced the results of the Executive Board ballot
      ▪ The following At-Large members were elected for two-year terms:
        • Jim Gober
        • Eleanor Kaufman
        • Andrew Leuchter
        • William Oppenheim

    The following at-large member was elected for a one-year term:
    • Beth Lazazzera

XIV. PRESENTATION OF AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANCELLOR BLOCK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

  Other Announcements and Presentation of Awards
  • Presentation and Gold Shield Award Announcement – Chancellor Gene Block
    o Daniel M.T. Fessler – Department of Anthropology
  • Senate Award Recipient Announcements – Senate Chair Sandra Graham
XV. REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Reports of Standing Committees and Faculties:

- Graduate Council Chair, Julio Vergara presented the proposal from the School of Law, for a Master of Legal Studies Graduate Degree Program
  - Establishes a New Self-Supporting Master of Legal Studies
  - Establishes a New Degree Designation
- After a brief presentation, voting ballots were collected. The results were reported as follows:
  - Yes: 59
  - No: 1
  - Abstain: 2

XVI. AWARD RECIPIENT RECEPTION

AWARD RECIPIENT RECEPTION IN ROSE GARDEN

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.
Committee on Committees: Additional Members for AY2018-19

To the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division

The Committee on Committees recommends confirmation of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate Council (GC) - 19 of 20</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, Timothy F.</td>
<td>OB GYN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF) - 6 of 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayala, Cesar</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charges Committee - 8 of 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastwood, Jo-Ann</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Continuing and Community Education (CCCE) - 7 of 8-10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atchison, Kathryn</td>
<td>Dentistry/Public Heath</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Development (CoD) - 7 of 7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardehali, Reza</td>
<td>Cardiology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanCour, Shawn</td>
<td>Information Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koretz, Brandon</td>
<td>Medicine-Geriatics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmerich, Michael</td>
<td>Asian Languages and Cultures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz, Steven</td>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) - 8 of 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirano, Katsuya</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship (FRL) - 7 of 7-10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubois, Ellen</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houk, Kendall</td>
<td>Chemistry and Biochemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grievance Advisory Committee (GAC) - 5 of 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Christopher</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonacich, Phillip</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) - 9 of 9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiss, Richard</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamshidi, Neema</td>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) - 13 of 16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, Ted</td>
<td>History/Statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Committee on Committees recommends confirmation of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groeling, Tim</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson, Deborah</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenberg, Evelyn</td>
<td>Public Affairs/Urban Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upton, Elizabeth</td>
<td>Musicology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Timothy</td>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Nalo</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radu, Roxana</td>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshi, Shantanu</td>
<td>Neurology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayman, Steven</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell, David</td>
<td>Microbiology, Immunology and Mol. Gen.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araiza, J. Ed</td>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posner, Miriam</td>
<td>Information Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington, Kenya</td>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appel, Hannah</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillespie, Thomas</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, Margaret</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

2018-19 Committee on Committees:

- Nicholas Brecha, Chair - Neurobiology
- Vickie Mays, Vice Chair - Psychology
- Dinesh Chhertri - Head and Neck Surgery
- Christopher Colwell - Psychiatry & Biobehav. Sciences / Semel Institute
- Frank Heuser - Arts & Architecture
- Yeumin “Christine” Hong - Dentistry
- Subramanian Iyer - Electrical Engineering
- Ioanna Kakoulli - Materials Science and Engineering
- Leah Lievrouw - Information Studies
The Committee on Committees recommends confirmation of the following:

Jennifer Long  
Head and Neck Surgery

Susanne B. Nicholas  
Department of Medicine

Ann Raldow  
Radiation Oncology

Beate Ritz  
Epidemiology

Renea Michelle Sturm  
Department of Urology

Robert Zeithammer  
Management/Economics

Submitted November 02, 2018
September 4, 2018

To: Catherine Clarke, Chair
Chemistry and Biochemistry

From: Linda Bourque, 2017-18 Chair
Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Proposal to Amend Bylaws of Chemistry and Biochemistry

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the proposed amendments to the Bylaws of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry voted on by department faculty in ballots that closed on March 21 and June 5, 2018 and submitted to Rules & Jurisdiction on July 16, 2018. The R&J Committee finds the amendments consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate. The bylaws will be submitted to the Executive Board for inclusion on the next Legislative Assembly agenda.

cc: Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Chris Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Yayoi Robinson, Academic Personnel Coordinator
Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
Marian M. Olivas, R&J Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
September 6, 2018

To: Academic Senate Executive Board

From: Linda Bourque, 2017-18 Chair
Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Chemistry & Biochemistry department bylaw revisions submitted on July 16, 2018

The Rules & Jurisdiction submits these proposed revisions of the Chemistry & Biochemistry department to the Executive Board for inclusion on the Consent Calendar of the next Legislative Assembly.

cc: Chris Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Joseph Bristow, Chair, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
July 16, 2018

Linda Bourque
Chair, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Dear Professor Bourque:

The Senate Faculty of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry met on Tuesday, March 6th, 2018 to discuss several proposed amendments to the Department Bylaws. The first two Department Bylaws amendments listed below are in response to advice from the College Dean’s Office following a grievance (Proposed amendments to II. Personnel Actions, section 1; and to V. Merit Actions – Non-senate positions, section 3 and 4). The third and fourth amendments were initiated by our Senate Faculty. The first, second and third amendments were approved by our faculty with a majority vote by secret ballot that closed on March 21, 2018. The fourth amendment required further discussion and our faculty approved it with a majority vote by secret ballot that closed on June 5, 2018. Below is a summary of the four amendments to the Department Bylaws.

1. Regarding edits to II. Personnel Actions, section 1, we are no longer allowed to be informed of exact date of peer review for classroom observation, and we are adding the recommended language in the proposed amendment: “When Senate and non-senate faculty are scheduled for a classroom observation, they should be notified of the quarter and not the specific day and time of the visit.”

2. Regarding edits to V. Merit Actions – Non-senate positions, section 3 and 4, New section 3, “For Unit 18 Lecturer academic personnel actions, the elected staffing committee must convene a meeting with the Department Chair present, discuss the case, and conclude with a vote.”

Former section 3 moved to section 4 with changes underlined and in bold, “The Department Chairman must report the vote of the divisional or search committee in recommending non-tenured appointments and the vote of the elected staffing committee in recommending (or rejecting) merit increases in his/her Chair’s letter. The chairman will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.”
3. Senate Faculty members at the meeting also asked that “Chairman” be changed to “Chair” (deleting “man” from “chairman”) throughout the Department Bylaws. There were no objections to this and the faculty decided to add this amendment to the bylaws.

4. A fourth proposed amendment to add “Search Committee Policies for Internal Candidates and Close Collaborators” to the Department Bylaws II. Personnel Actions, Section 3, New Departmental Appointments to Positions that Confer Membership in the Academic Senate. This proposed amendment addresses the Department’s Search Committee Policies for Internal Candidates and Close Collaborators for new departmental appointments to positions that confer membership in the academic senate. Please see attached document.

The attached document lists the amendments to our bylaws in the required template. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Yayoi Robinson by email at ysroth@chem.ucla.edu or phone at 310-983-3504.

Sincerely,

Catherine F. Clarke
Professor and Chair
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

Enclosure
Recommended Changes to Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Bylaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointments and Advances Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry</strong></td>
<td><strong>Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointments and Advances Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Senate Faculty on 4/29/16 in a secret ballot by a 2/3 majority: 29 yes; 3 no; 0 abstain; 22 not voting.</td>
<td>Approved by Senate Faculty on 4/29/16 in a secret ballot by a 2/3 majority: 29 yes; 3 no; 0 abstain; 22 not voting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Department Organization**
   1. The department Senate members are regular line Senate Faculty (Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors). Academic Senate faculty, including recalled Emeriti, will vote on non-personnel substantial departmental questions. Emeriti will be included in discussions of non-personnel substantial departmental questions, but will not participate in voting.
   2. Any Academic Senate faculty member can request a vote on an issue.
   3. The chief Departmental administrative officer is the Chair. The Chair receives assistance and advice from the Standing Committees of the Department, any Ad hoc Committees that may be appointed from time to time, and from the Faculty as a whole. The chairman of the department is granted decision making power in the day to day operations of the department.

2. **Personnel Actions**
   Personnel voting will include faculty with split appointments and faculty with joint appointments without a waiver option.
   1. The chairman will generally initiate action in advancement, promotion and appointment cases, but others may do so as well. The chairman retains the right to

[“Chairman” changed to “Chair” throughout bylaws by a secret ballot vote, March 21, 2018 of 40 aye, 0 nay and 0 abstentions]
express his or her own views to the Administration regardless of the departmental recommendation as determined by the method discussed below. All extramural correspondence with regard to extramural evaluation letters that involve advancements, promotions and appointments must be addressed to the chairman who will distribute to the appropriate committees or other department members.

2. Allocation of Positions

The allocation of positions among divisions is to be made by the chairman on the basis of departmental consensus. Any faculty member can call for departmental discussion and vote on this issue.

3. New Departmental Appointments to Positions that Confer Membership in the Academic Senate

It is the responsibility of the tenured departmental faculty in an area to make recommendations to the Department regarding new faculty appointments to tenured and non-tenured positions in that area. All departmental ladder faculty will be given an opportunity to review the file and comment on the appointment. A meeting will be held to discuss the case for appointment. Ladder faculty will then be asked to vote on the appointment. Full and Associate Professors have extended the right to vote on all new departmental appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate to Assistant Professors. [April 25, 2016 by a secret mail ballot vote of 28 aye, 5 nay and 0 abstentions]

1. The chairman Chair will generally initiate action in advancement, promotion and appointment cases, but others may do so as well. The chairman Chair retains the right to express his or her own views to the Administration regardless of the departmental recommendation as determined by the method discussed below. All extramural correspondence with regard to extramural evaluation letters that involve advancements, promotions and appointments must be addressed to the chairman Chair who will distribute to the appropriate committees or other department members. When senate and non-senate faculty are scheduled for a classroom observation, they should be notified of the quarter and not the specific day and time of the visit. [March 21, 2018 by a secret ballot vote of 40 aye, 1 nay and 1 abstention]

2. Allocation of Positions

The allocation of positions among divisions is to be made by the chairman Chair on the basis of departmental consensus. Any faculty member can call for departmental discussion and vote on this issue.

3. New Departmental Appointments to Positions that Confer Membership in the Academic Senate

It is the responsibility of the tenured departmental faculty in an area to make recommendations to the Department regarding new faculty appointments to tenured and non-tenured positions in that area. All departmental ladder faculty will be given an opportunity to review the file and comment on the appointment. A meeting will be held to discuss the
4. **Non-Reappointments:**

   a) An ad-hoc committee consisting of tenured members of the candidate’s division, and, in some cases, a few additional members appointed by the chairman will pre-review the personnel case of the candidate. The ad-hoc committee will report in writing to the chairman and the enfranchised faculty. The Chair will then call a meeting of the entire tenured faculty to discuss the issue.

   b) The tenured faculty will vote by secret ballot and a majority vote will represent the departmental recommendation, although the chairman may include his own recommendation. The chairman may refer to the matter back to the faculty for reconsideration, but he must report the results of all official votes to the Administration. The chairman will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

III. Promotions

To Associate Professor

   a) An ad-hoc committee consisting of tenured members of the candidate’s division, and, in some cases, a few additional members appointed by the chairman will pre-review the personnel case of the candidate. The ad-hoc committee will report in writing to the chairman and the enfranchised faculty. The Chair will then call a meeting of the entire tenured faculty to discuss the personnel case.

   b) The tenured faculty will vote by secret ballot and a majority vote will represent the departmental recommendation, although the chairman may include his own recommendation. The chairman may
refer the matter back to the faculty for reconsideration, but he must report the results of all official votes to the Administration. The chairman will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

To Full Professor

The same process is followed as with promotion to Associate Professor but only Full Professors participate in the ad hoc committee and in the full faculty vote.

IV. Merit Actions – Senate Faculty

1. All Faculty regular, accelerated, and hurdle merits except the 4th year appraisal of Assistant Professors have been delegated to the Elected Staffing Committee. [April 25, 2016 by a secret ballot. Fulls: 23 yes, 3 no, 2 abstain; Associate Professors, 2 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain; Assistant Professors, 4 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.]

2. Candidates for the Elected Staffing Committee will be at least four ladder faculty members willing to serve who are each nominated by at least three ladder faculty members. Election to the committee will be by secret ballot of the ladder faculty. Each faculty member may vote for two candidates, and any candidate receiving at least 20% of the votes will be elected. If less than two candidates receive 20% of the votes, a runoff election among the top three candidates will be held. The committee must consist of at least four members and elections must be held at least every three years. The chairman must report the vote of the divisional or search committee in and the vote of the elected staffing committee in recommending (or rejecting) merit increases.

concerning the search for the period of time during which the candidate is under consideration. They may provide comment if specifically asked by the department to do so. They should also refrain from having unsolicited informal conversations with colleagues about the candidate.

3) Search reports and cases for appointment should include a statement describing the unit’s implementation of these guidelines when they are relevant. [June 5, 2018 by a secret ballot vote of 25 aye, 7 nay and 0 abstentions]

4. Non-Reappointments:

a) An ad-hoc committee consisting of tenured members of the candidate’s division, and, in some cases, a few additional members appointed by the chairman Chair will pre-review the personnel case of the candidate. The ad-hoc committee will report in writing to the chairman Chair and the enfranchised faculty. The Chair will then call a meeting of the entire tenured faculty to discuss the issue.

b) The tenured faculty will vote by secret ballot and a majority vote will represent the departmental recommendation, although the chairman Chair may include his/her own recommendation. The chairman Chair may refer to the matter back to the faculty for reconsideration, but s/he must report the results of all official votes to the Administration. The chairman Chair will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

III. Promotions

To Associate Professor
3. The Elected Committee will consult widely and wisely, particularly within the candidates’ division, but where relevant, outside the division as well. The Elected Committee will make recommendations to the chairman and the chairman will make recommendations to the Chancellor.

4. Merit increases to Step VI and Initial Above-Scale. The Chair will appoint an appropriate advisory committee. This committee will consult with faculty members within the candidate’s division, and, when appropriate, outside the division before making its report. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the committee to consult informally with people outside the department who are especially knowledgeable in the candidate’s area. The Elected Staffing Committee reviews the personnel case and votes on merit increases to Step VI and Initial Above Scale.

5. 4th Year Appraisals

a) An ad-hoc committee consisting of tenured members of the candidate’s division, and, in some cases, a few additional members appointed by the chairman will pre-review the personnel case of the candidate. The ad-hoc committee will report in writing to the chairman who will then call a meeting of the entire tenured faculty to discuss the personnel case.

b) The tenured faculty will vote by secret ballot and a majority vote will represent the departmental recommendation, although the chairman may include his/her own recommendation. The chairman may refer the matter back to the faculty for reconsideration, but must report the results of all official votes to the Administration. The chairman will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

To Full Professor

The same process is followed as with promotion to Associate Professor but only Full Professors participate in the ad hoc committee and in the full faculty vote.

IV. Merit Actions – Senate Faculty

1. All Faculty regular, accelerated, and hurdle merits except the 4th year appraisal of Assistant Professors have been delegated to the Elected Staffing Committee. [April 25, 2016 by a secret ballot. Fulls: 23 yes, 3 no, 1 abstain; Associate Professors, 2 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain; Assistant Professors, 4 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.]

2. Candidates for the Elected Staffing Committee will be at least four ladder faculty members willing to serve who are each nominated by at least three ladder
V. Merit Actions – Non-Senate positions

1. The Elected Committee will consult widely and wisely, particularly within the candidates’ division, but where relevant, outside the division as well. Non-ladder appointments should be recommended to the Elected Committee by the division or appropriate search committee involved. (The search committee appointed by the chairman will normally consist of the divisional members and in some cases a few faculty members from other divisions.)

2. The Elected Committee will make recommendations to the chairman and the chairman will make recommendations to the Chancellor. If differences of opinion exist between the chairman, the elected committee and divisional or staffing committee in cases of non-ladder appointments, and if these differences cannot be resolved, then the issue will be referred to the tenured faculty. The chairman may at his discretion refer an issue back to a committee for further discussion and a new vote, or he may bring the issue up before the tenured faculty as a whole.

3. The chairman must report the vote of the divisional or search committee in recommending non-tenured appointments and the vote of the elected staffing committee in recommending (or rejecting) merit increases. The chairman will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

VI. Appeal

3. The Elected Committee will consult widely and wisely, particularly within the candidates’ division, but where relevant, outside the division as well. The Elected Committee will make recommendations to the chairman and the chairman will make recommendations to the Chancellor.

4. Merit increases to Step VI and Initial Above-Scale. The Chair will appoint an appropriate advisory committee. This committee will consult with faculty members within the candidate’s division, and, when appropriate, outside the division before making its report. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the committee to consult informally with people outside the department who are especially knowledgeable in the candidate’s area. The Elected Staffing Committee reviews the personnel case and votes on merit increases to Step VI and Initial Above Scale.

5. 4th Year Appraisals

a) An ad-hoc committee consisting of tenured members of the candidate’s
1. Any faculty member who is unhappy with a proposed action on his academic status may appeal to the Elected Staffing Committee. Furthermore, any three ladder faculty members may appeal for another faculty member.

2. An attempt to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement will be made. If this cannot be done, merit increases at the assistant professor level will be referred to the entire tenured faculty and those at the associate and full professor level to the full professors, and the case will then be handled in the same manner as promotions.

3. The Appeal System should be made simple and no one should be discouraged from using the system.

Adopted 3/31/82
(retyped 2/25/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)

Revisions to Original Department Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointments and Advances

The election procedures of the Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointments and Advances were revised on October 19, 1990 by a secret mail ballot vote of 40 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions, as follows:

Candidates for this committee will be at least three ladder faculty members willing to serve who are each nominated by at least three ladder faculty members. Election to the committee will be by secret ballot of the ladder faculty. Each faculty member may vote for two candidates, and the committee will consist of the four candidates from different divisions who had the highest vote division, and, in some cases, a few additional members appointed by the chairman Chair will pre-review the personnel case of the candidate. The ad-hoc committee will report in writing to the chairman Chair who will then call a meeting of the entire tenured faculty to discuss the personnel case.

b) The tenured faculty will vote by secret ballot and a majority vote will represent the departmental recommendation, although the chairman Chair may include his/her own recommendation. The chairman Chair may refer the matter back to the faculty for reconsideration, but s/he must report the results of all official votes to the Administration. The chairman Chair will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

V. Merit Actions – Non-Senate positions

1. The Elected Committee will consult widely and wisely, particularly within the candidates’ division, but where relevant, outside the division as well. Non-ladder appointments should be recommended to the Elected Committee by the division or appropriate search committee involved. (The search committee appointed by the chairman Chair will normally consist of the divisional members and in some cases a few faculty members from other divisions.)

2. The Elected Committee will make recommendations to the chairman Chair and the chairman Chair will make recommendations to the Chancellor. If differences of opinion exist between the chairman Chair, the elected committee and divisional or staffing committee in cases of non-ladder appointments, and if these differences cannot be resolved, then the issue will be referred to the tenured faculty. The chairman Chair may at his
totals among those nominated from their divisions, and also any additional faculty who received more than 20% of the votes cast. The Chair will be an ex-officio member of the committee. Elections must be held at least every three years.

Adopted 10/19/90
(retyped 11/9/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)

The election procedures of the Department Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointment and Advances were revised on December 20, 1993 by a secret mail ballot vote of 23 aye, 6 nay and 0 abstentions, as follows:

Assistant Professors who are members of the Faculty Senate will have the right to vote on all new departmental appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate.

Adopted December 20, 1993
(retyped 11/9/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)
Revote and Adopted April 25, 2016

The membership of the Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotion, Appointments and Advances was revised on October 7, 1997 by a unanimous vote at a faculty meeting as follows:

Elected members of the Staffing Committee who take a sabbatical leave during their three year tenure will be replaced during their absence by the previous divisional representative on the Staffing Committee.

Adopted October 7, 1997
(retyped 11/9/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)

The membership of the Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotion, discretion refer an issue back to a committee for further discussion and a new vote, or he may bring the issue up before the tenured faculty as a whole.

3. The chairman must report the vote of the divisional or search committee in recommending non-tenured appointments and the vote of the elected staffing committee in recommending (or rejecting) merit increases. The chairman will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

For Unit 18 Lecturer academic personnel actions, the elected staffing committee must convene a meeting with the Department Chair present, discuss the case, and conclude with a vote.

[March 21, 2018 by a secret ballot vote of 38 aye, 2 nay and 1 abstention]

4. The Department chairman Chair must report the vote of the divisional or search committee in recommending non-tenured appointments and the vote of the elected staffing committee in recommending (or rejecting) merit increases in his/her Chair’s letter. The chairman Chair will also report the views of a specific faculty member if requested.

[March 21, 2018 by a secret ballot vote of 38 aye, 2 nay and 1 abstention]

VI. Appeal

1. Any faculty member who is unhappy with a proposed action on his academic status may appeal to the Elected Staffing Committee. Furthermore, any three ladder faculty members may appeal for another faculty member.

2. An attempt to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement will be made. If this cannot be done, merit increases at the assistant professor level will be referred
Appointments and Advances was revised on April 25, 2016 by a secret mail ballot vote of Fulls: 23 yes, 3 no, 2 abstain; Associate Professors, 2 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain; Assistant Professors, 4 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.:

All Faculty regular, accelerated, and hurdle merits except the 4th year appraisal of Assistant Professors have been delegated to the Elected Staffing Committee.

Adopted May 2, 2016

---

Revisions to Original Department Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointments and Advances

The election procedures of the Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointments and Advances were revised on October 19, 1990 by a secret mail ballot vote of 40 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions, as follows:

Candidates for this committee will be at least three ladder faculty members willing to serve who are each nominated by at least three ladder faculty members. Election to the committee will be by secret ballot of the ladder faculty. Each faculty member may vote for two candidates, and the committee will consist of the four candidates from different divisions who had the highest vote totals among those nominated from their divisions, and also any additional faculty who received more than 20% of the votes cast. The Chair will be an ex-officio member of the committee. Elections must be held at least every three years.

Adopted 10/19/90
(retyped 11/9/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)
The election procedures of the Department Procedures for Academic Promotions, Appointment and Advances were revised on December 20, 1993 by a secret mail ballot vote of 23 aye, 6 nay and 0 abstentions, as follows:

Assistant Professors who are members of the Faculty Senate will have the right to vote on all new departmental appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate.

Adopted December 20, 1993
(retyped 11/9/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)
Revote and Adopted April 25, 2016

The membership of the Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotion, Appointments and Advances was revised on October 7, 1997 by a unanimous vote at a faculty meeting as follows:

Elected members of the Staffing Committee who take a sabbatical leave during their three year tenure will be replaced during their absence by the previous divisional representative on the Staffing Committee.

Adopted October 7, 1997
(retyped 11/9/99)
(retyped 5/8/2015)

The membership of the Departmental Procedures for Academic Promotion, Appointments and Advances was revised on April 25, 2016 by a secret mail ballot vote of

Fulls: 23 yes, 3 no, 2 abstain; Associate Professors, 2 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain; Assistant Professors, 4 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.]

All Faculty regular, accelerated, and hurdle merits except the 4th year appraisal of Assistant Professors have been delegated to the Elected Staffing Committee.
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Chemistry & Biochemistry Department Bylaws (No URL Specified)
May 24, 2018

To: Ronald Busuttil, Chair
   Surgery

From: Linda Bourque, Chair
   Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Re: Surgery Department Bylaws Submitted on May 9, 2018

Rules & Jurisdiction has reviewed the Surgery bylaws submitted on May 9, 2018. Thank you for incorporating the suggestions in the Rules & Jurisdiction letters of November 1, 2017 and May 7, 2018. R&J finds the bylaws consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate. This letter along with the proposed revisions will be sent to the Executive Board for review and placement on the Legislative Assembly Consent Calendar.

cc: Vera Moubayed, Staff and Academic Personnel Director
    Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Christoph Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Linda Mohr, Executive Director/CAO, Academic Senate
    Marian Olivas, Committee Analyst, Rules & Jurisdiction
May 25, 2018

To: Academic Senate Executive Board

From: Linda Bourque, Chair
       Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Surgery Department Bylaws Submitted on May 9, 2018

The Rules & Jurisdiction submits proposed revisions to the Department of Surgery Bylaws to the Executive Board for inclusion on the Consent Calendar of the next Legislative Assembly.

cc: Linda Bourque, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction Chair
    Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Sandra Graham, Chair, Academic Senate
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY
BYLAWS

Approved June 21, 2016 by a 2/3 secret majority ballot of Senate Faculty:

31 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain
ARTICLE I - NAME

The Department of Surgery, David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California, Los Angeles.

ARTICLE II - MISSION

To advance the knowledge of surgical science within an environment that provides optimal postgraduate medical education, fosters creative excellence in research, and maintains the highest quality of patient care.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERS

A. Faculty

Faculty shall include members who are salaried at UCLA Center for the Health Sciences (CHS), Santa Monica-UCLA Medical Center or at one of the UCLA-affiliated institutions in both Academic Senate and non-Senate titles, as listed below.

1. Academic Senate Faculty Titles:
   a. Regular Rank Professor Series
   b. In-Residence Professor Series
   c. Professor of Clinical X Series

2. Non-Senate Faculty Titles:
   a. Adjunct Professor Series
   b. Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series
   c. Visiting Professor Series

B. Volunteer Clinical Professor Series

Individuals who are community physicians and non-salaried by the University or one of the affiliated institutions may be appointed to the Volunteer Clinical Professor series. Initial appointments shall be made for a maximum of three years. Volunteer Clinical Professor appointees must fulfill defined teaching activities on an annual basis in order to remain members. Each Division shall be responsible for setting standards for teaching requirements, expectations for participation in educational activities of the division, and other privileges of the appointment which may include, but are not limited to: use of the UCLA name, use of faculty title, or advertisement of UCLA affiliation. Volunteer Clinical Professor participation is reviewed at least every five (5) years to ensure compliance with Volunteer Clinical Professor Guidelines as stated in divisional policy. Each Division shall designate a review process for appointment and reappointment in the Volunteer Clinical Professor series, and the results of these reviews shall be reported to the Chair’s Office and, subsequently, to the Dean’s Office.

C. Professional Research Series

Individuals who are engaged in independent research equivalent to that required for the Professor series may be appointed in the Professional Research series. Professional Researchers may serve full-time, part-time, or without salary status provided they meet the criteria for appointment in the series.

D. Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action

The Department of Surgery is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability, age or protected veteran status. (For the complete University of California nondiscrimination and affirmative action policy see: UC Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy.)
ARTICLE IV - DIVISIONS AND SECTIONS

The Department of Surgery shall be comprised of separate divisions representing distinct surgical subspecialties. The Department Chair, in consultation with the Surgery Division Chiefs and Dean of the David Geffen School of Medicine, may at his/her discretion create additional, merge, or eliminate divisions contingent upon programmatic or financial justification. The following Divisions shall be recognized as designated academic divisions:

- Cardiac Surgery
- General Surgery
- Liver and Pancreas Transplantation
- Pediatric Surgery
- Plastic Surgery
- Surgical Oncology
- Thoracic Surgery
- Vascular Surgery

All faculty and those in the Volunteer Clinical Professor series shall be appointed within a division. In addition, there shall be certain administrative programs or units (APUs) established as separate financial centers, including the Chairman’s Office. All staff shall be employed within a division or unit.

ARTICLE V - OFFICERS

A. The Department Chair shall be the executive officer of the Department, responsible to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Vice Chancellor, UCLA Health Sciences, and Dean, David Geffen School of Medicine for the effective operation of the Department’s programs, financial management, and for compliance with University policies and goals.

B. The Chair may propose the appointment of an Executive Vice Chair who would assist the Chair in determining departmental policy, represent the Department in lieu of the Chair at various School-wide and University committees, and shall serve as Chair in the event the Chair is out of town, on vacation, or temporarily unable to carry out his duties as Chair.

C. Vice Chairs with designated responsibilities within the Department may be appointed by the Chair with the approval of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and Dean, David Geffen School of Medicine. The Chiefs of Surgery at West Los Angeles Veterans Administration Medical Center, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Olive View-UCLA Medical Center, and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center shall be designated as Vice Chairs of the Department of Surgery upon proposal by the Chair.

ARTICLE VI - DIVISION CHIEFS

Division Chiefs are appointed and serve at the discretion of the Department Chair. Their appointment is administrative rather than academic in nature, and therefore may be extended or terminated, provided there is programmatic justification to do so. Division Chiefs shall be reviewed at least every five (5) years by a peer review body of surgeons.

ARTICLE VII - POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION

The faculty shall have the overall responsibility for the selection and training of all house staff appointed by the Department of Surgery. The training experience shall ensure an optimal provision of education to residents and medical care to patients, consistent with the general and specific requirements of the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education. Requests for assignment of house staff positions by the various institutions affiliated
with the Department shall be considered by the appropriate reviewing bodies within the Department. The Vice Chair for Surgical Education shall be responsible for overseeing the curricula and policies of the postgraduate educational programs. This position shall be appointed by the Chair and report directly to the Chair for all educational matters.

ARTICLE VIII - MEETINGS

The Department Chair shall convene meetings of the full-time faculty annually, or as s/he deems necessary. The Chair shall set agenda for the meetings in advance and notify the full-time faculty. Upon individual request, voluntary faculty may be permitted to attend general meetings, but the Chair shall reserve the right to deny their attendance. All meetings and committees conducted by the Department will utilize appropriate and customary parliamentary procedures for order.

ARTICLE IX - STANDING COMMITTEES

The Chair shall appoint standing and ad hoc committees as appropriate. The Department shall maintain the following standing committees:

A. Surgical Chiefs
   The Surgical Chiefs Meeting shall be attended by the Surgery Department Chair, Executive Vice Chair of Surgery, Vice Chair for Surgical Education, Chief of each Surgical Division or his/her designee, and the Executive Administrator of the Department. Other guests may be invited as appropriate on a periodic basis. The Surgical Chiefs shall approve all appointments and reappointments to the UCLA Medical Staff, discuss policies on intra- and interdepartmental issues, and provide leadership in strategic planning efforts. The Surgical Chiefs, in conjunction with the Chair, shall have general responsibility for the development, implementation, and enforcement of the administrative, academic, and patient care policies of the Department of Surgery.

B. Academic Senate
   The Department of Surgery shall elect representatives to the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate for three-year terms. A ballot shall be mailed to the Academic Senate members of the Department. Results of the election ballot will be tallied by the Chair’s Office and forwarded to the Campus Academic Senate Office.

C. Appointments and Promotions (“A & P”) Committee
   This is a joint committee of Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor ranks in the participating surgical Departments (e.g., Neurosurgery, Orthopaedic Surgery, Surgery and Urology), appointed by the Department Chairs in consultation with the respective Department faculty. This Committee shall meet as required for the purpose of pre-reviewing and providing advisory recommendations regarding all dossiers proposed for appointment, promotion, termination of appointment, change in series, merit increase, fourth-year appraisals, five-year academic reviews, or other required academic review processes. The Committee shall forward their advisory vote and recommendations to the respective home Department Committees on Academic Personnel. A summary of the A & P Committee advisory vote and recommendation shall be maintained in the Surgery Academic Personnel office.

D. Department of Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel
   The Department of Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel (“SurgCAP”) is charged with discussion and reviewing the A & P advisory recommendation of Department of Surgery academic personnel actions, and forwarding the final recommendation to the Senate faculty. This elected Committee shall be composed of Department of Surgery Academic Senate faculty at the rank of Associate and above. The
Committee shall meet as required to discuss and provide an advisory vote on all academic actions received from the A & P Committee. The SurgCAP vote shall be performed by confidential ballot and one more than 50% of the total members shall constitute a quorum. The results shall then be tallied and forwarded as an advisory vote to the voting Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor ranks for their formal Senate vote on these actions.

E. **Education Committee**
   The Education Committee shall be responsible for facilitating the development and implementation of curricula for the training programs (medical student clerkships, residencies, and fellowships), recommending policy, adjudicating coverage and resource allocation issues, and ensuring compliance with Residency Review Committee (RRC) regulations (i.e., “Milestones”). The Committee is comprised of the Department Chair, Vice Chair for Surgical Education, Program Directors, Medical Student Clerkship Director, the Administrative Director of the Education Office (or their designated representatives), and will be chaired by the Vice Chair for Surgical Education. The committee shall meet at least twice per year, but subcommittees may be convened on a more frequent basis, as specific aspects of the educational program require.

F. **Quality Improvement Committees**
   Each Division shall have the responsibility for developing a QI plan to be presented to the Chair and the Chief Quality Officer for approval. Divisional faculty shall either participate in the General Surgery Morbidity and Mortality conferences, or maintain an independent M&M process. The departmental Chief Quality Officer shall represent the Department in the appropriate Enterprise QI process, for the purpose for assuring compliance with JCAHO regulations and state licensing regulations, and assuring consistency of QA/QI policies with Enterprise standards.

G. **Space Allocation Committee**
   This Committee shall develop strategic direction, in concert with the Department Chair, with respect to allocation of research space. The Vice Chair for Research shall Chair this body. This Committee shall meet at least once annually in order to review the space plan for the Department, as well as to review and prioritize any requests for new or additional space, and provide recommendations on retention of existing research space by investigators.

**ARTICLE X - VOTING PRIVILEGES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE FACULTY ACTIONS**

A. **Non-Personnel, Substantial Departmental Questions**
   Academic Senate members, including recalled Emeriti, shall have the right to vote on non-personnel substantial departmental questions.

B. **Personnel Actions of both Senate and non-Senate Faculty**
   1. **Extension of Voting Privileges:**
      a. The right to vote on personnel actions has been extended to In-Residence and Clinical X Professors by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on 3/2/2016 of Tenured Full Professors (9 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain) and of Tenured Associate Professors (3 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain). These series will vote according to the privileges of their rank (Full, Associate, and Assistant).

      b. **Emeriti**
         Emeriti retain membership in the Department, but do not have the right to vote on substantial departmental matters or on personnel actions. Emeriti of the Department of Surgery who are recalled to service in the Department regain voting rights on substantial departmental matters and personnel actions during the period of such service.
The right to vote on personnel actions has been extended to recalled Emeriti by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on April 11, 2017 of Tenured Full and Associate Professors (7 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain). Once recalled to the Department, Emeriti may vote according to the privileges of their rank during their period of service.

2. **Appointments to the Academic Senate**
   Full and Associate Professors vote on all appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate and on all Senate joint and split appointments to the Department.

3. **Promotions and Merits**
   a. **Promotion to Full Professor and Full Professor merits:**
      Full and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all promotions to Full Professor and all Full Professor merits.  
      *Extended to Associate Professors by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on 3/2/2016 of Tenured Full Professors, 8 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain.*
   
   b. **Promotion to Associate Professor and Associate Professor merits:**
      Full and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all promotions to Associate Professor and all Associate Professor merits.

   c. **Assistant Professor merits, fourth-year appraisals, and non-reappointment:**
      Full and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all Assistant Professor merits, including fourth-year appraisals and non-reappointments.

4. **Five Year Reviews**
   Five-year reviews will be conducted according to the procedures described in the CALL, Appendix 12. Faculty review (and vote, if needed) will be taken according to the same ranks that vote on other actions.

5. **Non-Senate Faculty**
   Non-Senate faculty with 100% employment in the Department may be requested to provide a separate, advisory vote on non-Senate faculty personnel actions or on substantial departmental questions.  
   *Approved by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on 7/1/2016 of Academic Senate faculty, 24 yes, 6 no, 0 abstain.* (At this time the Department has not extended to non-Senate faculty the right to an advisory vote on Senate personnel actions.)

6. **Volunteer Clinical Professors**
   Those in the Volunteer Clinical Professor may not vote on substantial Department questions or on personnel actions.

   Appointments and promotions in the Volunteer Clinical Professor series require, at minimum, a division review of the programmatic need for such actions. Appointment to this series shall not be automatic upon either departure from the full-time faculty or graduation from a University of California residency or fellowship training program.

   a. Volunteer Clinical Professor appointments at the Assistant Professor rank shall require a vote of the division Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor rank in all series, as well as a vote of the Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel Committee.

   b. Volunteer Clinical Professor appointments and promotions at the Associate and Full Professor ranks shall require a division vote, a vote of the Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel, and a final vote of the Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor rank in all series entitled to vote as outlined in Article X of these Bylaws.
7. **Professional Researchers**

Appointees in the Professional Research series may not vote on substantial Department questions or on personnel actions.

Appointments and promotions for appointees in the Professional Research Series are reviewed and voted upon consistent with the voting procedures as outlined in Article XI.

**ARTICLE XI - VOTING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS**

A. Review, discussion and advisory vote by the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

B. Review, discussion and advisory vote by the Department of Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel. This vote shall be recorded in the candidate’s dossier and forwarded to the voting Academic Senate faculty.

C. Formal vote by the departmental Academic Senate faculty entitled to vote on that personnel action. (See Article X.) This vote shall be performed by confidential ballot.

**ARTICLE XII - APPOINTMENTS TO SCHOOL, MEDICAL CENTER, AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES**

The Department Chair shall sit on standing and ad hoc committees in the Medical School, UCLA Hospital System, UCLA Health System, and the University Campus. In his absence, the Executive Vice Chair or other designee shall represent him. The Department Chair may also propose that members of the Department of Surgery represent the Department on appropriate committees.

**ARTICLE XIII - AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS**

The Department Bylaws may be amended at any time by a 2/3 majority vote of a quorum of all Academic Senate faculty in all series of the Department of Surgery. The proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing and circulated to the entire Academic Senate faculty prior to the vote being taken.

Minor amendments to language in the Bylaws that reflect changes in University nomenclature or procedure and do not impact the prerogatives of the faculty may be enacted by the Chair.

A. The Department of Surgery Health Sciences Compensation Plan Bylaws may be amended at any time by a majority vote of a quorum of the faculty participating in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, with approval by the Department Chair and Dean. Affected Plan participants shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed revisions to these Bylaws prior to a vote being taken. (For additional information regarding these policies, see the Department of Surgery Health Sciences Compensation Plan Bylaws.)
David Geffen School of Medicine
at UCLA

DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY
BYLAWS

Approved June 21, 2016 by a 2/3 secret majority ballot of Senate Faculty:

31 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain
ARTICLE I - NAME

The Department of Surgery, David Geffen School of Medicine at the University of California, Los Angeles.

ARTICLE II - MISSION

To advance the knowledge of surgical science within an environment that provides optimal postgraduate medical education, fosters creative excellence in research, and maintains the highest quality of patient care.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERS

A. Full-Time Faculty

Full-time faculty shall include members who are salaried at UCLA Center for the Health Sciences (CHS), Santa Monica-UCLA Medical Center or at one of the UCLA-affiliated institutions in both Academic Senate and non-Senate titles, as listed below.

1. Academic Senate Faculty Titles:
   a. Regular (19900, Ladder) Series
   b. In-Residence Series
   c. Professor of Clinical X

2. Non-Senate Faculty Titles:
   a. Adjunct Series
   b. Health Sciences Clinical (Compensated) Series
   c. Researcher Series
   d. Visiting Professor

B. Voluntary Faculty

Individuals who are community physicians and non-salaried by the University or one of the affiliated institutions may be appointed to the Voluntary Faculty. Initial appointments shall be made for a maximum of three years. Voluntary Faculty must fulfill defined teaching activities on an annual basis in order to remain members. Each Division shall be responsible for setting standards for teaching requirements, expectations for participation in educational activities of the division, and other privileges of the appointment which may include, but are not limited to: use of the UCLA name, use of faculty title, or advertisement of UCLA affiliation. Voluntary Faculty participation is reviewed at least every three (3) years to ensure compliance with Voluntary Faculty Guidelines as stated in divisional policy. Each Division shall designate a review process for appointment and reappointment of Voluntary Faculty, and the results of these reviews shall be reported to the Chair’s Office and, subsequently, to the Dean’s Office.

C. Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action

The Department of Surgery is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer. All qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, national origin, disability, age or protected veteran status. (For the complete University of California nondiscrimination and affirmative action policy see: UC Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy.)
ARTICLE IV - DIVISIONS AND SECTIONS

The Department of Surgery shall be comprised of separate divisions representing distinct surgical subspecialties. The Department Chairman, in consultation with the Surgery Division Chiefs and the Provost/Dean of the School of Medicine, may at his/her discretion create additional, merge, or eliminate divisions contingent upon programmatic or financial justification. The following Divisions shall be recognized as designated academic divisions:

- Cardiac Surgery
- General Surgery
- Liver and Pancreas Transplantation
- Pediatric Surgery
- Plastic Surgery
- Surgical Oncology
- Thoracic Surgery
- Vascular Surgery

All full-time and Voluntary faculty shall be appointed within a division. In addition, there shall be certain administrative programs or units (APUs) established as separate financial centers, including the Chairman’s Office. All staff shall be employed within a division or unit.

ARTICLE V - OFFICERS

A. The Department Chair shall be the executive officer of the Department, responsible to the Provost and Dean for Medical Sciences for the effective operation of the Department’s programs, financial management, and for compliance with University policies and goals.

B. The Chair may propose the appointment of an Executive Vice Chair who would assist the Chair in determining department policy, represent the Department in lieu of the Chair at various School-wide and University committees, and shall serve as Chair in the event the Chair is out of town, on vacation, or temporarily unable to carry out his duties as Chair.

C. Vice Chairs with designated responsibilities within the Department may be appointed by the Chair with the approval of the Provost and Dean for Medical Sciences. The Chiefs of Surgery at West Los Angeles Veterans Administration Medical Center, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Olive View-UCLA Medical Center, and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center shall be designated as Vice Chairs of the Department of Surgery upon proposal by the Chair.

ARTICLE VI - DIVISION CHIEFS

Division Chiefs are appointed and serve at the discretion of the Department Chair. Their appointment is administrative rather than academic in nature, and therefore may be extended or terminated, provided there is programmatic justification to do so. Division Chiefs shall be reviewed at least every five (5) years by a peer review body of surgeons.

ARTICLE VII - POSTGRADUATE EDUCATION

The faculty shall have the overall responsibility for the selection and training of all house staff appointed by the Department of Surgery. The training experience shall ensure an optimal provision of education to residents and medical care to patients, consistent with the general and specific requirements of the Accreditation Council on Graduate Medical Education. Requests for assignment of house staff positions by the various institutions affiliated with the Department shall be considered by the appropriate reviewing bodies within the Department. The Vice
Chair for Surgical Education shall be responsible for overseeing the curricula and policies of the postgraduate educational programs. This position shall be appointed by the Chair and report directly to the Chair for all educational matters.

ARTICLE VIII - MEETINGS

The Department Chair shall convene meetings of the full-time faculty annually, or as s/he deems necessary. The Chair shall set agenda for the meetings in advance and notify the full-time faculty. Upon individual request, voluntary faculty may be permitted to attend general meetings, but the Chair shall reserve the right to deny their attendance. All meetings and committees conducted by the Department will utilize appropriate and customary parliamentary procedures for order.

ARTICLE IX - STANDING COMMITTEES

The Chair shall appoint standing and ad hoc committees as appropriate. The Department shall maintain the following standing committees:

A. **Surgical Chiefs**
   The Surgical Chiefs Meeting shall be attended by the Surgery Department Chair, Executive Vice Chair of Surgery, Vice Chair for Surgical Education, Chief of each Surgical Division or his/her designee, and the Executive Administrator of the Department. Other guests may be invited as appropriate on a periodic basis. The Surgical Chiefs shall approve all appointments and reappointments to the UCLA Medical Staff, discuss policies on intra- and interdepartmental issues, and provide leadership in strategic planning efforts. The Surgical Chiefs, in conjunction with the Chair, shall have general responsibility for the development, implementation, and enforcement of the administrative, academic, and patient care policies of the Department of Surgery.

B. **Academic Senate**
   The Department of Surgery shall elect two representatives to the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate for three-year terms. The Chair, in consultation with the Division Chiefs, shall recommend a slate of six candidates representing the surgical divisions. A ballot will then be mailed to the Academic Senate members of the Department. Results of the election ballot will be tallied by the Chairman's Office and forwarded to the Campus Academic Senate Office.

C. **Appointments and Promotions (“A & P”) Committee**
   This is a joint committee of Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor rank in the participating surgical departments (e.g., Neurosurgery, Orthopaedic Surgery, Surgery and Urology), appointed by the Department Chairs in consultation with the respective Department faculty. This Committee shall meet as required for the purpose of pre-reviewing and providing advisory recommendations regarding all dossiers proposed for appointment, promotion, termination of appointment, change in series, merit increase, fourth-year appraisals, five-year academic reviews, or other required academic review processes. The Committee shall forward their advisory vote and recommendations to the respective home department Committees on Academic Personnel. A summary of the A & P Committee advisory vote and recommendation shall be maintained in the Surgery Academic Personnel office.

D. **Department of Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel**
   The Department of Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel (“SurgCAP”) is charged with discussion and reviewing the A&P advisory recommendation of academic personnel actions, and forwarding the final recommendation to the senate faculty. This Committee shall be composed of Department of Surgery Academic Senate faculty at the rank of Associate and above, appointed by the Chair in consultation with...
the faculty. The Committee shall meet as required to discuss and provide an advisory vote on all academic actions received from the Appointments and Promotions Committee. The SurgCAP vote shall be performed by confidential ballot and one more than 50% of the total members shall constitute a quorum. The results shall then be tallied and forwarded as an advisory vote to the voting Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor rank for their formal Senate vote on these actions.

E. **Education Committee**

The Education Committee shall be responsible for facilitating the development and implementation of curricula for the training programs (medical student clerkships, residencies, and fellowships), recommending policy, adjudicating coverage and resource allocation issues, and ensuring compliance with Residency Review Committee (RRC) regulations (i.e., “Milestones”). The Committee is comprised of the Department Chair, Vice Chair for Surgical Education, Program Directors, Medical Student Clerkship Director, the Administrative Director of the Education Office (or their designated representatives), and will be chaired by the Vice Chair for Surgical Education. The committee shall meet at least twice per year, but subcommittees may be convened on a more frequent basis, as specific aspects of the educational program require.

F. **Quality Improvement Committees**

Each Division shall have the responsibility for developing a QI plan to be presented to the Chair and the Chief Quality Officer for approval. Divisional faculty shall either participate in the General Surgery Morbidity and Mortality conferences, or maintain an independent M&M process. The departmental Chief Quality Officer shall represent the Department in the appropriate Enterprise QI process, for the purpose of assuring compliance with JCAHO regulations and state licensing regulations, and assuring consistency of QA/QI policies with Enterprise standards.

G. **Space Allocation Committee**

This Committee shall develop strategic direction, in concert with the Department Chair, with respect to allocation of research space. The Vice Chair for Research shall Chair this body. This Committee shall meet at least once annually in order to review the space plan for the Department, as well as to review and prioritize any requests for new or additional space, and provide recommendations on retention of existing research space by investigators.

**ARTICLE X - VOTING PRIVILEGES FOR ACADEMIC SENATE FACULTY ACTIONS**

A. **Non-Personnel, Substantial Departmental Questions**

Academic Senate members, including recalled Emeriti, shall have the right to vote on non-personnel substantial departmental questions.

B. **Personnel Actions of both Senate and non-Senate Faculty**

1. **Extension of Voting Privileges:**

   a. The right to vote on personnel actions has been extended to In-Residence and Clinical X Professors by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on 3/2/2016 of Tenured Full Professors (9 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain) and of Tenured Associate Professors (3 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain). These series will vote according to the privileges of their rank (Full, Associate, and Assistant).

   b. **Emeriti Faculty**

      Emeriti faculty retain membership in the department, but do not have the right to vote on substantial departmental matters or on personnel actions. Emeriti faculty of the Department of Surgery who are recalled to service in the Department regain voting rights.
on substantial departmental matters and personnel actions during the period of such service.

The right to vote on personnel actions has been extended to recalled Emeriti faculty by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on April 11, 2017 of Tenured Full and Associate Professors (7 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain). Once recalled to the department, Emeriti may vote according to the privileges of their rank during their period of service.

2. **Appointments to the Academic Senate**
   Full and Associate Professors vote on all appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate and on all Senate Joint and Split appointments to the department.

3. **Promotions and Merits**
   a. **Promotion to Full Professor and Full Professor merits:**
      Full and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all promotions to Full Professor and all Full Professor merits. [Extended to Associate Professors by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on 3/2/2016 of Tenured Full Professors, 8 yes, 2 no, 0 abstain.]
   
   b. **Promotion to Associate Professor and Associate Professor merits:**
      Full and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all promotions to Associate Professor and all Associate Professor merits.
   
   c. **Assistant Professor merits, Fourth-Year appraisals, and non-reappointment:**
      Full and Associate Professors have the right to vote on all Assistant Professor merits, including fourth-year appraisals and non-reappointments.

4. **Five Year Reviews.**
   Five-year reviews will be conducted according to the procedures described in the CALL, Appendix 12. Faculty review (and vote, if needed) will be taken according to the same ranks that vote on other actions.

5. **Non-Senate Faculty**
   Non-Senate faculty with 100% employment in the Department may be requested to provide a separate, advisory vote on non-Senate faculty personnel actions or on substantial departmental questions. [Approved by a 2/3 majority secret ballot on 7/1/2016 of Academic Senate faculty, 24 yes, 6 no, 0 abstain.] (At this time the department has not extended to non-Senate faculty the right to an advisory vote on Senate personnel actions.)

6. **Voluntary Faculty**
   Voluntary faculty may not vote on substantial departmental questions or on personnel actions.

7. **Clinical Voluntary Faculty**
   Appointments and promotions in the Clinical (Voluntary) series require, at minimum, a division review of the programmatic need for such actions. Appointment to this series shall not be automatic upon either departure from the full-time faculty or graduation from a University of California residency or fellowship training program.
   
   a. Clinical Voluntary appointments at the Assistant Professor rank shall require a vote of the division Academic Senate faculty at the Associate and Full Professor rank in all series, as well as a vote of the Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel Committee.
   
   b. Clinical Voluntary appointments and promotions at the Associate and Full Professor ranks shall require a division vote, a vote of the Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel, and a
ARTICLE XI - VOTING PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ACTIONS

A. Review, discussion and advisory vote by the Appointments and Promotions Committee.

B. Review, discussion and advisory vote by the Department of Surgery Committee on Academic Personnel. This vote shall be recorded in the candidate’s dossier and forwarded to the voting Academic Senate faculty.

C. Formal vote by the departmental Academic Senate faculty entitled to vote on that personnel action. (See Article X.) This vote shall be performed by confidential ballot.

ARTICLE XII - APPOINTMENTS TO SCHOOL, MEDICAL CENTER, AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

The Department Chair shall sit on standing and ad hoc committees in the Medical School, UCLA Hospital System, UCLA Health System, and the University Campus. In his absence, the Executive Vice Chair or other designee shall represent him. The Department Chair may also propose that members of the Department of Surgery represent the Department on appropriate committees.

ARTICLE XIII - AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

The Department Bylaws may be amended at any time by a 2/3 majority vote of a quorum of all Academic Senate faculty in all series of the Department of Surgery. The proposed amendments shall be submitted in writing and circulated to the entire Academic Senate faculty prior to the vote being taken.

Minor amendments to language in the Bylaws that reflect changes in University nomenclature or procedure and do not impact the prerogatives of the faculty may be enacted by the Chair.

A. The Department of Surgery Health Sciences Compensation Plan Bylaws may be amended at any time by a majority vote of a quorum of the faculty participating in the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, with approval by the Department Chair and Dean. Affected Plan participants shall be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on any proposed revisions to these Bylaws prior to a vote being taken. (For additional information regarding these policies, see The Department of Surgery Health Sciences Compensation Plan Bylaws.)
They have to schedule a meeting as well regardless if whether or not anyone comes.

Looks like I need to send a memo.

On Fri, Jun 23, 2017 at 12:15 PM, Olivas, Marian <molivas@senate.ucla.edu> wrote:

SINCE I WROTE BELOW, I HAD A CONVERSATION WITH VERA. THEY DO NOT HAVE FACULTY MEETINGS TO DISCUSS CASES. IN FACT IT LOOKS LIKE THEY HAVE FEW ALL-FACULTY MEETINGS (ONCE A YEAR?)

IS IT ENOUGH TO MAKE THE DOSSIER AVAILABLE TO VIEW AND PUT IN A STATEMENT THAT ANY SENATE MEMBER CAN CALL FOR A MEETING TO DISCUSS? THEY SEEM TO THINK A REQUIREMENT TO MEET IS UNSURMOUNTABLE.

I finally had a chance to look at this one, so here are my notes:

- The extensions seem to be in order. They did some of the votes awhile ago and some of them recently, so that part is cleaned up.

- They have the 2-committee review: The joint surgery department committee (A&P) “pre” review – and then a departmental committee (SurgCAP) “pre” review. What they did to “clean” these up was to make the members non-administrator faculty.

- After the “pre” review, all actions go to the faculty for a faculty vote by whatever ranks have privilege for that action.

The challenge to the above description that I see is this:

In Article VIII on meetings combined with the voting procedures description in Article XI. If the faculty only meet annually, when is there an actual discussion about cases? Perhaps this is an error in their description and they actually do have meetings and an opportunity to discuss before personnel votes, but it is not clear in the bylaws. The way these are written seems like they have more or less delegated academic personnel decisions to a chair-selected set of committees and faculty vote based on these committee recommendations.
Marian McKenna Olivas, Senior Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate Judicial Committees

(Academic Senate website) www.senate.ucla.edu / (email) molivas@senate.ucla.edu / (phone) 310.206.2469 / (fax) 310.206.5273

IMPORTANT WARNING: This email contains confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this message in error, please notify me immediately and destroy the related message.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Dear Marian,

On behalf of Dr. Ronald Busuttil, Chairman of the Department of Surgery, I respectfully submit the Departmental Bylaws to the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction of the UCLA Academic Senate. This document was approved by our academic senate faculty on June 21, 2016, however we have recently approved an amendment (duly reflected and noted therein).

Please let me know if there are any questions or concerns. I want to personally thank you for your kind guidance and assistance throughout this process.

We look forward to the committee’s review.

Sincerely,

Vera

Vera Moubayed | Staff and Academic Personnel Director
David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA
Surgery | Neurosurgery | Head & Neck Surgery | Orthopaedic Surgery | Urology
10833 Le Conte Ave. Rm. 72-131 CHS | Los Angeles, CA 90095 | Mailcode: 174918
☎: 310.825.0652 | ☎: 310.206.7024 | ✉: vmoubayed@mednet.ucla.edu

UCLA HEALTH SCIENCES IMPORTANT WARNING: This email (and any attachments) is only intended for the use of the person or entity to which it is addressed, and may contain information that is privileged and confidential. You, the recipient, are obligated to maintain it in a safe, secure and confidential manner. Unauthorized redisclosure or failure to maintain confidentiality may subject you to federal and state penalties. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify us by return email, and delete this message from your computer.
September 4, 2018

To: Aaron Tornell, Chair  
   Faculty Executive Committee  
   College of Letters and Science

From: Linda Bourque, 2017-18 Chair  
   Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Proposal to Amend Bylaws of the College of Letters and Science

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the proposal to amend the Bylaws of the College of Letters and Science voted on by the College faculty from May 17 to May 30, 2018 and submitted on July 3, 2018 and finds them consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

Please also submit a clean version of the bylaws with the date on which these were approved and the result of the vote to approve them. Put these at the top of the Bylaws. The revised bylaws, along with this letter, will be sent to the Executive Board for inclusion on the next Legislative Assembly.

cc: Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
    Chris Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate  
    Marian M. Olivas, R&J Committee Analyst, Academic Senate  
    Mitsue Yokota, Academic Administrator
January 31, 2018

To: Aaron Tornell, Chair  
    Faculty Executive Committee  
    College of Letters and Science

From: Linda Bourque, Chair  
    Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: Bylaws Submitted On January 31, 2018

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the Bylaws that the College of Letters and Science submitted on January 31, 2018, and finds them consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

cc: Michael Levine, Vice Chancellor  
    Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
    Christoph Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction  
    Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate  
    Marian Olivas, Committee Analyst, Rules & Jurisdiction  
    Meg Buzzi, Academic Personnel Office  
    Heather Small, Information Technology Services  
    Bonnie MacDougall, Vice Chancellor’s Office
September 6, 2018

To: Academic Senate Executive Board

From: Linda Bourque, 2017-18 Chair
Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: College of Letters & Sciences School Bylaws: Revisions submitted on July 3, 2018

The Rules & Jurisdiction submits these proposed revisions of the College of Letters & Sciences School bylaws to the Executive Board for inclusion on the Consent Calendar of the next Legislative Assembly.

cc: Chris Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Joseph Bristow, Chair, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
This is a reference document to an external location.

The College Faculty votes on these bylaws during their May election. (No URL Specified)
Explanation of Changes to Appendix II Bylaws: College of Letters and Science

- Revisions were made to Part III to clarify the duties of the Chair and Vice Chair.
- Revisions were made to Part V to move the roles of the Chair and Vice Chair to Part III.
- Revisions were made to the academic groups in Part VI to correct departmental name changes, include departments that were omitted, and correct the name of the undergraduate student association.
- Revisions were made to Part VII to clarify the terms of elected members and filling vacancies.
- Revisions were made to Part IX to clarify that the *Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures* will be used in instances not coved by the Bylaws.

**Appendix II Bylaws**
College of Letters and Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current (strike-through to be deleted)</th>
<th>Proposed (underlined to be added)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part I. Functions</strong></td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Faculty of the College of Letters and Science shall conduct the government of the College.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Part II. Membership**               | **No Change**                     |
| 1. Membership in the Faculty of the College of Letters and Science is defined by Divisional Bylaws 50(A) and 184. |                                     |

| **Part III. Officers**                | **Part III. Officers**             |
| 1. *Chair.* The Faculty shall elect a Chair every two years in odd-numbered years, according to procedures prescribed in Divisional Bylaw 150. The Chair shall serve a two-year term beginning September first. | 1. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty shall be Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee. |
| 2. *Vice Chair.* The Faculty shall elect a Vice Chair every two years in even numbered years, according to procedures prescribed in Divisional Bylaw 150. The Vice Chair shall serve a two-year term beginning September first. The two-year terms of the Vice Chair and Chair shall begin in alternate years. | 2. *Chair.* The Faculty shall elect a Chair every two years in odd-numbered years, according to procedures prescribed in Divisional Bylaw 150. The Chair shall serve a two-year term beginning September first. |
|                                           | 3. *Vice Chair.* The Faculty shall elect a Vice Chair every two years in even numbered years, according to the procedures prescribed in Divisional Bylaw 150. The Vice Chair shall serve a two-year term beginning September first. The two-year |
3. The terms of the Vice Chair and Chair shall begin in alternate years.

4. If at any time, the Vice Chair is unable to complete their term, an interim appointment shall be made by the Chair of the Faculty.

5. If at any time, the Chair is unable to complete their term, the post shall be filled by the Vice Chair.

6. If at any time, the Chair is unable to complete their term and the Vice Chair is unable to fill the position, another member of the Faculty Executive Committee, elected by majority vote of the Faculty Executive Committee membership shall fill the post for the remainder of the elected term.

### Part IV. Business of the Faculty of the College

1. The Faculty as a whole shall meet at such times as it may determine or at the call of the Chair or the Vice Chair. Upon the written request of fifty voting members, a special meeting must be called by the Chair or, in her or his absence or disability, by the Vice Chair of the Faculty. Special meetings shall be limited to consideration of the matters of business specified in the request. The call to meetings must be announced to all Faculty of the College at least ten days of instruction prior to the meeting.

2. Matters requiring a vote of the Faculty shall be submitted to an electronic ballot conducted in accordance with Senate Bylaws 95 and 340.

### Part V. Faculty Executive Committee

1. The Faculty of the College delegates to the Faculty Executive Committee its powers to act under Divisional Bylaw 50(D) (3).

   A. The Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty shall be Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee.

   B. The Chair shall appoint committees to conduct the business of the Faculty of the
The Chair shall appoint committees to conduct the business of the Faculty of the College that are not otherwise provided for, and shall be an *ex-officio* member on all such committees.

### Part VI. Membership of the Faculty Executive Committee

1. The membership of the Faculty Executive Committee shall consist of elected College faculty, student members, and *ex-officio* members.  

   **No Change**

A. Faculty Members. The Faculty Executive Committee has thirteen voting members: the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty and eleven faculty members, one elected from each of the academic groups below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Group</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. English; Comparative Literature; Gender Studies</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Art History; Classics; Asian Languages and Cultures; Linguistics; faculty with Humanities Division appointments (w/o departmental assignment)</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. French and Francophone Studies; Germanic Languages; Italian; Near Eastern Languages and Cultures; Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Languages and Cultures; Spanish and Portuguese.</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Integrative Biology and Physiology; Psychology</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics; Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology.</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mathematics; Philosophy; Society and Genetics; Statistics.</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chemistry and Biochemistry; Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences; Institute of the Environment and Sustainability.</td>
<td><strong>No Change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aerospace Studies; Atmospheric Sciences; Military Sciences; Naval Science; Physics and Astronomy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aerospace Studies; Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences; Military Sciences; Naval Science; Physics and Astronomy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Asian American Studies; Chicana and Chicano Studies; History; Communication Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. African American Studies; Asian American Studies; Chicana and Chicano Studies; History; Communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Economics; Political Science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Anthropology; Geography; Sociology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Student Members.</strong> Two undergraduate and two graduate students appointed by the governing bodies of the Undergraduate Student Association (USA) and Graduate Student Association (GSA) shall participate as non-voting members of the Faculty Executive Committee and shall be appointed annually. The student votes shall be recorded separately and reported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Student Members.</strong> Two undergraduate and two graduate students appointed by the governing bodies of the Undergraduate Student Association Council (USAC) and Graduate Student Association (GSA) shall participate as non-voting members of the Faculty Executive Committee and shall be appointed annually. The student votes shall be recorded separately and reported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Ex-Officio Members.</strong> The College deans shall serve as non-voting ex-officio members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part VII. Terms for Elected Members of the Faculty Executive Committee

1. The term of the elected members shall be two years, beginning on September first. Members representing even numbered groups shall be elected in even numbered years. Members representing odd numbered groups shall be elected in odd numbered years. Interim appointments shall be made by the Chair of the Faculty and shall extend through the remainder of the elected term.

### Part VII. Terms for Elected Members of the Faculty Executive Committee

9. The term of the elected members shall be two years, beginning on September first. Members representing even numbered groups shall be elected in even numbered years. Members representing odd numbered groups shall be elected in odd numbered years. If at any time, an elected member is unable to complete their term, an interim appointment shall be made by the Chair of the Faculty and shall extend through the remainder of the elected term.

### Part VIII. Elections of the Faculty Executive Committee

1. Elections of members shall follow the procedures for electronic ballots set forth in Senate Bylaw 340 and Divisional Bylaw 150 (G).

No Change
### Part IX. Duties of the Faculty Executive Committee

1. The Faculty Executive Committee shall:

   A. Provide general oversight of the academic programs in the College and bring before the Faculty of the College any recommendations that the Faculty Executive Committee may deem advisable using procedures set forth in Senate Bylaw 95.

   B. Serve as an advisory body on matters concerning the welfare of students in the College.

   C. Designate the specific courses (including prerequisites and limitations) which shall be accepted in fulfillment of graduation requirements of the College.

   D. Review and approve requirements for College majors, minors, honors programs, and other curricular requirements of the College.

   E. Review and propose for faculty vote changes to College regulations.

   F. Review and approve proposals for new departments, Centers for Interdisciplinary Instruction, and interdepartmental programs.

   G. Consult with concerned faculty members and members of the administration and make recommendations to the Deans based on established Senate policies about the College's allocation of educational resources, academic priorities, and planning and budget issues.

### Part X. Meetings of the Faculty Executive Committee

1. The Faculty Executive Committee shall meet at least once each quarter.

2. A quorum for the Faculty Executive Committee shall consist of seven voting members.
### Part XI. Amendment of Bylaws

1. These Bylaws may be amended by two-thirds affirmative vote of the Faculty voting by electronic ballot, provided notice shall have been given fourteen calendar days prior to the electronic voting deadline.

No Change
October 28, 2018

To: Greg Grether, Vice Chair
    Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

From: Alfreda Iglehart
    Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Re: Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) Department Bylaws Submitted on October 11, 2018

Rules & Jurisdiction has reviewed the EEB Department bylaws submitted on October 11, 2018. Thank you for incorporating the numbering suggestions made by Linda Bourque (2017-18 R&J Chair) after your earlier submission.

R&J finds the revisions consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate and appropriately approved by 2/3 of the Faculty voting. This letter along with the proposed revisions will be sent to the Executive Board for review and placement on the Legislative Assembly Consent Calendar.

cc: Karen Sears, EEB Chair
    Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Christoph Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
    Linda Mohr, Executive Director/CAO, Academic Senate
    Marian Olivas, Committee Analyst, Rules & Jurisdiction
November 1, 2018

To: Academic Senate Executive Board

From: Alfreda Iglehart
Rules & Jurisdiction Committee

Re: Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) Department Bylaws Submitted on October 11, 2018

The Rules & Jurisdiction submits these proposed revisions of the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) Department bylaws to the Executive Board for inclusion on the Consent Calendar of the next Legislative Assembly.

cc: Chris Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current bylaws</th>
<th>Proposed bylaws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles Department of <strong>Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</strong> (EEB)</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles Department of <strong>Ecology and Evolutionary Biology</strong> (EEB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREAMBLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>PREAMBLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This document is written to be in conformity with both the Standing Rules of the Regents of the University of California and Bylaw 55 of the State-wide Academic Senate of the University (UC SB 55). It was adopted by two-thirds majority vote of Departmental members of the UCLA Academic Senate following a regularly scheduled faculty meeting held on November 9, 2015.</td>
<td>This document is written to be in conformity with both the Standing Rules of the Regents of the University of California and Bylaw 55 of the State-wide Academic Senate of the University (UC SB 55). It was adopted by two-thirds majority vote of Departmental members of the UCLA Academic Senate through an email ballot distributed on June 18, 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>1. <strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. The chief Departmental administrative officer is the <strong>Chair</strong>. The Chair receives assistance and advice from the Standing Committees of the Department, any Ad hoc Committees that may be appointed from time to time, and from the Faculty as a whole. <strong>Non-academic Staff</strong> assist the Chair in operational matters. The duties and responsibilities of the Chair are spelled out in the Announcement of the President entitled &quot;Duties of Department Chairs (or Equivalent Officers)&quot;</td>
<td>1.1. The chief Departmental administrative officer is the <strong>Chair</strong>. The Chair receives assistance and advice from the Standing Committees of the Department, any Ad hoc Committees that may be appointed from time to time, and from the Faculty as a whole. <strong>Non-academic Staff</strong> assist the Chair in operational matters. The duties and responsibilities of the Chair are spelled out in the Announcement of the President entitled &quot;Duties of Department Chairs (or Equivalent Officers)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. One or more <strong>Vice-Chairs</strong> may be appointed by the Chair with the advice and consent of the Department and the approval of the Divisional Dean of Life Sciences. The normal term of service of a ViceChair will be three years with the appointment being renewed annually. ViceChairs will be responsible for duties assigned to them by the Chair.</td>
<td>1.2. One or more <strong>Vice-Chairs</strong> may be appointed by the Chair with the advice and consent of the Department and the approval of the Divisional Dean of Life Sciences. The normal term of service of a ViceChair will be three years with the appointment being renewed annually. ViceChairs will be responsible for duties assigned to them by the Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. There are five <strong>Standing Committees</strong>. Composition of committees is determined after consultation with faculty, who are asked for their preferences and</td>
<td>1.3. There are five <strong>Standing Committees</strong>. Composition of committees is determined after consultation with faculty, who are asked for their preferences and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composition of committees is determined each year by the Chair, taking into account the following: (1) areas of expertise and interest of each faculty member; (2) discussions between Chair and Vice Chairs to achieve some balance of subject matter fields in a given year or on a rotating basis; (3) availability of faculty during the academic year for service on departmental committees; and (4) fairness of load, so that certain faculty members do not consistently carry an unfair burden. The standing committees are:

- Personnel Committee
- Curriculum Committee
- Graduate Admissions and Support Committee
- Seminar Committee
- Departmental Awards Committee

Excepting only the Personnel Committee, **Standing Committees** may have student members, said students having full participatory and voting rights. The Chair works with appropriate Undergraduate and Graduate Student Organizations to identify student members. Students will normally serve for terms of one year. Except as explicitly provided below faculty appointments to standing committees are normally for terms of one or more years. The Chair ensures that terms are staggered in time.

1.4. **Ad hoc Committees** (e.g., Search Committees for new faculty members) may be appointed by the Chair as needed for the operations of the Department. The Chair determines the charges for these committees as is appropriate.

1.5. **Special Functions** of the Department may be assigned by the Chair as responsibilities of individual members of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Committee</th>
<th>Personnel Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Admissions and Support Committee</td>
<td>Graduate Admissions and Support Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Committee</td>
<td>Seminar Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Awards Committee</td>
<td>Departmental Awards Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
faculty. These Functions may include, but are not restricted to:

- Biomedical Library Liaison(s)
- Departmental Webmaster
- DWQE Coordinators
- Director, Botanical

Garden/Herbarium
- Graduate Advisor
- Undergraduate Advisor
- MBQ Coordinator
- FBQ Coordinator
- Dickey Collection Advisor

to the Chair

### 2. OPERATIONS

#### 2.1. Parliamentary Procedures and Voting

2.1.1 The Department operates according to the rules of both the UC statewide Academic Senate and the UCLA divisional Academic Senate. These bylaws apply to all Departmental actions on “substantial departmental questions” [UC SB 55(A)(1)] and all academic personnel actions [UC SB 55(B)(1-7)]. Except as specified below, standard parliamentary procedures are followed. When needed A. Sturgis’ *The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures* (4th edition, 2001) is used for guidance.

2.1.2 Faculty members in the Department who are members of the Academic Senate and have active appointments are eligible to vote on the matters specified in sec. 2.1.1. Only one series of titles is presently represented: Regular Series (19900, Ladder; Tenured and Tenure-track). Changes in this governance
document can only be made if the proposed action is a listed agenda item for a meeting of Departmental faculty that has been scheduled and publicized in advance according to normal Department procedure. A 2/3 majority vote of all Senate members present at such meetings is required for approval of changes. This document will be studied and revised by an ad hoc Bylaws Committee every 4 years; one of these revisions must occur during the year of Departmental self-review prior to the Department’s 8-year review.

2.1.3 All faculty members with Regular series titles and active appointments have equal voting rights in all Departmental matters, including personnel actions. Personnel voting rights on Appointments were extended to Assistant Professors by a two-thirds majority (# yes, # no) secret ballot following the November 9, 2015 faculty meeting. Voting rights on Full Professor Promotions and Merits were extended to Associate and Assistant Professors by a two-thirds majority (# yes, # no) secret ballot following the November 9, 2015 faculty meeting. Voting rights on Associate Professor Promotions and Merits were extended to Assistant Professors by a two-thirds majority (# yes, # no) secret ballot following the November 9, 2015 faculty meeting. Emeriti can participate in Departmental meetings; their voting privileges are determined at 4-year intervals at the time of revision of these Bylaws. Currently, emeriti do not have personnel voting privileges, whether they are
Recalled, not recalled, or appointed as Research Professors. Recalled emeriti have voting privileges on all non-personnel substantial department questions. Adjunct faculty members can participate in Departmental meetings not involving personnel actions, but do not have voting privileges. Temporary faculty members may attend Departmental faculty meetings, but do not have voting privileges. Faculty members with joint appointments in other units have voting rights as agreed upon within the terms of their appointments.

2.1.4 Faculty members may vote by absentee ballot. Faculty members on leave may vote, but their votes will not be solicited. Secure electronic voting is available when feasible.

2.1.5 Majorities are determined on the basis of pro and con votes only; votes to abstain do not count.

2.1.6 Departmental meetings are normally called by the Chair or the Chair’s designee. Personnel actions and other substantial matters for consideration at Departmental meetings must appear on written agendas distributed to all faculty members at least three working days prior to the meetings. Exceptions to this rule require unanimous approval.

2.1.7 A quorum consists of 50% of the regular faculty members not on leave.

2.1.8 Recruitment of new faculty is done...
by ad hoc search committees appointed by the Chair. Search committee recommendations are made to the department at scheduled faculty meetings as agenda items. Recommendations are discussed by all eligible faculty in attendance at those meetings. Faculty with active Regular series appointments will vote on proposed appointments by secret written ballots for periods of two business days, beginning immediately after the presentation meeting.

3. CHARGES TO COMMITTEES

3.1. RESPONSIBILITIES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

3.1.1. PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

All discussions of personnel actions are confidential. Committee membership consists of a minimum of four Regular series faculty. Ad hoc members may be added as needed, as in cases involving faculty with joint appointments with other units.

The Personnel Committee is primarily responsible for reviewing and recommending to the Chair and the Department the full range of personnel actions involving Regular series members of the Academic Senate, also appointees in the non-Senate Adjunct Professor series. There are two special categories of actions for which the Committee is designated as the final reviewing body, making recommendations directly to the Chair:

DMS 5–8
1) Actions involving non-Senate appointees in the Adjunct Professor, Professional Researcher and Project Scientist series.
2) 5-year performance reviews of Senate members when such reviews are required under terms of the APM.

The Chair has discretion to bring any of these actions to the full Department if conditions arise in which Departmental review is considered essential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Actions</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The Personnel Committee reviews and analyzes all aspects of a candidate's dossier, and makes a recommendation for action to the Department. Extramural references for candidates, when required, will be selected by the Department Chair after the candidate has been given the opportunity to provide suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The Personnel Committee presents its findings at a regularly scheduled Departmental meeting. After hearing the review and recommendation of the Committee, all regular members of the Department present discuss and consider the recommendation, then vote on it. A secret written ballot is held two working days after the discussion. The LSSA Office of Academic Personnel is responsible for conducting the ballot, the result of which is reported to the Chair. It is the responsibility of the Chair to inform the candidate of the exact vote.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The Personnel Committee then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) The Personnel Committee reviews and analyzes all aspects of a candidate's dossier, and makes a recommendation for action to the Department. Extramural references for candidates, when required, will be selected by the Department Chair after the candidate has been given the opportunity to provide suggestions.

2) The Personnel Committee presents its findings at a regularly scheduled Departmental meeting. After hearing the review and recommendation of the Committee, all regular members of the Department present discuss and consider the recommendation, then vote on it. A secret written ballot is held two working days after the discussion. The LSSA Office of Academic Personnel is responsible for conducting the ballot, the result of which is reported to the Chair. It is the responsibility of the Chair to inform the candidate of the exact vote.

3) The Personnel Committee then
advises the Chair in the preparation of the Departmental letter.

4) The Chair forwards the Departmental recommendation to the Dean. At the Chair's discretion a second ("Chair's") letter may be included as described in University policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Actions</th>
<th>Merit Increases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merit increases, including fourth-year appraisals for Assistant Professors, are handled in the same manner as promotions except that external reviews are not solicited. Voting eligibility for merit increases is the same as for promotions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Actions</th>
<th>Adjunct Professor Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any member of the regular faculty may nominate a candidate for appointment in the Adjunct series. Fully documented nominations are referred by the Chair to the Personnel Committee for review and recommendation. Appointments, advancements in rank, and merit increases are handled in the same manner as for regular series faculty. Each initial nomination and all recommendations for subsequent actions must include statements specifically describing the ways in which the candidates will contribute to departmental teaching programs at either or both the undergraduate or graduate levels during the duration of the initial appointment or renewal appointment. Those statements must be developed jointly by the faculty sponsor and the candidate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Votes on reappointments must be conducted by the Department every two years for appointees at the Assistant and Associate Professor levels, and every three years for appointees at the Full Professor level. The results are reported to the Divisional Dean.

Personnel Actions – Research Professor Series

1) Appendix 38: Research Professor was added to the UCLA CALL on April 6, 2012. The operative sections of that document state:

“Professors Emeriti from UCLA who have continued a high level of research scholarship since their retirement may be eligible to utilize the title Research Professor as a working title. Appointees to Research Professor status must be able to demonstrate that their research activities since retirement have led to one or more of the following outcomes: an active external grant, a proposal to obtain external grant funding, or a recent history of external grant funding, internal research funds, publication of scholarly books, monographs, or journal articles, scholarly presentations at professional meetings

II. TERMS OF SERVICE
Appointments as Research Professor shall be made for three years, or in cases where a Research Professor is Principal Investigator of an active grant, for three years or the duration of the grant, whichever is longer.

III. PROCEDURES
Appointment authority is delegated

Personnel Actions – Research Professor Series

2) Votes on reappointments must be conducted by the Department every two years for appointees at the Assistant and Associate Professor levels, and every three years for appointees at the Full Professor level. The results are reported to the Divisional Dean.
to academic deans and may not be further delegated. Requests for appointment as Research Professor are normally initiated through the department chair or ORU Director by submission of a letter by the applicant that documents his or her continuation of a high level of research scholarship since retirement. In accordance with department or ORU procedures, the chair or director should consult appropriately with the faculty. If the unit concurs, the chair or director shall recommend the appointment to the appropriate dean. The dean will notify the applicant of the decision in writing with a copy to the recommending unit. Renewal of an appointment is possible, but not automatic. The procedures for reappointment are the same as described above in this section.”

2) Departmental implementation of this policy will be done as follows:

a) Professors Emeriti wishing to be appointed as Research Professor will submit a letter to the Department Chair making that request. The letter must document their post retirement research activity in accordance with the terms of Appendix 38. It must also specify the requested duration of the appointment per the Appendix.

b) The Chair will refer the letter to the Personnel Committee for its determination as to whether or not the request meets the standards of the Appendix. If it does meet the
standards the Committee will recommend that the Chair forward the request to the Dean of Life Sciences. If it does not the Committee will return the letter to the Chair with its recommendation as to what additional information may be needed to satisfy the standards. A revised letter will be reviewed as a new submission.

c) This policy and procedure will go into effect July 1, 2012.

3.1.2 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Committee membership consists of a minimum of three regular faculty members, one of whom is committee Chair, the Lead Undergraduate Student Affairs Officer, and the Faculty Undergraduate Advisor.

Committee responsibilities are:

1) In general, to keep the catalogue and the schedule of classes up to date. To consider proposals for new courses or deletion or modification of existing courses by faculty members. The Committee presents its recommendations for new courses, changes in course descriptions, and deletions of courses to the Chair for final approval.

2) Proposed changes in core curriculum and the preparation for the major must be approved by the Department.

3.1.3 GRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND SUPPORT COMMITTEE

the request to the Dean of Life Sciences. If it does not the Committee will return the letter to the Chair with its recommendation as to what additional information may be needed to satisfy the standards. A revised letter will be reviewed as a new submission.

c) This policy and procedure will go into effect July 1, 2012.

Policy on Acceleration Requests

1) All acceleration requests must be accompanied by a letter to the Chair from the candidate justifying the request. Regardless of the justification, all acceleration requests made by May 1 will be reviewed by the Personnel Committee, presented to the Department, and submitted to the Dean of Life Sciences, unless withdrawn by the candidate. Late acceleration requests, defined as those made after May 1, must be based on a significant achievement, such as a national award, that occurred or was announced after May 1. Whether this criterion has been met will be evaluated by the Personnel Committee.

2) If the Personnel Committee determines that a late acceleration request is justified, the case will proceed as usual, unless an extension of the Dean's deadline is needed. If an extension of the Dean's deadline is needed, the Department will submit a request for an extension to the Dean, along with the candidate's justification.
Committee membership consists of five regular faculty members, one of whom is committee Chair, plus the Graduate Student Affairs Officer, and the Faculty Graduate Advisor. The latter two people are both ex officio members.

Committee responsibilities are:

1) The committee provides for the acceptance and admission of new graduate students. The committee monitors the calendar for admissions and works to ensure that offers of admission are as competitive as resources will permit. Through the Graduate Affairs Office it handles correspondence with prospective graduate students, manages student files, provides student files for faculty review, and designates provisional advisors.

2) The committee advises on policies and procedures for the selection, appointment and assignment of teaching assistants. It is responsible for collection of data for evaluation of the performance of teaching assistants. It generates and develops materials for orientation of new appointees. It also provides advice on the administration of graduate fellowships such as Traineeships, Fellowships, and others which may be sought by graduate students in the Department. It administers Departmental (e.g., travel and dissertation research support) and Graduate Division funds that support graduate students.

3) If the Personnel Committee finds that a late acceleration request is not justified, the candidate will be informed of the basis for this decision in writing. If the candidate chooses to appeal the decision, their justification for the acceleration request and the Personnel Committee’s decision will be submitted to the Dean. The Department will proceed with the case, if asked to do so by the Dean.

3.1.2 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Committee membership consists of a minimum of three regular faculty members, one of whom is committee Chair, the Lead Undergraduate Student Affairs Officer, and the Faculty Undergraduate Advisor.

Committee responsibilities are:

1) In general, to keep the catalogue and the schedule of classes up to date. To consider proposals for new courses or deletion or modification of existing courses by faculty members. The Committee presents its recommendations for new courses, changes in course descriptions, and deletions of courses to the Chair for final approval.

2) Proposed changes in core curriculum and the preparation for the major must be approved by the Department.

3.1.3 GRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND SUPPORT COMMITTEE

Committee membership consists of five regular faculty members, one of whom is committee Chair, plus the Graduate Student Affairs Officer, and the Faculty Graduate Advisor.
3.1.4 SEMINAR COMMITTEE

The committee is responsible for organizing, scheduling, and overseeing the Departmental seminar program. The committee solicits suggestions from the faculty, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows for desired speakers. Committee structure and operations vary at the discretion of the Chair.

3.1.5 DEPARTMENTAL AWARDS COMMITTEE

The committee is composed of at least two faculty members. The committee oversees the Departmental awards program with the advice and assistance of the Lead Undergraduate Student Affairs Officer and the Graduate Student Affairs Officer. The committee assists the Chair in preparing and selecting nominations for the numerous extra-departmental faculty awards and prizes (e.g., Faculty Research Lecturer, Distinguished Teaching Award, Woman Scientist of the Year, etc.) for which the Department is asked to submit names and dossiers each year.

4. APPENDICES

A. Policy on Adjunct Professors

1) An Adjunct appointment will be made only when the Department will be clearly well served by such an appointment.

2) All such appointees must meet the hiring standards that we impose on any candidate for a regular tenure track position.

3) The candidate must demonstrate a commitment to teach on a regular basis. This will include...
participation in a graduate or advanced undergraduate course, and may also involve lower division or core course teaching. While there is no commitment to a salary for such participation, it is not precluded for lower division and core teaching. Salaries for such teaching must be negotiated with the Department Chair. Appointees are encouraged to serve as members of advisory committees for graduate students.

4) All extramural funding for research administered through UCLA must be "signed off" by the University, although overhead may not necessarily go to UCLA unless the University is the sole underwriter of the grant.

5) Space must be negotiated with the Department Chair.

6) The candidate will be eligible to co-sponsor graduate students.

7) Advancement will follow the same procedures as for regular faculty. Evidence of continuing academic excellence and productivity, similar to our active faculty, will be a condition of continued appointment.

B. Departmental Equipment and Services

1) All equipment designated for instructional use and purchased with Departmental funds must be made available for regularly scheduled courses.

2) When such equipment is not in use in courses, it may be used for research fellows for desired speakers. Committee structure and operations vary at the discretion of the Chair.

3.1.5 DEPARTMENTAL AWARDS COMMITTEE

The committee is composed of at least two faculty members. The committee oversees the Departmental awards program with the advice and assistance of the Lead Undergraduate Student Affairs Officer and the Graduate Student Affairs Officer. The committee assists the Chair in preparing and selecting nominations for the numerous extra-departmental faculty awards and prizes (e.g., Faculty Research Lecturer, Distinguished Teaching Award, Woman Scientist of the Year, etc.) for which the Department is asked to submit names and dossiers each year.

4. APPENDICES

A. Policy on Adjunct Professors

1) An Adjunct appointment will be made only when the Department will be clearly well served by such an appointment.

2) All such appointees must meet the hiring standards that we impose on any candidate for a regular tenure track position.

3) The candidate must demonstrate a commitment to teach on a regular basis. This will include participation in a graduate or advanced undergraduate course, and may also involve lower division or core course teaching. While there is no commitment to a salary for such participation, it is not precluded for lower division and core teaching. Salaries for such
with the understanding that it must be
maintained in proper order by the
faculty member concerned and that it
must be relinquished promptly when
needed for a course.

3) Whenever appropriate, major pieces
of equipment purchased with
Departmental funds and requiring
special technical knowledge for their
use will be assigned by the Chair to a
specific faculty member who will
assume responsibility for overall
maintenance.

4) A current list of all pieces of
Departmental equipment purchased
for courses and their location will be
available in the Stockroom. This will
include a listing by courses.

5) The Facilities Manager will be
responsible for maintaining a listing
of all technical services
(photographic, illustration, workshop,
etc.) available in the Department.

teaching must be negotiated with
the Department Chair. Appointees
are encouraged to serve as members
of advisory committees for graduate
students.

4) All extramural funding for research
administered through UCLA must
be "signed off" by the University,
although overhead may not
necessarily go to UCLA unless the
University is the sole underwriter of
the grant.

5) Space must be negotiated with the
Department Chair.

6) The candidate will be eligible to co-
sponsor graduate students.

7) Advancement will follow the same
procedures as for regular faculty.
Evidence of continuing academic
excellence and productivity, similar
to our active faculty, will be a
condition of continued appointment.

8) Adjunct Assistant Professors in the
Department of Ecology and
Evolutionary Biology have
historically taught 6 courses per year
as a full load. The motion being
considered is to lower the teaching
load for these adjuncts to 4 courses
per year (for 100% teaching
positions). The reasoning for this is
that the teaching workload for these
positions should be between ladder
faculty and lecturers (which teach 6
courses as a full load). This change
would apply to all Adjunct Assistant
Professors, including the new
Adjunct Assistant Professors we plan
to recruit in the upcoming year who
will split their time between research
in the lab of a ladder faculty member.
B. Departmental Equipment and Services

1) All equipment designated for instructional use and purchased with Departmental funds must be made available for regularly scheduled courses.

2) When such equipment is not in use in courses, it may be used for research with the understanding that it must be maintained in proper order by the faculty member concerned and that it must be relinquished promptly when needed for a course.

3) Whenever appropriate, major pieces of equipment purchased with Departmental funds and requiring special technical knowledge for their use will be assigned by the Chair to a specific faculty member who will assume responsibility for overall maintenance.

4) A current list of all pieces of Departmental equipment purchased for courses and their location will be available in the Stockroom. This will include a listing by courses.

5) The Facilities Manager will be responsible for maintaining a listing of all technical services (photographic, illustration, workshop, etc.) available in the Department.
Dear Greg:

I agree that it appears that you need to vote again on the proposed changes to your bylaws.

In the meantime, please set-up the new and old bylaws so that they are in parallel construction. This becomes a problem starting with Section 3, Charges to Committees. In the prior section 2. Operations, you had sections and subsections clearly numbered. That is no longer the case starting with section 3. Charges to Committees. Please adopt a system similar to what you have in Section 2. For example, it looks like Personnel Actions - Promotions should be identified as Section 3.1.1.A; and Personnel Actions - Merit Increases should be identified as Section 3.1.1.B.; etc.

Should Policy on Acceleration Requests be Section 3.1.1.E.? As such it does not belong opposite to and parallel to 3.1.2 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE. It should exist after Section 3.1.1.D. and before Section 3.1.2. As nearly as I can tell this is not a rewrite of a prior existent section but is, rather, a completely new section. That should be clearly indicated in how it is set up; there should be no text in the left hand column opposite this new section of text.

I recommend that you restructure the text before you ask the faculty to vote on the changes.

Linda Bourque

On Tue, Sep 4, 2018 at 5:26 PM, Greg Grether <ggrether@g.ucla.edu> wrote:

Dear Dr. Bourque,

I believe the attached document is in the required format. If not, please let me know what else is required.

This document only includes the bylaws changes that I originally submitted to Marian Olivas (in a different format) on June 20, 2018. It does not include a second bylaws change that Sheena Sanchez intended to add when Marian asked us to submit our proposed changes in the new format on August 14. Sheena is currently on vacation, but looking back at the vote that was taken on the second change to our bylaws, I do not think it was valid. The faculty voted on a question about the bylaws, not on the exact wording of the new bylaws. I have pasted that question below for your evaluation, but in my judgement, we will need to ask the faculty to vote on this second bylaws change after our bylaws committee drafts the new wording and obtains our chair’s approval.
I would be grateful if your committee could proceed with the proposed amendment attached. I apologize for the confusion and disorganization on our end.

Sincerely,

Greg Grether

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
Ballot

Monday, June 18, 2018-Tuesday, June 19, 2018

Ballot: By-Laws Vote

PLEASE VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING MOTION:

Please vote on the following proposal introduced this spring at faculty meetings:

Adjunct Assistant Professors in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology have historically taught 6 courses per year as a full load. The motion being considered is to lower the teaching load for these adjuncts to 4 courses per year (for 100% teaching positions). The reasoning for this is that the teaching workload for these positions should be between ladder faculty and lecturers (which teach 6 courses as a full load). This change would apply to all Adjunct Assistant Professors, including the new Adjunct Assistant Professors we plan to recruit in the upcoming year who will split their time between research in the lab of a ladder faculty member and teaching.

Do you support this suggested change to our by-laws?

☐ YES
☐ NO
☐ ABSTAIN
On Sep 4, 2018, at 3:43 PM, LINDA BOURQUE <lbourque@ucla.edu> wrote:

Dear Professor Grether:

Please submit the proposed amendment to the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology Bylaws within the context of the full set of bylaws and clearly indicate at the beginning of the document the date and results of the vote that approved the amended bylaws. These should be presented in two columns with the old information in the left column and the new information in the right column.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Linda Bourque

............................................
Dr. Gregory F. Grether
Professor and Vice Chair
Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
621 Charles E. Young Drive South
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606 USA

Phone: (310) 794-9769
Fax: (310) 206-3987
Website:  https://sites.lifesci.ucla.edu/eeb-gretherlab/
### Current bylaws

#### BYLAWS

**UCLA DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY**

**PREAMBLE**

This document is written to be in conformity with both the Standing Rules of the Regents of the University of California and Bylaw 55 of the State-wide Academic Senate of the University (UC SB 55). It was adopted by two-thirds majority vote of Departmental members of the UCLA Academic Senate following a regularly scheduled faculty meeting held on November 16, 2015 (20 of 29 eligible faculty voted; 22 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

1. **ORGANIZATION**

   1.1. The chief Departmental administrative officer is the Chair. The Chair receives assistance and advice from the Standing Committees of the Department, any Ad hoc Committees that may be appointed from time to time, and from the Faculty as a whole. Non-academic Staff assist the Chair in operational matters. The duties and responsibilities of the Chair are spelled out in the Announcement of the President entitled "Duties of Department Chairs (or Equivalent Officers)"

   1.2. One or more Vice-Chairs may be appointed by the Chair with the advice and consent of the Department and the approval of the Divisional Dean of Life Sciences. The normal term of service of a ViceChair will be three years with the appointment being

### Proposed bylaws

#### BYLAWS

**UCLA DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY**

**PREAMBLE**

This document is written to be in conformity with both the Standing Rules of the Regents of the University of California and Bylaw 55 of the State-wide Academic Senate of the University (UC SB 55). It was adopted by two-thirds majority vote of Departmental members of the UCLA Academic Senate following a regularly scheduled faculty meeting held on November 16, 2015 (20 of 29 eligible faculty voted; 22 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain) and was amended on April 9, 2018 (Of 32 faculty eligible to vote, 22 voted yes, 0 voted no, 0 abstained, 9 did not vote, and there was one recusal.).

1. **ORGANIZATION**

   1.1. **no change**

   1.2. **no change**
renewed annually. Vice Chairs will be responsible for duties assigned to them by the Chair.

1.3. There are five **Standing Committees**. Composition of committees is determined after consultation with faculty, who are asked for their preferences and allowed to review the list of assignments before it is finalized. Composition of committees is determined each year by the Chair, taking into account the following: (1) areas of expertise and interest of each faculty member; (2) discussions between Chair and Vice Chairs to achieve some balance of subject matter fields in a given year or on a rotating basis; (3) availability of faculty during the academic year for service on departmental committees; and (4) fairness of load, so that certain faculty members do not consistently carry an unfair burden. The standing committees are:

Personnel Committee  
Curriculum Committee  
Graduate Admissions and Support Committee  
Seminar Committee  
Departmental Awards Committee

Excepting only the Personnel Committee, **Standing Committees** may have student members, said students having full participatory and voting rights. The Chair works with appropriate Undergraduate and Graduate Student Organizations to identify student members. Students will normally serve for terms of one year. Except as explicitly provided below faculty appointments to standing committees are normally for terms of one or more years. The Chair ensures that terms are staggered in time.

1.4. **Ad hoc Committees** (e.g., Search Committees for new faculty members) may be
appointed by the Chair as needed for the operations of the Department. The Chair determines the charges for these committees as is appropriate.

1.5. **Special Functions** of the Department may be assigned by the Chair as responsibilities of individual members of the faculty. These Functions may include, but are not restricted to:

- Biomedical Library Liaison(s)
- Departmental Webmaster
- DWQE Coordinators
- Director, Botanical Garden/Herbarium
- Graduate Advisor
- Undergraduate Advisor
- MBQ Coordinator
- FBQ Coordinator
- Dickey Collection Advisor to the Chair

### 2. OPERATIONS

#### 2.1. Parliamentary Procedures and Voting

2.1.1 The Department operates according to the rules of both the UC statewide Academic Senate and the UCLA divisional Academic Senate. These bylaws apply to all Departmental actions on “substantial departmental questions” [UC SB 55(A)(1)] and all academic personnel actions [UC SB 55(B)(1-7)]. Except as specified below, standard parliamentary procedures are followed. When needed A. Sturgis' *The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedures* (4th edition, 2001) is used for guidance.

2.1.2 Faculty members in the Department who are members of the Academic Senate and have active appointments are eligible to vote on the matters specified in sec. 2.1.1. Only one series of titles is presently
represented: Regular Series (19900, Ladder; Tenured and Tenure-track). Changes in this governance document can only be made if the proposed action is a listed agenda item for a meeting of Departmental faculty that has been scheduled and publicized in advance according to normal Department procedure. A 2/3 majority vote of all Senate members present at such meetings is required for approval of changes. This document will be studied and revised by an ad hoc Bylaws Committee every 4 years; one of these revisions must occur during the year of Departmental self-review prior to the Department’s 8-year review.

2.1.3 All faculty members with Regular series titles and active appointments have equal voting rights in all Departmental matters, including personnel actions. Personnel voting rights on Appointments were extended to Assistant Professors by a two-thirds majority (# yes, # no) secret ballot following the November 9, 2015 faculty meeting. Voting rights on Full Professor Promotions and Merits were extended to Associate and Assistant Professors by a two-thirds majority (# yes, # no) secret ballot following the November 9, 2015 faculty meeting. Voting rights on Associate Professor Promotions and Merits were extended to Assistant Professors by a two-thirds majority (# yes, # no) secret ballot following the November 9, 2015 faculty meeting. Emeriti can participate in Departmental meetings; their voting privileges are determined at 4-year intervals at the time of revision of
these Bylaws. Currently, emeriti do not have personnel voting privileges, whether they are recalled, not recalled, or appointed as Research Professors. Recalled emeriti have voting privileges on all non-personnel substantial department questions. Adjunct faculty members can participate in Departmental meetings not involving personnel actions, but do not have voting privileges. Temporary faculty members may attend Departmental faculty meetings, but do not have voting privileges. Faculty members with joint appointments in other units have voting rights as agreed upon within the terms of their appointments.

2.1.4 Faculty members may vote by absentee ballot. Faculty members on leave may vote, but their votes will not be solicited. Secure electronic voting is available when feasible.

2.1.5 Majorities are determined on the basis of pro and con votes only; votes to abstain do not count.

2.1.6 Departmental meetings are normally called by the Chair or the Chair’s designee. Personnel actions and other substantial matters for consideration at Departmental meetings must appear on written agendas distributed to all faculty members at least three working days prior to the meetings. Exceptions to this rule require unanimous approval.

2.1.7 A quorum consists of 50% of the
regular faculty members not on leave.

2.1.8 Recruitment of new faculty is done by ad hoc search committees appointed by the Chair. Search committee recommendations are made to the department at scheduled faculty meetings as agenda items. Recommendations are discussed by all eligible faculty in attendance at those meetings. Faculty with active Regular series appointments will vote on proposed appointments by secret written ballots for periods of two business days, beginning immediately after the presentation meeting.

3. CHARGES TO COMMITTEES

3.1 RESPONSIBILITIES OF STANDING COMMITTEES

3.1.1 PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

All discussions of personnel actions are confidential. Committee membership consists of a minimum of four Regular series faculty. Ad hoc members may be added as needed, as in cases involving faculty with joint appointments with other units.

The Personnel Committee is primarily responsible for reviewing and recommending to the Chair and the Department the full range of personnel actions involving Regular series members of the Academic Senate, also appointees in the non-Senate Adjunct Professor series. There are two special categories of actions for which the Committee is designated as the final reviewing body.
making recommendations directly to the Chair:

1) Actions involving non-Senate appointees in the Adjunct Professor, Professional Researcher and Project Scientist series.

2) 5-year performance reviews of Senate members when such reviews are required under terms of the APM.

The Chair has discretion to bring any of these actions to the full Department if conditions arise in which Departmental review is considered essential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Actions</th>
<th>Promotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The Personnel Committee reviews and analyzes all aspects of a candidate's dossier, and makes a recommendation for action to the Department. Extramural references for candidates, when required, will be selected by the Department Chair after the candidate has been given the opportunity to provide suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2) The Personnel Committee presents its findings at a regularly scheduled Departmental meeting. After hearing the review and recommendation of the Committee, all regular members of the Department present discuss and consider the recommendation, then vote on it. A secret written ballot is held two working days after the discussion. The LSSA Office of Academic Personnel is responsible for conducting the ballot, the result of which is reported to the Chair. It is the responsibility of the Chair to recommending to the Chair and the Department the full range of personnel actions involving Regular series members of the Academic Senate.

It is also responsible for reviewing appointees in the non-Senate Adjunct Professor series.

There are two special categories of actions for which the Committee is designated as the final reviewing body, making recommendations directly to the Chair:

1) Actions involving non-Senate appointees in the Adjunct Professor, Professional Researcher and Project Scientist series.

2) 5-year performance reviews of Senate members when such reviews are required under terms of the APM.

The Chair has discretion to bring any of these actions to the full Department if conditions arise in which Departmental review is considered essential.

3.1.1.A Personnel Actions | Promotions |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The Personnel Committee reviews and analyzes all aspects of a candidate's dossier, and makes a recommendation for action to the Department. Extramural references for candidates, when required, will be selected by the Department Chair after the candidate has been given the opportunity to provide suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The Personnel Committee presents its findings at a regularly scheduled Departmental meeting. After hearing the review and recommendation of the Committee,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inform the candidate of the exact vote.

3) The Personnel Committee then advises the Chair in the preparation of the Departmental letter.

4) The Chair forwards the Departmental recommendation to the Dean. At the Chair's discretion a second ("Chair's") letter may be included as described in University policy.

Personnel Actions Merit Increases

Merit increases, including fourth-year appraisals for Assistant Professors, are handled in the same manner as promotions except that external reviews are not solicited. Voting eligibility for merit increases is the same as for promotions.

Personnel Actions Adjunct Professor Series

1) Any member of the regular faculty may nominate a candidate for appointment in the Adjunct series. Fully documented nominations are referred by the Chair to the Personnel Committee for review and recommendation. Appointments, advancements in rank, and merit increases are handled in the same manner as for regular series faculty. Each initial nomination and all recommendations for subsequent actions must include statements specifically describing the ways in which the candidates will contribute to departmental teaching programs at either or both the undergraduate or graduate levels during the duration of the initial appointment or renewal appointment. Those

all regular members of the Department present discuss and consider the recommendation, then vote on it. A secret written ballot is held two working days after the discussion. The LSSA Office of Academic Personnel is responsible for conducting the ballot, the result of which is reported to the Chair. It is the responsibility of the Chair to inform the candidate of the exact vote.

3) The Personnel Committee then advises the Chair in the preparation of the Departmental letter.

4) The Chair forwards the Departmental recommendation to the Dean. At the Chair's discretion a second ("Chair's") letter may be included as described in University policy.

3.1.1.B Personnel Actions Merit Increases

Merit increases, including fourth-year appraisals for Assistant Professors, are handled in the same manner as promotions except that external reviews are not solicited. Voting eligibility for merit increases is the same as for promotions.

3.1.1.C Personnel Actions Adjunct Professor Series

1) Any member of the regular faculty may nominate a candidate for appointment in the Adjunct series. Fully documented nominations are referred by the Chair to the Personnel Committee for review and recommendation. Appointments, advancements in rank, and merit increases are handled in the same manner as for regular series faculty.
statements must be developed jointly by the faculty sponsor and the candidate.

2) Votes on reappointments must be conducted by the Department every two years for appointees at the Assistant and Associate Professor levels, and every three years for appointees at the Full Professor level. The results are reported to the Divisional Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Actions – Research Professor Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Appendix 38: Research Professor was added to the UCLA CALL on April 6, 2012. The operative sections of that document state:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Professors Emeriti from UCLA who have continued a high level of research scholarship since their retirement may be eligible to utilize the title Research Professor as a working title. Appointees to Research Professor status must be able to demonstrate that their research activities since retirement have led to one or more of the following outcomes: an active external grant, a proposal to obtain external grant funding, or a recent history of external grant funding, internal research funds, publication of scholarly books, monographs, or journal articles, scholarly presentations at professional meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. TERMS OF SERVICE
Appointments as Research Professor shall be made for three years, or in cases where a Research Professor is Principal Investigator of an active regular series faculty. Each initial nomination and all recommendations for subsequent actions must include statements specifically describing the ways in which the candidates will contribute to departmental teaching programs at either or both the undergraduate or graduate levels during the duration of the initial appointment or renewal appointment. Those statements must be developed jointly by the faculty sponsor and the candidate.

2) Votes on reappointments must be conducted by the Department every two years for appointees at the Assistant and Associate Professor levels, and every three years for appointees at the Full Professor level. The results are reported to the Divisional Dean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1.1.D Personnel Actions – Research Professor Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Appendix 38: Research Professor was added to the UCLA CALL on April 6, 2012. The operative sections of that document state:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Professors Emeriti from UCLA who have continued a high level of research scholarship since their retirement may be eligible to utilize the title Research Professor as a working title. Appointees to Research Professor status must be able to demonstrate that their research activities since retirement have led to one or more of the following outcomes: an active external grant, a proposal to obtain external grant funding, or a recent history of external grant funding, internal research funds, publication of scholarly books, monographs, or journal articles, scholarly presentations at professional meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DMS 5–30
III. PROCEDURES
Appointment authority is delegated to academic deans and may not be further delegated. Requests for appointment as Research Professor are normally initiated through the department chair or ORU Director by submission of a letter by the applicant that documents his or her continuation of a high level of research scholarship since retirement. In accordance with department or ORU procedures, the chair or director should consult appropriately with the faculty. If the unit concurs, the chair or director shall recommend the appointment to the appropriate dean. The dean will notify the applicant of the decision in writing with a copy to the recommending unit. Renewal of an appointment is possible, but not automatic. The procedures for reappointment are the same as described above in this section.”

2) Departmental implementation of this policy will be done as follows:

a) Professors Emeriti wishing to be appointed as Research Professor will submit a letter to the Department Chair making that request. The letter must document their post retirement research activity in accordance with the terms of Appendix 38. It must also specify the requested duration of the appointment per the Appendix.

II. TERMS OF SERVICE
Appointments as Research Professor shall be made for three years, or in cases where a Research Professor is Principal Investigator of an active grant, for three years or the duration of the grant, whichever is longer.

III. PROCEDURES
Appointment authority is delegated to academic deans and may not be further delegated. Requests for appointment as Research Professor are normally initiated through the department chair or ORU Director by submission of a letter by the applicant that documents his or her continuation of a high level of research scholarship since retirement. In accordance with department or ORU procedures, the chair or director should consult appropriately with the faculty. If the unit concurs, the chair or director shall recommend the appointment to the appropriate dean. The dean will notify the applicant of the decision in writing with a copy to the recommending unit. Renewal of an appointment is possible, but not automatic. The procedures for reappointment are the same as described above in this section.”

2) Departmental implementation of this policy will be done as follows:

a) Professors Emeriti wishing to be appointed as Research Professor will submit a letter to the Department Chair making that request. The letter must document their post retirement research activity in accordance with the terms of Appendix 38. It must also specify the requested duration of the appointment per the Appendix.
b) The Chair will refer the letter to the Personnel Committee for its determination as to whether or not the request meets the standards of the Appendix. If it does meet the standards the Committee will recommend that the Chair forward the request to the Dean of Life Sciences. If it does not the Committee will return the letter to the Chair with its recommendation as to what additional information may be needed to satisfy the standards. A revised letter will be reviewed as a new submission.

c) This policy and procedure will go into effect July 1, 2012.

document their post retirement research activity in accordance with the terms of Appendix 38. It must also specify the requested duration of the appointment per the Appendix.

b) The Chair will refer the letter to the Personnel Committee for its determination as to whether or not the request meets the standards of the Appendix. If it does meet the standards the Committee will recommend that the Chair forward the request to the Dean of Life Sciences. If it does not the Committee will return the letter to the Chair with its recommendation as to what additional information may be needed to satisfy the standards. A revised letter will be reviewed as a new submission.

c) This policy and procedure will go into effect July 1, 2012.

3.1.1.E Personnel Actions – Policy on Acceleration Requests

1) All acceleration requests must be accompanied by a letter to the Chair from the candidate justifying the request. Regardless of the justification, all acceleration requests made by May 1 will be
### 3.1.2 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Committee membership consists of a minimum of three regular faculty members, one of whom is committee Chair, the Lead Undergraduate Student Affairs Officer, and the Faculty Undergraduate Advisor.

Committee responsibilities are:

1) **In general, to keep the catalogue and the schedule of classes up to date. To consider proposals for new courses or deletion or modification of existing courses by faculty members.** The Committee presents its recommendations for new courses, changes in course reviewed by the Personnel Committee, presented to the Department, and submitted to the Dean of Life Sciences, unless withdrawn by the candidate. Late acceleration requests, defined as those made after May 1, must be based on a significant achievement, such as a national award, that occurred or was announced after May 1. Whether this criterion has been met will be evaluated by the Personnel Committee.

2) **If the Personnel Committee determines that a late acceleration request is justified, the case will proceed as usual, unless an extension of the Dean's deadline is needed.** If an extension of the Dean’s deadline is needed, the Department will submit a request for an extension to the Dean, along with the candidate's justification.

3) **If the Personnel Committee finds that a late acceleration request is not justified, the candidate will be informed of the basis for this decision in writing.** If the candidate chooses to appeal the decision, their justification for the acceleration request and the Personnel Committee’s decision will be submitted to the Dean. The Department will proceed with the case, if asked to do so by the Dean.

---

**3.1.2 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

---
descriptions, and deletions of courses to the Chair for final approval.

2) Proposed changes in core curriculum and the preparation for the major must be approved by the Department.

3.1.3 GRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND SUPPORT COMMITTEE

Committee membership consists of five regular faculty members, one of whom is committee Chair, plus the Graduate Student Affairs Officer, and the Faculty Graduate Advisor. The latter two people are both ex officio members.

Committee responsibilities are:

1) The committee provides for the acceptance and admission of new graduate students. The committee monitors the calendar for admissions and works to ensure that offers of admission are as competitive as resources will permit. Through the Graduate Affairs Office it handles correspondence with prospective graduate students, manages student files, provides student files for faculty review, and designates provisional advisors.

2) The committee advises on policies and procedures for the selection, appointment and assignment of teaching assistants. It is responsible for collection of data for evaluation of the performance of teaching assistants. It generates and develops materials for orientation.

3.1.3 GRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND SUPPORT COMMITTEE

No change
of new appointees. It also provides advice on the administration of graduate fellowships such as Traineeships, Fellowships, and others which may be sought by graduate students in the Department. It administers Departmental (e.g., travel and dissertation research support) and Graduate Division funds that support graduate students.

3.1.4 SEMINAR COMMITTEE

The committee is responsible for organizing, scheduling, and overseeing the Departmental seminar program. The committee solicits suggestions from the faculty, graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows for desired speakers. Committee structure and operations vary at the discretion of the Chair.

3.1.5 DEPARTMENTAL AWARDS COMMITTEE

The committee is composed of at least two faculty members. The committee oversees the Departmental awards program with the advice and assistance of the Lead Undergraduate Student Affairs Officer and the Graduate Student Affairs Officer. The committee assists the Chair in preparing and selecting nominations for the numerous extra-departmental faculty awards and prizes (e.g., Faculty Research Lecturer, Distinguished Teaching Award, Woman Scientist of the Year, etc.) for which the Department is asked to submit names and dossiers each year.

4. APPENDICES

A. Policy on Adjunct Professors

1) An Adjunct appointment will be made only when the Department
2) All such appointees must meet the hiring standards that we impose on any candidate for a regular tenure track position.

3) The candidate must demonstrate a commitment to teach on a regular basis. This will include participation in a graduate or advanced undergraduate course, and may also involve lower division or core course teaching. While there is no commitment to a salary for such participation, it is not precluded for lower division and core teaching. Salaries for such teaching must be negotiated with the Department Chair. Appointees are encouraged to serve as members of advisory committees for graduate students.

4) All extramural funding for research administered through UCLA must be "signed off" by the University, although overhead may not necessarily go to UCLA unless the University is the sole underwriter of the grant.

5) Space must be negotiated with the Department Chair.

6) The candidate will be eligible to co-sponsor graduate students.

7) Advancement will follow the same procedures as for regular faculty. Evidence of continuing academic excellence and productivity, similar to our active faculty, will be a condition of continued appointment.

4. APPENDICES

A-4.1 Policy on Adjunct Professors

4.1.1 An Adjunct appointment will be made only when the Department will be clearly well served by such an appointment.

4.1.2 All such appointees must meet the hiring standards that we impose on any candidate for a regular tenure track position.

4.1.3 The candidate must demonstrate a commitment to teach on a regular basis. This will include participation in a graduate or advanced undergraduate course, and may also involve lower division or core course teaching. While there is no commitment to a salary for such participation, it is not precluded for lower division and core teaching. Salaries for such teaching must be negotiated with the Department Chair. Appointees are encouraged to serve as members of advisory committees for graduate students.

4.1.4 All extramural funding for research administered through
B. **Departmental Equipment and Services**

1) All equipment designated for instructional use and purchased with Departmental funds must be made available for regularly scheduled courses.

2) When such equipment is not in use in courses, it may be used for research with the understanding that it must be maintained in proper order by the faculty member concerned and that it must be relinquished promptly when needed for a course.

3) Whenever appropriate, major pieces of equipment purchased with Departmental funds and requiring special technical knowledge for their use will be assigned by the Chair to a specific faculty member who will assume responsibility for overall maintenance.

4) A current list of all pieces of Departmental equipment purchased for courses and their location will be available in the Stockroom. This will include a listing by courses.

5) The Facilities Manager will be responsible for maintaining a listing of all technical services (photographic, illustration, workshop, etc.) available in the Department.

UCLA must be "signed off" by the University, although overhead may not necessarily go to UCLA unless the University is the sole underwriter of the grant.

5) **4.1** Space must be negotiated with the Department Chair.

6) **4.1.6** The candidate will be eligible to co-sponsor graduate students.

7) **4.1.7** Advancement will follow the same procedures as for regular faculty. Evidence of continuing academic excellence and productivity, similar to our active faculty, will be a condition of continued appointment.
Departmental equipment purchased for courses and their location will be available in the Stockroom. This will include a listing by courses.

4.2.5 The Facilities Manager will be responsible for maintaining a listing of all technical services (photographic, illustration, workshop, etc.) available in the Department.
October 11, 2018

TO: Rules and Jurisdiction Committee, UCLA Academic Senate
FROM: Greg Grether, Vice Chair, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
RE: Amendment to department bylaws

Dear members of the Rules and Jurisdiction Committee,

Please find the attached proposed revision of the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) bylaws. The only substantive change is the addition of a new section (3.1.1.E) on acceleration requests. Our previous bylaws did not have a section on acceleration requests. As noted in the preamble, the exact wording of this amendment was presented to the EEB faculty and received a unanimous positive vote.

Professor Elizabeth Borque requested in an email dated 9/4/18 that we add additional subsection numbers for consistency. After some confusion on our end about exactly what was required, Marian Olivas kindly added subsection numbers and made some other minor wording changes. Those changes are tracked in the version attached.

Sincerely,

Greg Grether

Dr. Gregory F. Grether
Professor and Vice Chair
Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
621 Charles E. Young Drive South
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1606 USA

Phone: (310) 794-9769
Fax: (310) 206-3987
Website: https://sites.lifesci.ucla.edu/eeb-gretherlab/
To: Joseph Bristow, Chair  
Academic Senate  

From: Willeke Wendrich, Chair  
Graduate Council  

Date: October 24, 2018  

Re: Department of Biomathematics Name Change Proposal  

At its meeting on October 19, 2018, the Graduate Council reviewed the proposal from the Department of Biomathematics to change its name to the Department of Computational Medicine. I am pleased to report that the Graduate Council approved the department name change proposal at its meeting on October 19, 2018 (13 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions; GSA Reps: 4 in favor).

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.
October 2, 2018

Joseph Bristow
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Biomathematics Name Change Proposal

Dear Professor Bristow,

Thank you for providing the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) with an opportunity to comment on the proposal from the David Geffen School of Medicine requesting to change the name of the Department of Biomathematics to Department of Computational Medicine. At its meeting on October 1, 2018, the Council reviewed and approved (10 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain) the proposal to change the name of the department. No evident financial issues were observed.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at palsberg@ucla.edu or via the Council on Planning and Budget’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu or x62470.

Sincerely,

Jens Palsberg, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
August 14, 2018

Sandra Graham, Chair
Academic Senate
3125 Murphy Hall
Mail Code 140801

Dear Chairperson Graham:

This letter is written on behalf of the Dean’s Office of the David Geffen School of Medicine to support the name change which has been requested by the Department of Biomathematics in the DGSOM, to be effective as soon as administratively possible. The Department’s faculty voted to change its name to the Department of Computational Medicine. This name change is fully supported by the Dean’s Office and the Faculty Executive Committee of the DGSOM.

As detailed in the attached proposal, the name change is the result of a long-term strategic planning process for computational biology broadly defined in the David Geffen School of Medicine. The process began with the formation of the Biomedical Informatics Task Force (in Fall of 2013 and continued with two committees, the first commissioned by EVC Waugh and the second by Dr. Jayathi Murthy, Dean of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (HSSEAS). Each of these groups has been supportive of the proposed name change.

The name change represents an expansion of the scope of the current department to a broader focus that will include computational genomics. It also anticipates future plans to more closely affiliate the Department of Computational Medicine with the HSSEAS. The proposal provides further detail about this planned collaboration, which we believe can establish UCLA as the leading program in biomedical data science.

In further support of this request, I attach a vote page from the Department of Biomathematics, a letter of approval from the DGSOM FEC, a letter of support from the Dean of HSSEAS, and a resource analysis from AVC Roth.
We ask that you approve this request to change the name of the Department of Biomathematics to the Department of Computational Medicine. We believe that the new name correctly recognizes and describes the mission, work, and future of the Department. We are grateful for the Academic Senate’s consideration of our proposal and will be pleased to provide any additional information that is required.

Sincerely,

Jonathan R. Hiatt, M.D.
Professor of Surgery
Vice Dean for Faculty

Attachments
July 8, 2018

Kelsey C. Martin, M.D., Ph.D.
Dean, David Geffen School of Medicine

Dear Dr. Martin:

I am writing to formally request a change in the name of our department from “Biomathematics” to “Computational Medicine”. The departmental vote for the proposed change, was 11 in favor and 1 opposed, with votes received from all 12 voting members.

This name change (1) represents an expansion of the scope of the current department and (2) anticipates future plans for departmental affiliation. I shall deal with each of these in turn.

**Expanded departmental scope.** The department is now expanding beyond the current focus around the two excellent graduate programs hosted in the department (the Biomathematics Ph.D. program and the Masters in Clinical Research) to a broader focus which will include additional faculty and research areas. Specifically, the department will also now serve as an academic home for existing faculty in Computational Genomics, who currently have primary appointments in different departments and schools at UCLA, and a home for faculty who will be recruited to UCLA to work on machine learning and computer vision applied to electronic health data. The new department name reflects this broader scope.

**New departmental affiliation.** Changing the name of the department is the first step in the plan to more closely affiliate the Department of Computational Medicine with the School of Engineering. The department will provide new mechanisms for collaboration between the Schools of Engineering and Medicine at UCLA, facilitate the strengthening of our many existing collaborations, and provide infrastructure to support these collaborations. The ultimate goal is to maximize the impact of UCLA in scholarly research in this area in both the biomedical sciences and engineering and to translate advances from these efforts to the UCLA Health System and beyond.

The Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and the David Geffen School of Medicine have had a decades-long history of successful collaboration. The UCLA Health System recently has made its full complement of electronic health records available to researchers and is collecting genomic, imaging and other types of data at a breathtaking pace. Analysis of these data will yield tremendous medical and biological advances yet requires sophisticated data science which is not currently present in the medical school. The collaboration between HSSEAS and DGSOM faculty in the development of systems for collecting and analyzing personal sensor data from cohorts of more than 100,000 people lies at the heart of the Depression Grand Challenge, which will extend opportunities for collaboration...
for at least the next decade. The recently established Institute for Precision Health in the medical school in addition to the plans for the Department of Computational Medicine provide unique opportunities to build upon successful collaborations between these two schools and to encourage new ones.

The Department of Computational Medicine will play a critical role in strengthening collaboration between engineering and medicine at UCLA including the development of a roadmap for establishing UCLA as the leading program in biomedical data science. While there are many areas of collaboration between engineering and medicine, the department’s focus is on areas related to data science.

The name change is the result of a long term strategic planning process for computational biology broadly defined in the David Geffen School of Medicine. The process began with the formation of the Biomedical Informatics Task Force (of which I was the chair) in Fall of 2013. The task force represented the various stakeholders including departments, graduate programs and institutes involved in computational Biology at UCLA. One of the key recommendations of the task force report was to expand the scope of Biomathematics and change the name of the department to reflect the new scope. Computational Medicine was one of several names that were proposed in the task force report. After my appointment as department chair, two additional campus committees were appointed to help organize the computational biology landscape at UCLA and define where the department, with its new scope, fits into the landscape. The first committee, commissioned by Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh, is the “Committee to Evaluate Computational Biology, Genomics and Medicine Landscape at UCLA”, led by Dr. Judith Gasson and representing various stakeholders in areas related to computational biology and computational medicine. The second committee, commissioned by Dr. Jayathi Murthy, Dean of the HSSEAS, is the “Engineering Committee on Strategic Opportunities in Computational Medicine” led by Dr. Jens Palsberg and representing various stakeholders in units that will be involved in bridging Engineering and Medicine. Both of these campus committees were asked to discuss the new scope of the department and proposed name change and are enthusiastically supportive of both. In particular, the Report from Dr. Gasson’s Committee, submitted on July 5, 2018, stated the following:

“We unanimously endorse the name Computational Medicine for the department currently being structured between the Schools of Medicine and Engineering. The department will serve as a resource to support data science collaborations between the two schools. It will build upon existing collaborative strengths in Computational Genetics and Genomics, as well as, supporting faculty in areas including Clinical Machine Learning, with concordant strategic recruitment in such areas. The department will also recruit faculty in other areas, such as Computer Vision, which naturally bridge the two schools. In these disciplinary areas the department will engage with interdepartmental programs for graduate training rather than develop a departmental program.”

Our department is not the first to request a change in its name. In 2013, UCLA “Anesthesiology” changed its name to “Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine.” In earlier years, UCLA "Radiology" changed to "Radiological Sciences" and UCLA "Family Practice" to "Family Medicine". Furthermore, the inclusion of the word "Medicine" is not unique; many departments/divisions already include the name, such as Internal Medicine, Emergency Medicine, Family Medicine, Transfusion Medicine, Sleep Medicine, Undersea Medicine, Palliative Medicine, and others. The word “medicine” is appropriate for all endeavors in medical sciences and practice of medicine.
The Department of Computational Medicine at UCLA is committed to becoming an internationally renowned and leading program in data science applied to biomedical data and is committed to transforming patient care in the UCLA Health System by leveraging recent advances in machine learning and artificial intelligence. The name change is an important first step.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Eleazar Eskin, Ph.D.
Chair, Department of Biomathematics
David Geffen School of Medicine
University of California, Los Angeles
VOTE ON DEPARTMENTAL NAME CHANGE

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH BYLAW 55
(Please make all entries in the columns to the right)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report of Vote</th>
<th>Primary Department:</th>
<th>Secondary Department:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicate class of eligible voters under approved departmental procedures for implementation of Bylaw 55.</td>
<td>Biomathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples: elected committee tenure staff entire staff, etc.</td>
<td>All Faculty in the Regular and In Residence series and Recalled Emeritus Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number eligible to vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion voted upon and proposed effective date

Proposed departmental name change from “Biomathematics” to “Computational Medicine”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aye</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Other (Explain)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DMS 6–8
August 2, 2018

To: Eleazar Eskin, Ph.D.
   Chair, Department of Biomathematics
   David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

From: Alon Y. Avidan, M.D., M.P.H.
      Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
      Professor of Neurology
      David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA

Re: Change in department name from “Biomathematics” to “Computational Medicine”

Dear Dr. Eskin,

Thank you, on behalf of the Faculty Executive Committee, for attending the meeting of August 1st, 2018 to present the proposed name department name change from “Biomathematics” to “Computational Medicine”.

After review and discussion in executive session, the members of the committee returned the following vote: eleven in favor, one abstention, and three absent from the meeting.

Respectfully,

Alon Y. Avidan, M.D.
Chair of the Faculty, DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee (FEC)

cc: Nader Pouratian, M.D., Ph.D., Vice Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
    Gary J. Schiller, M.D., Past Chair of the Faculty (DGSOM Faculty Executive Committee)
    Jonathan R. Hiatt, M.D., Vice Dean for Faculty, DGSOM
August 3, 2018

Sandra Graham, Chair
Academic Senate
3125 Murphy Hall
Mail Code 140801

Dear Chairperson Graham:

I am writing on behalf of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (HSSEAS) to provide enthusiastic support for the name change, which has been requested by the Department of Biomathematics in the David Geffen School of Medicine. The new proposed name is the Department of Computational Medicine.

The name change is the first step in a process of substantial collaboration between the Department of Computational Medicine and the HSSEAS. We hope that this collaboration will eventually take the form of a joint department spanning both schools. Department Chair Eleazar Eskin, holding a professorial appointment in HSSEAS and in DGSOM, is an ideal leader for this evolving department as the collaboration grows and flourishes.

Thank you for considering this proposal. Please let me know if you need any further information.

Sincerely,

Jayathi Murthy
Ronald and Valerie Sugar Dean, HSSEAS
To: Julio Vergara, Chair, 2017-18 Graduate Council  
From: Jeff Roth, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning & Budget  
Date: August 13, 2018  
Re: Resource Analysis of Computational Medicine Departmental Name Change  

Dear Julio,

I am writing in response to a request for a resource analysis of the David Geffen School of Medicine’s proposal to change the name of the Department of “Biomathematics” to “Computational Medicine”. The proposal points to the broadening scope of the Department and the growing role of the Department in cross-campus collaborations related to computational biology and biological data science.

My office reviewed this proposal and determined that there are no implications on campus resources as a result of this name change. The Office of Academic Planning and Budget views the increase in cross-campus collaboration as a positive trend.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Jeff Roth  
Associate Vice Chancellor  
Academic Planning and Budget

cc: Estrella Arciba, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate  
    Joseph Bristow, Vice Chair and Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
    Eleazar Eskin, Chair, Department of Biomathematics  
    Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate  
    Sandra Graham, Chair, Academic Senate  
    Jonathan Hiatt, Vice Dean for Faculty, David Geffen School of Medicine  
    Kelsey Martin, Dean, David Geffen School of Medicine  
    Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
    Anja Paardekooper, Senior Associate Dean, Finance and Administration,  
        David Geffen School of Medicine  
    Beth Lazazzera, Chair, Undergraduate Council  
    Eric Wells, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) determines criteria for undergraduate admission, considers issues and policies related to admissions, and makes valuable contributions to the admissions process, both at the freshman and advanced standing (transfer) levels. The CUARS Chair also serves as liaison to the University of California Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and reports to and advises the Academic Senate and the Chancellor on matters involving undergraduate admissions and relations with schools.

CUARS develops and monitors research on admissions criteria used to support the University’s goals and objectives of excellence, access, and diversity. Additionally, the Committee monitors campus procedures for recruitment, outreach, and informational services to schools in order to ensure a well-informed and diverse student body. This report summarizes the Committee’s activities and actions during the 2017-2018 academic year.

Undergraduate Admission - Overview

For students hoping to matriculate to UCLA in fall 2017 (i.e. fall 2016 applicants), the university received a total of 102,242 freshman applications (63,523 CA Residents, 21,004 domestic nonresidents, and 17,715 international) and 21,859 transfer applications (18,333 CA community college, 859 other UCs, 354 CA state universities, and 2,313 from other schools). The number of applications continues to increase in all categories (i.e. freshman, transfer, California resident, domestic nonresident, and international). Comparative applications data is presented in table form on the following pages.
Table 1. Fall 2017 Freshman Applications Overview by Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>California Residents</th>
<th>Out of State</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicants</td>
<td>63,523</td>
<td>21,004</td>
<td>17,715</td>
<td>102,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admits</td>
<td>9,288</td>
<td>4,873</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>16,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>6,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit Rate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll Rate</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Applicants</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Fall 2017 Freshmen Application Quartiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>Out of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>Out of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Weighted GPA</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted GPA</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Composite</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Courses (domestic only)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Fall 2017 Enrolled Freshman Quartiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25th Percentile</th>
<th>75th Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>Out of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Weighted GPA</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unweighted GPA</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Composite</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Courses (domestic only)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Fall 2017 Transfer Applications Overview by Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>% of Total Applicants</th>
<th>% of Total Admits</th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Admits</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>17,302</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>4,594</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2,649</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>3,814</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Fall 2017 Transfer Applications Overview by College and School Applied to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>% of Total Applicants</th>
<th>% of Total Admits</th>
<th>Admits</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Admits</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>% of Total Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,859</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,531</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3,167</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters &amp; Science</td>
<td>16,679</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>4,974</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Arts &amp; Architecture</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering &amp; Applied Science</td>
<td>3,498</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Music</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Theater, Film &amp; Television</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Application Trends from 2000-2017

Table 7. Freshmen Undergraduate Admissions History from 2000-2017
Changes to UC Academic Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area D)

This year the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) discussed making changes to UC Academic Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (Area D), the regulation governing the amount of laboratory science coursework required to be eligible for admission as a freshman applicant. A BOARS workgroup recommended that the UC:

1) Increase the minimum area “d” requirement from 2 years (3 recommended) to 3 years, while continuing to require 2 units of coursework that “provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics.”

2) Change the name of the area “d” subject requirement from Laboratory Science to Science.

The proposed regulation is as follows (proposed text deletions are highlighted with a red strikethrough, while proposed additions are highlighted with blue, underlined text):

424. Candidates applying for freshman admission on the basis of a transcript of record from a secondary school in California must satisfy the course work requirements specified in this regulation. (Am 2 Jun 77; Am 26 May 82; Am 3 May 90; Am 24 May 00) (Am 17 June 2009)
A. Course Requirements

1. Unit Requirements For the purpose of this Regulation, a unit consists of a year-long college preparatory course approved by the University at the applicant’s high school, in one of the following subject areas: History/Social Science, English, Mathematics, Laboratory Science, Language Other Than English, Visual and Performing Arts, and College-Preparatory Electives. A minimum of 15 units must be completed in grades 9-12 as specified in paragraph C of this Regulation. However, courses in Mathematics and Language other than English taken in grades 7 and 8 may be included in the required 15 units if the courses are accepted by the applicant’s high school as equivalent to high school courses that meet the a-g requirements of SR.424.A.3. At least 7 of the 15 required units must be completed during the applicant’s last two years in high school. A minimum of 11 units must be completed before the end of grade 11. (Rev 4 May 1995) (Am 17 June 2009) (Am June 2013)

2. Exception to the Unit Requirements Notwithstanding Paragraph A.1 of this Regulation, a campus may elect to admit an applicant who does not present the required minimum 15 units prior to high school graduation, provided that the applicant has completed 11 units before the end of the grade 11, including those specified in Paragraph A.3 of this Regulation. Campuses should exercise this option sparingly, and only when an applicant presents a strong overall record of academic achievement that is at least comparable to the records of other applicants admitted to the campus. (Am 17 June 2009) (Am June 2013)

3. Specific Subject Requirements The following subject requirements must be satisfied through the completion of approved courses of study as provided in Bylaw 145.B.5.

a. History/Social Science, 2 units. One unit of world history, cultures, and historical geography; and, one unit of US History or one-half unit of US History and one-half unit of Civics or American government. (Am 17 June 2009)


c. Mathematics, 3 units. Four are recommended. Must include the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and two- and threedimensional geometry. (Am 17 June 2009)

d. Laboratory Science, 2 3 units. Three are recommended. Must provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics. (Am 17 June 2009)
e. Language other than English, 2 units. Three are recommended. Both units must be in the same language. (Am 17 June 2009)

f. Visual and performing arts, 1 unit. Must be a single, year-long course in dance, drama/theater, music, or visual art. (Am 17 June 2009)

g. College preparatory elective, 1 unit. Additional approved a-f courses beyond the minimum required, or courses that have been approved specifically in the ‘g’ subject area (Am 17 June 2009)

Many of the local divisions, including UCLA, expressed concerns about the potential negative impact of the changes on diversity, access, and that they could lead to a potential ‘watering down’ of the curriculum by including online courses, and courses where students are not actively engaged in the process of gathering data and texting conclusions. However, despite these concerns, Academic Council approved the proposed change on February 14, 2018, with a vote of 29 in favor and 6 opposed. As of this writing, the UC Provost has delayed advancing the revision to the Regents in order to better prepare responses to anticipated questions about access concerns. If approved by the Regents, the change will affect students entering high school in 2019 and hoping to matriculate to a UC in fall 2023.

UCLA Graduate Professional Schools Expanding to Offer Undergraduate Degrees

This year CUARS considered a proposal from UCLA’s Luskin School of Public Affairs, which currently only confers graduate degrees, to establish a B.A. in Public Affairs. Similar programs are currently being developed by the Graduate School of Education and Information Sciences and the Fielding School of Public Health. In order to address possible admissions concerns, the Luskin School proposed that their program will be a ‘transfer only’ major (i.e. they will not offer direct freshman admission). The proposed admissions plan will allow undergraduates in the College of Letters and Science and other schools the opportunity to apply to transfer to the Luskin School. The Luskin School is hoping to allot approximately 50% of their seats for students transferring from CA community colleges; the remaining students will be selected from students who are already enrolled at UCLA. CUARS was supportive of the proposed admission structure.

Admission by Exception and Student-Athlete Admissions

Over the course of many meetings, CUARS analyzed UCLA’s admissions by exception (AxE) practices, including student-athlete admissions practices. The committee was satisfied with the current practices, but does wish to form a stronger relationship with the Student-Athlete Admissions Committee, which is currently not affiliated with CUARS. In 2018-19 CUARS will attempt to have a member of the Student-Athlete Admissions Committee periodically join CUARS to provide the committee with an update and facilitate the sharing of information and best practices. Admissions will also begin to regularly provide CUARS with anonymized data regarding student-athlete admissions. CUARS has recommended that data are tracked on the numbers of student athlete prospects with files that are vetted prior to consideration or formal vote by the the Student-Athlete Admissions Committee.
Admissions and Student Success

This year CUARS examined UCLA freshmen holistic review process as it relates to student success. While understanding success can mean many different things, GPA and graduating with a degree from UCLA within 4/6 years were eventually identified as the most salient measures for routine analysis. Interpretation of the analyses by members supported the impression UCLA’s holistic review policy and practices function as intended (i.e., to consider student credentials within the high school contexts in which they are achieved), and that students from all admissions bands are succeeding. Furthermore, holistic scoring appears to make discriminations at the top end of the scale that are not fully explained by quantitative metrics alone (i.e., GPA and test scores) which is consistent with what we would expect with such a large proportion of applicants with excellent metrics and with the objective of considering the full 14 factors considered in comprehensive review. Holistic scores, in turn, are associated with a range of key campus performance outcomes. However, given the rise in the number of applications and UCLA’s increasing selectivity, the committee determined it might be necessary to monitor the outcomes of the existing holistic scoring structure. With well over 100,000 freshmen applications received a year, it will become increasingly challenging to make discriminations among an already highly qualified pool of applicants.

Executive Sessions

This year CUARS members reserved the final 30 minutes of every meeting for an executive session of the voting members of the committee. Members found the practice to be useful, and the committee decided to permanently continue with these sessions moving forward.

Community College Transfer Guarantee

In April, 2018, UC President Janet Napolitano and California Community College (CCC) Chancellor Eloy Oakley signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) asking the UC Academic Senate to create a systemwide transfer guarantee for students applying to UCs from CCCs. Any guarantee would have to be approved by the UC Academic Senate, which was not consulted prior to the signing of the MOU. BOARS was not consulted prior to the announcement of the MOU, but has been asked to develop the policy for approval by the Academic Council and Regents for implementation to inform enrolled CCC students in Fall 2019. A new workgroup has been formed and includes members of the earlier Transfer Task Force, UC Admissions Directors, and CCC representatives. BOARS is currently discussing proposals for a transfer guarantee that focus on maintaining a certain GPA in one of the twenty-one currently approved UC Transfer Pathways. Similar to the system-wide guarantee for CA freshmen admissions, it is believed that any transfer guarantee will employ a system of admission by referral to UCs with capacity in intended majors. Many of the UCs that struggle to maintain the 2:1 freshmen-to-transfer admissions ratio are excited by the prospect of a transfer guarantee. Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs) currently in place at all but three UC campuses (UCLA, UCB, and UCSD) will still be in effect. It is expected that any guarantee will have a minimal impact on UCLA’s current transfer admissions. However, there are concerns at UCLA and across the system that there may be confusion about the nature of the system-wide guarantee among transfer applicants.
**Annual Compare Favorably Reporting**

Each year BOARS requests information from each campus asking them to compare the success of their CA freshmen admits to that of international freshmen student admits. A variety of factors are examined, including GPA, admissions exams, and first-year performance of students who have matriculated to a UC. UCLA international students continue to compare favorably to domestic admits.

**Potential Issues CUARS May Consider in 2018-19**

- Proposed Community College Transfer Guarantee
- Increasing Number of Applications and Selectivity
- Graduate Professional Schools Offering Undergraduate Programs
- Strengthening Ties with the Student-Athlete Admissions Committee
- Increases in Enrollment Targets
- Transfer Admissions Practices

**Relationship with Undergraduate Admission, Enrollment Management, and other Consultants**

CUARS benefitted greatly from productive relationships with various administrative offices at UCLA. Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Youlonda Copeland-Morgan, UCLA Director of Undergraduate Admission Gary Clark, Associate Director of Admission Mike Drish, Associate Vice Provost for Student Diversity and Director of the Academic Advancement Program Charles Alexander, Director of Enrollment Planning and Academic Performance Analysis Robert Cox, Undergraduate Admissions Principal Administrative Analyst Tom Skewes-Cox, and Executive Director of Institutional Research and Decisions Support Adam Sugano participated in CUARS meetings throughout the year and provided valuable data and perspectives to the committee. CUARS looks forward to continuing these productive relationships in the 2018-19 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Cohen, English
Barbara Knowlton, Psychology
Jessica Lynch-Alfaro, Society and Genetics
William Newman, Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences
Rene Ong, Physics and Astronomy
Majid Sarrafzadeh, Computer Science
Richard Weiss, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Anna Lau, Psychology, Chair
ANNUAL REPORT 2017-2018

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics represents the Academic Senate and serves as a pathway for communication with the UCLA Administration with respect to matters primarily pertaining to the academic matters and the welfare of the university’s student-athletes. A major responsibility of the Committee involves reviewing policies and practices of the UCLA Athletics Department as they affect the academic progress and performance of student-athletes. The Committee also engages broader issues regarding the relation of the athletics program to the overall academic mission of the university. The Committee advises the Administration and Athletics Department and maintains liaison with equivalent committees at other universities on matters of policy.

Summary

The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics met three times and discussed several key topics during the academic year. Among the most prominent:

1. Measuring Success- Coaching and Encouraging the Student Athlete
2. Safety-Research on Concussions and Head Injuries
3. Academic Progress and Rating of UCLA Student-Athletes
4. Changes to the Graduation Success Rate NCAA Reporting

Major Topics for the Academic Year 2017-18

Measuring Success- Coaching and Encouraging the Student Athlete

Throughout the academic year the Committee met with UCLA coaches from the following teams; Amy Fuller, Head Coach for the Women’s Rowing Team, Cori Close, Head Coach for the Women’s Basketball Team and Kirk Walker, Assistant Coach for the Softball Team. Coaches were invited to discuss their team’s challenges, successes and the encouragement provided to support their athlete’s balance between their academics and sport.

The committee first heard from Coach Fuller who shared testimonials from her alumni. The committee was impressed with the accomplishments made by many of the rowing alumni. Athletes who take up rowing do so because they love the sport, not to become professional athletes. For this reason the coaching staff encourage their women to do well academically and to
earn their degrees and continue to graduate school. The philosophy of Coach Fuller’s program is development and retention.

The committee next met with Coach Close who believes in providing a complete and transformational experience. College athletics has shifted from being transformative to transactional. She demands that her players remain fully committed-balance their academics, tune out the noise, stay focus and “ponder the stone” (consider something deeply). During basketball season the players have no life. They are student-athletes, its basketball, and your academics. The average team GPA is a 3.5, and Coach Close believes the team’s time management, leadership and commitment helps maintains the team’s high GPAs.

Kirk Walker, Assistant Softball Coach shared some of the teams’ successes and the ways the coaching staff maintains balance. Given the length of the Softball season and the value placed on academics, the staff have implemented a six week Summer Bridge Program helping to acclimate and transition new recruits to campus life. The Bridge program has been successful in bringing the athlete up to speed with the University’s academic programs, the peer learning program and getting accustomed to attending study hall. The Softball season is extremely long (spanning over two quarters), traveling is extremely taxing on the team. It is difficult to create windows and time to study, especially when competitions and games are in the middle of the day.

It was agreed upon by all three coaches, the need for additional study space on campus within close proximity to practice areas. In addition providing some time of outlet for the teams and being able to expose them to cultural and art experience given their time commitments.

It becomes problematic coordinating travel arrangements to athletic events, when professors change their final exam schedule. Based on anecdotal information from student athletes, final exam schedules were changed. The committee learned that some professors change their final exams to week 10 or to weekends. The general policy notes: The instructor’s methods of evaluation must be announced at the beginning of the course. Final written examinations may not exceed three hours’ duration and are given only at the times and places established and published by the department chair and the registrar. [UCLA Academic Senate regulation A-332(A)]. The committee agreed that the final exam schedule provided by the Registrar should be followed. The question probed the committee to investigate further. However, after asking a few athletes who shared their exams had been changed to their Coach- later no one wanted to provide their course and professor’s name. The committee thought that if this was a general problem across the university, it might be relevant to discuss this topic with colleagues at the College Level (i.e., the Undergraduate Council or other appropriate committees).

Safety-Research on Concussions & Head Injuries
Doctor Christopher Giza, Assistant Professor of Neurosurgery from the Steve Tisch, BrainSport Program- presented on sports concussions and brain health. For the past 30 years UCLA has studied head and brain injuries. A concussion is defined as a brain movement injury. To decrease risk, individual athlete’s go through a series of multimodal pre-season baseline testing to improve concussion detection. Protecting athletes from premature contact risk, repeat concussion, and orthopedic injury, is practiced by; good team play, when in doubt sit them out, wearing protective equipment and reducing unnecessary contact. The old way of thinking to take
time off after trauma to the brain is no longer. New data and research indicates that turning the brain off after an injury is not a good way to restore the brain. Athletes are encouraged to gradually return to normal activity (cognitive and physical) with improved safe recovery and to avoid prolonged inactivity. Information was shared on the largest concussion study initiative ($30 million) between the NCAA and the Department of Defence Grand Alliance- Care Consortium-studying the safety of student-athletes and service members. The data gathered takes place over several phases; clinical outcomes (CLIN), Head Impact Measurements (Helmet Sensors, HIM), Advance Neuroimaging (MRI), Biotechnology- delivering therapy for neurodegenerative (BIOGEN).

The committee’s primary concern is the student-athletes academic recovery. Dr. Giza explained that different forms of controlled exercise expedite recovery. Specifically with Football “the kickoff” continues to be discussed and ways to improve the play of the game to ensure player’s safety. We cannot forget our women athletes- a third of the study identifies women who have suffered concussions. Researchers and engineers are looking at sensors for women such as, mouth guards and retainers. Our UCLA teams have been asked to incorporate preventative measures to reduce risk, keeping the focus on player’s safety.

Academic Progress & Rating of UCLA Student-Athletes
A primary responsibility of the Committee is to review the academic progress of student-athletes at UCLA. The Committee reviewed three reports over the course of the year presented by Ja’nae Davis, Associate Athletic Director for Academic Student Services and Nicholas Thornton, Assistant Director of Compliance and Eligibility. The Fall 2017- Spring 2018 Academic Summary Report provided data on four key areas (broken down by quarter): (1) the Director’s Honor Roll; (2) Fall 2017 Graduates; (3) NCAA Academic Eligibility Issues and (4) Students Below a 2.0 cumulative GPA. Historically the percentage of student-athletes who achieve the Honor Roll designation fall between 45-50%; and in 2017-18 all three quarterly figures have exceeded the ranges, averaging well above 50%. The Athletic Department’s general goal is to keep the percentage of student-athletes falling below a 2.0 Cumulative GPA at 2% or less per quarter, The Athletic Department has been successful noting improvements with the average remaining under 2% overall. The percentage most commonly consist of freshman/sophomores, as student-athletes tend to become better adjusted and more fully utilize the department’s academic services over time. Noted in the Spring and comparing quarters, athlete’s GPA’s tend to drop between the Winter and Spring quarters.

Changes to the Graduation Success Rate NCAA Reporting
The NCAA approved a new calculation method to determine an institution’s Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The new ruling allows student-athletes in good academic standing who depart from an institution to pursue professional athletics to no longer negatively impact the institutions GSR. Institution will no longer be penalized when an academically eligible athlete departs to play professionally. This is a HUGE win for UCLA.

Respectfully submitted,
IAC 2017-18:
Peter Bradley, Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics
John Hughes, Management
ANNUAL REPORT 2017-2018

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Committee on Teaching represents the Academic Senate on issues pertaining to pedagogy and teaching, and has two major responsibilities: (1) the selection of six members of the Senate, three non-Senate faculty, and five teaching assistants to receive awards for distinguished teaching, and (2) the advising of the Division and departments with regard to policies that will enlarge possibilities for distinguished teaching and improve the quality of instruction, including methods of evaluation of teaching.

Summary:
The Committee on Teaching (COT) met a total of five times throughout the academic year and discussed several key topics at these meetings and also via emails. Among the most prominent were the following:

1. Campus-Wide Strategic Reports
2. Ad hoc Committee to Improve Teaching Evaluations
3. Classroom Etiquette
5. Revisions to Appendix XII

In addition, the Committee members spent the majority of their time evaluating and selecting the Distinguished Teaching Award nominations.

Campus-Wide Strategic Reports:
Academic Senate Leadership requested the Committee’s feedback on the Classroom Advisory Committee Report and Education Task Force Report. Members read through both reports, and the reports were extensively discussed. The comments from the committee were summarized in the following two letters.

“Classroom Advisory Committee Report_COT to Sandra Graham.pdf”

The abovementioned letters also referred to the following letter from the previous year’s COT:
“COT Online Education Issues Definition-ac3.pdf”

Ad hoc Committee to Improve Teaching Evaluations:
A working group comprised of former Academic Senate Chairs, Distinguished Teaching Award winners, and Office of Instructional Development staff was put together to revise teaching evaluations and pilot a new form of the teaching evaluation. The chair of this group had asked the COT to consider making this group an ad hoc committee of the COT. The COT members extensively discussed this request, and unanimously agreed that the teaching evaluation working group should remain separate and continue as an independent group.

**Classroom Etiquette:**
After receiving a request from the Office of Instructional Development (OID) to consider creating guidelines on classroom etiquette, the Committee reviewed OID’s website (http://www.oid.ucla.edu/classroom) and unanimously agreed that there should be guidelines and a section added to their site on “Good Classroom Practices.” To ensure all classes can begin on time, the following guidelines were recommended for all instructors; 1) Erase all chalkboards/whiteboards at the end of class. 2) Leave all the classrooms in a condition that allows the next class to begin without any interruptions. 3) Instructors and students should be out of the classroom at least five minutes before the next class beginning.

**Second Systemwide Review Proposed APM 285, 2103, 133, 740, 135 and 235**
The Committee read the above document, and did not agree that the working title “Teaching Professor” be used for Lecturers with Security of Employment and Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment. The COT believed that someone whose primary function is teaching and not research is a Lecturer and not a Professor. In these cases, the COT advised that the word “Professor” should not be used in any working title and instead proposed that the title “Lecturer” should be used. The COT believed that creating the title of “Teaching Professor” could send the message to regular series faculty that teaching is not an essential part of their mission. In addition, the COT did not agree that the Chancellor be given the authority to appoint an Associate Professor or Professor to the Associate Lecturer with Security of Employment or Lecturer with Security of Employment title. This action was looked upon as being demoralizing to an individual who has spent many years of dedication and service to the university.

**Revisions to Appendix XII**
The Committee read the above document, and had the following feedback. Due to the use of the word “ordinarily” in Sections 5b and c, the COT was concerned that the changes in these sections seem to imply that the Discrimination Prevention Office (DPO) of the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) or the Title IX Office need not be the primary investigatory body for complaints. The COT believed that these offices should be handling these cases as these offices have professionals trained in dealing with these sensitive issues. Sections 5b and c also mention that the accused faculty member has a right to appear before the Charges Committee but does not also grant that same right to the alleged victim. This was also problematic to the COT. Moreover, Section 5c also grants the Charges Committee the authority “to determine de novo whether the underlying facts constitute a violation of APM 015, Part II, Section A.2, C.5, or D.2.” This was also identified as a problem since the Charges Committee comprised of faculty is given the power to make a decision that may be counter to conclusions made by the trained professionals in the Title IX Office or DPO. Accordingly, the COT recommended that the changes to Appendix XII be revised in consultation with the Title IX Office and DPO.
**Distinguished Teaching Awards:**
The committee spent considerable time over the course of three meetings discussing the nominations received for the 2017-2018 Distinguished Teaching Awards for Senate Faculty, Teaching Assistants, and Non-Senate Faculty. The committee also discussed revisions to the brochure and award information. The Office of Instructional Development and COT were victorious in securing an award amount of $6,000 for the Non-Senate teaching award, which now matches that of the Senate award. The noticeable increases in the number of nomination packets received were debated as well as the multiple nominations received from the same department. Members expressed how multiple nominations received from one department inevitably led to comparisons and is a disadvantage to those candidates. In the future, sample templates will be provided that serve as examples of what should be included in the dossiers to ensure consistency among the nominees’ packets.

The following awardees were selected:

**Senate Faculty**
- David Macfadyen, Comparative Literature, and Musicology
- Lorrie Frasure-Yokley, Political Science
- Christopher Kelty, Institute for Society and Genetics
- Vilma Ortiz, Sociology
- Casey Reas, Design Media Arts
- Sarah Stein, History

**Teaching Assistants**
- Scott Abramson, Languages and Cultures
- Kevin Coffey, Earth, Planetary and Space Science
- William Kowalsky, Philosophy
- Danielle Smith, Psychology
- Devon Widmer, Chemistry and Biochemistry

**Non-Senate Faculty**
- Zhao Li, Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Karen Cunningham, English
- Dana Watson, Writing Programs

All committee members have been invited to attend the Andrea L. Rich Night to Honor Teaching ceremony, to be held in October 2018, where the recipients will be recognized.

Respectfully submitted,
Committee on Teaching 2017-18:
Paul Barber, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
James Bisley, Neurobiology
Samuel Culbert, Management
Jeanne Miranda, Psychiatry & Bio-Behavioral Sciences
Lee Todd Miller, Pediatrics
Thomas O’Dell, Physiology
John Papadopoulos, Classics
Srinivasa Reddy, Medicine Cardiology
Joanna Schwartz, Law
Daniel Kamei, Bioengineering, **CHAIR**

Submitted: September 2018
ANNUAL REPORT 2017-2018

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) is the Academic Senate’s primary pathway for communication with the UCLA Administration concerning library services and scholarly communication. The Committee takes, as its principal obligation, to reflect and articulate the views of UCLA faculty members concerning the role of the University Library in the acquisition, storage, and provision of scholarly materials. The Committee represents the Division and the faculty in all matters of library policy and advises the Library administration accordingly. COLASC works to forcefully, clearly, and collegially represent faculty interests and concerns in these areas in the spirit of shared governance.

The Committee held five meetings in 2017-18.

Major topics addressed by COLASC during the academic year included:

1. Campus-Wide Strategic Report

2. California Digital Library- Shared Licensing

3. Systemwide Senate Reviews

4. Open Access 2020- Signing of the Expression of Interest

Campus-Wide-Strategic Reports:
Executive Vice Chancellor Waugh established a task force to review instructional space on campus. The survey reviewed classroom capacity and functionality, as well as the spaces that students use for studying. The Librarians were asked to provide their projections on space through the year 2040, looking at the square footage needed per student. Due to a mandated increase in enrollment, UCLA currently has seating space for only about ten percent of its undergraduate population.

During COLASC’s December meeting additional information was provided regarding the space task force. The task force examined available space on campus and provided recommendations as it relates to space utilization given the mandate to increase enrollment. Senate Leadership requested the Committee’s feedback on the Campus Wide Strategic Reports. The Committee reviewed the Classroom Advisory Committee Report. Members were privy to the information
outlined in the report since the library spaces were surveyed to identify available space on campus. The committee discussed the report extensively identifying areas as it relates to scheduling, existing classroom space, study space, non-traditional space, utilization, sustainability, and the mandate to increase enrollment. The following feedback and recommendations were summarized and provided to Senate Leadership in the following letter. Classroom Advisory Committee Report_COLASC Response Final.docx

A brief description of the challenges facing the library includes limited space for public programming; lack of quiet space for studying and a need for additional and replacement furniture. Another concern was the limited library space available for instruction and small-group discussions by faculty and teaching assistants.

California Digital Library:

The California Digital Library (CDL) was founded by the University of California in 1997 to take advantage of emerging technologies that were transforming the way digital information was published and accessed. Since then, in collaboration with the UC libraries and other partners, the world’s largest digital research libraries have been established and changed the ways that faculty, students, and researchers discover and access information.

In partnership with the UC libraries, the CDL has continually broken new ground by developing systems linking users to the vast print and online collections within UC and beyond. Building on the foundations of the Melvyl Catalog, one of the largest online library catalogs in the country was built. The University has saved millions of dollars by facilitating the co-investment and sharing of materials and services used by libraries across the UC system. They work in partnership with campuses to bring the treasures of the libraries, museums, and cultural heritage organizations to the world. They continue to explore how services such as digital curation, scholarly publishing, archiving and preservation support research throughout the information lifecycle.

The CDL a vital component to the mission of the UC libraries. They can provide the University with the infrastructure and support commonly needed by the campus libraries, freeing them to focus their resources and meet the needs of their users.

COLASC members received information on what it takes financially to share journals based on a tiered licensing and the pricing system. The model has four tiers based on the type of Institution. UCLA fits under a Tier 1 journal licensing model given the Universities enrollment and size. Tiered pricing enables organizations to enjoy full access to journals at rates that are appropriate to their size, needs, and usage. This model acknowledges the value that online access provides an institution over traditional print journals. Tier 1, licenses cover the entire UC System; Tier 2 licenses cover at least two campuses, ex. Health Science and Tier 3 licenses cover only one campus and are subject specific. Periodically the resources allocated among all nine UC campuses are reviewed. All of Tier 1 licenses are handled by the California Digital Library (CDL). The current
model where funding is based on a co-investment model among all UC campuses was under review by the UC Librarians with plans to cut budgets. This model will severely impact UCLA’s budget.

Systemwide Senate Reviews

Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Thesis and Dissertations

The committee discussed the proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Thesis and Dissertations policy and its facts. The committee agrees with the new policy however they did have some apprehensions. In the case of some fields where dissertations are a book and led to the journey and transition to someone’s profession if the book is mandated to be part of Open Access and having to sit in a two-year embargo, the dissertation would not be able to become a book immediately. (see Chair Sobel’s response to UCOLSA- dated January 26, 2018)

Open Access 2020 and the Signing of the Expression of Interest

Executive Vice Chancellor Waugh attended COLASC’s March 2018, meeting to discuss concerns as they relate to UCLA signing the Open Access 2020 Expression of Interest. The steps taken by the Academic Senate to inform faculty, staff and University constituents about Open Access were outlined. On March 20, 2018, EVC Waugh officially signed the Expression of Interest, placing UCLA in solidarity with our sister UC campuses and many other Universities. The concerns that remain regarding Open Access relates to financial sustainability. Journals currently crowd our libraries and limit the moveability of libraries and the library system. University State funding is decreasing and having available funds is an issue. What will the article process charges (APC)/publication fees charged to authors look like to keep work available via Open Access? Will the University be able to continue to fund the research and afford the journal subscriptions? Can the articles and journals be provided at a less cost? Moving forward, the University will need to consider sustainable models. A new model could have a direct bearing on the Library and directly impact the way faculty are promoted.

University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

In 2017-18 the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication held three meetings, which were attended by Chair Eric Sobel.

The major issues discussed were as follows:

- New tiers of the retirement system and retiree health plan were shared regarding the decrease in University contribution to employee’s retirement and shifting the cost to the employee or the retiree.
- Increasing the number of enrolled transfer students to offset state budget cuts. Regularizing pathways so that students understand what they need to transfer to UC. A focus has been placed on the STEM as well as recruiting first-generation, and an underrepresented freshman, but campuses are being pressured to focus on transfer students.
- Consultation with the California Digital Library- Licensing experiences a three percent cut
every year because they are self-funded and due to their structural deficiency. In 2016-17, the CDL collections budget was a little under $48 million on licensing which was funded by individual campuses. The most significant level of expenditures going toward journals.

- Compliance & Letters- demonstrating how faculty can deposit their materials into UC’s Open Access repository eScholarship. Members discussed, and all voted in favor of sending a memo to Roger Wakimoto, Vice Chancellor, Research and Michael Levine, Interim Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel requesting a mandate that all published work is placed into a Harvester. Members were in favor of finding a way to have published work tied to one's dossier using Opus and the Universities personnel database to track published work.

- University of California Office of Scholarly Communication was reborn in 2013. They have many excellent tutorials on how authors can work with journals on legal matters. For example, how the copyright on an author’s work can be returned to the author for work published before the UC’s copyright retention policy went into effect.

- This Office also provides institutions with the tools to work with publishers to help journals flip from a subscription base practice to open access.

- They also provide support to UCOP with promoting Open Access. The UC’s are one of the leading institutions promoting the move to Open Access. Other Universities are waiting to see the UC’s success.

- There is considerable work to identify frameworks, resource data management systems, and user interfaces for archiving scholarly data. This is a long-term, massive project.

- Finally, there is work by the California Digital Library to continue harvesting articles by UC authors and to integrate the results into the academic promotion review system via Opus.

**Briefings from the University Librarian**

Throughout the year, Librarian Virginia Steel provided the Committee with library initiatives, news, and updates.

**Library Space & Funding projects**

**Southern Regional Library**- An engineering study was conducted to determine if the Southern Regional Libraries’ infrastructure is strong enough to support the increase in the collections storage. The stacks would be preserved by placing books on trays that are packed on slabs.

**Young Research Library**- The third floor of the Young Research Library needs a complete renovation with new furniture, electrical and paint. YRL has not been updated since 1970. There are some coding issues regarding any improvements made which could potentially be very expensive for the University.

**Powell Library**- An architectural study was conducted to determine if the South side of Powell Library can be opened to make space for a walkthrough. By opening the south side of Powell, it would increase sitting which in turn affect where the staff is currently housed.
The Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF) is a cooperative library storage facility, owned and operated by the University of California and is located on the grounds of UC Berkeley's Richmond Field Station. Expansion to the current facility was scheduled to begin in 2018. Once the expansion of the NRLF is completed, collections will then be housed within the new facility, releasing some space at the SRLF.

Open Access
Red, Gold and Green Open Access Initiatives
Red Open Access is a new model that would stop libraries from paying for the development and review of journal overlay and pre-print. Articles would go under some form of a peer review process. The idea is to have repositories based on a particular discipline where articles can undergo a review process. Also, to the new OA model, currently the Gold Open Access- where authors publish in a journal which provides immediate open access to articles on the publisher's website. Another model is Green Open Access- authors publish in any journal then self-archive the accepted manuscript in an institutional repository or discipline repository. There is no charge for green open access. However, publishers usually require an embargo period (6-24 months) before manuscripts become Open Access.

HathiTrust Shared Print Initiative
The primary goals of the HathiTrust Shared Print Programs are to ensure the preservation of print and digital collections by linking the two programs. The goal is to reduce the overall cost of the collection management for HathiTrust members. An agreement was made, and copyright management service will be retained print copies at both the Northern Regional Library and Southern Regional Library Facilities.

AAU/ARL/AAUP Open Access Monograph Initiatives
The Open Access Monograph initiative was implemented in March of 2017. The initiative was intended to advance the wide dissemination of scholarships by the humanities and humanistic social science faculty members. The goal is to publish open-access digital editions of peer-reviewed and professionally edited articles. The universities and colleges that have committed to three components: provide a baseline university publishing grant of $15,000 to support the publication of open access, digital article.

Licensing
California Digital Library- Shared Licensing
Based upon the shared licensing and the tiered systems cost allotted per campus, the model was built and is based on historical expenses. A task force was created and is made up of University Librarians. Information on the University of California’s librarian's licensing, and tier structure was discussed through the year and referenced (*Financial Implications of the FTE Conversions & Proposed Parameters of an Offsetting Model*). Tier 1, licenses cover the entire UC System; Tier 2 licenses cover at least 2 campuses, ex. Health Science and Tier 3 licenses cover only one campus.
and are subject specific. Periodically the resources allocated among all nine UC campuses are reviewed. All of Tier 1 licenses are handled by the California Digital Library (CDL). The current model where funding is based on a co-investment model among all UC campuses is currently under review by the UC Librarians with budgets expected to be cut. Certain UC Campuses are appealing to the UCOP expressing that they cannot continue to operate under the current tier structures and models. The licensing contracts for six of the big publishers are up for renegotiation, which includes Elsevier, Springer, Wiley Online Library and Taylor & Francis Group. The UC Librarians are considering boycotting the journals listed above. The profit margins for these scholarly journals upwards of forty percent and will cost UCLA several million dollars per year. Expected budget cuts and the sharing of resources by all ten UC campuses led to the assembling of a task force titled “THE BIG DEAL.” This task force will analyze the needs of each campus. There is a need to find sustainable budgeting given the pattern of cost inflation with an annual increase of two to four percent; strategies must be developed for outright cost reduction.

**UC Press**
The Office of the President is negotiating whether UC Press should remain in Oakland or be moved to UCLA. Conversations are leaning toward leaving the press in Oakland. However the Director would report to UCLA- reporting structures would change which affects the presses structure and organization, Human Resource and staffing.

Respectfully submitted,

COLASC 2017-18:
Joel Braslow, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science
Elizabeth Carter, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures
Michael Colacurcio, English
Jerome Hershman, Medicine
Ramesh Srinivasan, Information Studies
Timothy Tangherlini, Scandinavian Sections
Derjung Mimi Tarn, Family Medicine
Ronald Vroon, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures
Eric Sobel, Human Genetics, CHAIR

Submitted October 30, 2018
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To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Committee is charged with representing all Senate and Faculty interest in online education, as well as other potential issues surrounding instructional technology. The overarching purview of the committee is to ensure that any steps taken to adopt online courses, or additional means of instructional technology serve to enhance the quality of UCLA’s programs and do not cause the academic quality of the university’s instructional program to suffer.

Summary

The Committee on Instruction and Technology discussed several key issues during the academic year. Among the most prominent:

1. Online Program Management
2. Campus-Wide Reports-Classroom Accessibility
3. Information Technology-Cyber Security
4. Sustainability & Continuation

Major Issues Fall 2017-Spring 2018

Online Program Management

Previously the committee was asked to review the Online Course Policy by the Undergraduate Council (UgC). CIT was asked to define the following online course issues: 1) the definition of what constitutes an online course at UCLA; 2) the adequacy of the UgC online course approval procedures; 3) the development of a set of teaching and learning principles to guide instructors in developing online courses and; 4) how the quality of technologically enhanced courses can be maintained.

Online course development and offerings are still relatively new at UCLA; CIT will continue to examine and recommend best practices that provide faculty, departments, and Divisions with
guidelines on how to integrate online and technologically enhanced courses into the undergraduate curriculum.

In mid-January, CIT was contacted by Academic Planning and Budget to review a potential pool of outside vendors to provide online course development. The vendors selected would work with departments and Divisions on Instructional Design, Marketing, provide Student Support, or offer a full-service Online management program.

**Campus-Wide Reports- Classroom Accessibility**

The Academic Senate Leadership requested CIT’s feedback on the Campus Wide Strategic reports. CIT decided to review the Classroom Advisory Committee report at great lengths. The committee felt that the report lacked evidence and guiding principles supporting its recommendations. The needs of the following groups; instructors, students, and residents should have been evaluated and understood before offering such recommendations. Recommendations were submitted to leadership outlining these concerns; donor funding, the utilization, and scheduling of existing classroom space and the universities network wireless capacity. Members questioned the dollar figures quoted in the report and the process in which the calculations were determined.

Divya Sharma, Undergraduate Student Association Representative, requested to meet with CIT members regarding classroom accessibility through the use of technology. His request followed the December Skirball fires and the Campus-Wide Strategic Classroom Accessibility Report specifically addressing recommendation #4 which directly calls for BruinCast to be revamped. He voiced the limitations experienced using the current BruinCast program. He provided an example on other platforms adopted by UCLA departments and Divisions, one example, Echo 360 which provides real-time classroom lectures that can be casted simultaneously.

In response to Divya Sharma’s request, Jan Reiff and Matt Hedges were invited to speak with members regarding UCLA’s BruinCast and other University systems. The BruinCast system was designed to meet the multiple needs of the University. They presented on the systems used and how they are subsidized. The Office of Instructional Development pays for the maintenance of the BruinCast system. Statistics and figures were presented on the number of lecture halls equipped for video streaming, podcasting and having access to portable equipment. The BruinCast system provides the University with an archive of recorded lecturers- the turnaround time to retrieve recorded lectures is within a 24 hour period. They also spoke about professors not being in favor of their lecturers recorded, as it makes them disposable and decreases classroom attendance. It was agreed that BruinCast is a service provided to students who for whatever reason can not attend class but gives them the opportunity to obtain a copy of the archived lecturer. In the case of an emergency situation, the question remains how to access real-time lectures when a student is unable to access campus.
Information Technology and Cyber Security

Security prevention and protecting the University from the threat of an attack is a major concern. The entire year conversations relating to the Universities’ cybersecurity, data operations, and its overall systems were discussed. The Universities’ security is vulnerable to attacks and can be breached and compromised at any time. This year UCOP began looking for ways to centralize cyber risk. Decisions had to be made faster than the original governance models established. An Executive Committee was put in place given the recent threat of attacks. Moving forward decisions will be made via a new structure comprised of executives, IT staff, and academics (which includes the Academic Senate). This group will look at cybersecurity across campus and within the health systems, looking at ways to understand the landscape and making decisions for the greater good.

Given the data threats to the UC Systems, UCLA has contracted with FireEye, Inc., a cybersecurity company that provides products and services to protect against advanced cyber threats, such as advanced persistent threats and spear phishing to help the University make smarter decisions and outmaneuver attackers.

In addition to contracting with FireEye, an added layer of security was added in October 2017, The Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA), a strengthened access control cloud base authentication solutions with the use of the services during a period of a 12-hour window. A faculty governance and management committee was formed to make sure UCLA remains in compliance. The University was met with much resistance to the MFA implementation as it added one more level of security when signing onto the network. Why were University constituents not consulted and educated on the need for the multi-factor authentication and the need for additional levels of security? Why couldn’t there be a multi-layer approach to the layers of security enforced based on the classified area and associated work? When addressing more sensitive and higher levels of security like the California Digital Library, Research, and the Healthcare Systems areas strict practices could be enforced.

Sustainability & Continuation

The Committee on Instruction and Technology was a product of the Ad Hoc Committee on Instructional Technology (AHCIT) and was formed into a stand-alone Academic Senate committee during the academic year 2012-2013. The committee was initially established to address faculty interest in the realms of instructional technology and online education, but also the use of technology within courses taught in-person. The charge was that the committee would convene for three years and after which it would be determined if the committee would continue or be re-appointed. Due to administrative staff changes in the Academic Senate, the assessment of CIT was not completed during the academic year 2015-2016 to determine if the CIT would continue as assembled or re-appointed. The concern as it stands is if CIT did not exist where would be the
“home base” for such issues as outlined above? What committee or group would address and represent issues concerning instructional technology and online education? Currently standing as a stand-alone committee, CIT continues to face the following issues, the committee’s limited purview regarding technology, small membership, often unable to reach quorum due to low attendance (members over-committed), and the inability to secure a chair for the 2018-2019 academic year.

**UCACC**

At the Senate level, UCACC is a key committee charged with looking at broader University-wide cybersecurity details. Policies across campuses continue to be reviewed on both the academic and medical sides. Given the constant demand, the University has no choice but to move quickly on the implementation of additional security measures. Researchers are continuously approached by the big three; Apple, Google, and Microsoft to sell clinical trial data. They are willing to pay an incredible amount of money to have access to medical records. Given UCLA is a research institution patients relinquish their privacy rights and the data obtained. IT continues to search for answers to the following questions; 1) what is the value in sharing data, 2) how do we continue to manage our data and operations and stay in compliance?

Respectfully submitted,

**CIT 2017-18:**
Yong Kim, Dentistry  
Renee Tajima- Pena, Asian American Studies  
Sarah Roberts, Information Studies  
Yingnian Wu, Statistics  
Michael Shin, Geography- **CHAIR**

Final Drafted Submitted: October 30, 2018
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The responsibility of the Committee on Faculty Research Lectureship is the naming of two faculty distinguished for research achievement to deliver public lectures during the succeeding academic year on topics of the lecturer’s choice. Department Chairs and other officials propose the nominees.

Summary
The annual UCLA Faculty Research Lectures honor our university’s most distinguished scholars in science, the arts, humanities and social disciplines. The Committee has named Professor Stephanie Jamison from the Asian Languages and Cultures department, and Professor Jack Feldman from the Department of Neurobiology as the UCLA Faculty Research Lecturers for 2018-19.

2018-2019 Faculty Research Lecturer Selection
Members were seeking a recipient that would have a large scholarly impact via his or her publications, and have made extraordinary achievements in research. In addition, members chose a lecturer based on the ability to present a lecture of interest to a broad community of scholars. The committee determined that Stephanie Jamison from the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures would receive the distinguished Faculty Research Lectureship for North campus.

The committee agreed that Jack Feldman from the Department of Neurobiology would receive the Faculty Research Lectureship for South Campus. The committee was extremely impressed with all the candidates, and suggested that each candidate resubmit his or her dossier for consideration next year.

Respectfully Submitted,

Katherine Stone, School of Law, Chair
Utpal Benerjee, Department of Molecular, Cell and Development Biology
Richard Kaner, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Efrain Kristal, Department of Comparative Literature
Robert Bjork, Department of Psychology
Ghez, Andrea, Department of Physics and Astronomy
Karen Orren, Department of Political Science

October 23, 2018
Committee on Emeriti Affairs 2017 – 2018 Annual Report

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Emeriti Affairs Committee (formerly University Emeriti and Pre-Retirement Relations Committee) is responsible for maintaining communication with emeriti on matters of concern to them and with active faculty on retirement-related matters. Where appropriate, the Committee has the responsibility to inform and consult with the Office of the Chancellor and the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate regarding matters of concern to these groups. The Committee is also charged with maintaining liaison with the Emeriti/Retiree Relations Center, with recommending emeritus status for non-Senate academic retirees, and with editing and circulating commemorative statements for deceased members of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate and for such non-Senate members as the Chancellor or President may request. We have appended a list of continuing issues that are or may become of concern to emeriti.

Summary

State of the Faculty Center
Professor Belinda Tucker, President of the Faculty Center Association, visited the committee to provide an update on the Faculty Center (FC). This is her third year serving on the board, and her first year as President. On November 30, 2018, President Tucker held a Faculty Center Association Membership meeting to highlight an effective plan to move forward. Two years ago, the Faculty Center Association hired Luciano Sautto, a highly experienced and proven General Manager, to increase the center’s fiscal health. Mr. Sautto and President Tucker developed a plan to increase revenue, increase client base, and improve facilities and the dining experience. The first step towards improving the center’s fiscal health was cutting expenses. The first order of business was to implement summer and winter curtailments, and encouraged employees to find jobs during the summer. They also cut back on the number of vendors used, to further offset, costs the association increased event prices, and no longer offer complimentary alcohol and desserts.

The new business model includes a marketing campaign to increase memberships. The association is also encouraging the university community to hold more events at the Faculty Center. Last year, Patricia Greenfield encouraged graduates to host their graduate dinners at the Faculty Center instead of traveling off campus. This year President Tucker is encouraging student organizations to order box lunches. Professor Jacoby suggested placing ads in the alumni magazine to help attract business. He also suggested converting the basement into a bar. S. Barnes suggested handing out coupons to the Faculty Center for Bruin Day and campus tours. Members also suggested offering temporary memberships to faculty from other institutions. Professor Tucker will follow-up on that suggestion.

President Tucker is also working on collecting delinquent dues. Members suggested gradually increasing membership dues and expanding the membership base. President Tucker is in the process of hiring an accountant and purchasing a Point of Sales system to
help with the reduction of financial errors, and collaborating with the University Credit Union to allow guests to pay with credit/debit payments.

President Tucker is currently in negotiations with the administration. The Faculty Center has never had a formal agreement with the university, since its inception in 1959. However, she is happy to state that negotiations are nearly complete. A part of the compromise is offering campus leadership two seats on the board. The agreement with the university will mean a significant fusion of cash into the center. This agreement will help the center pay for significant renovations to the facility.

Emeriti Medical Benefits
Bridget Sheehan-Watanabe visited the committee to provide an overview of emeriti health and Medicare plans. Medicare is health insurance for people age 65+ and younger if disabled. Medicare contains 4 parts, Part A covers hospital insurance section, Part B covers medical insurance, Part C covers Medicare advantage plan, which is an HMO and Part D provides Medicare drug covers. Retirees are eligible to start the Medicare enrollment process 3 months before requested Medicare effective date. Mr. Sheehan-Watanabe informed the committee that retirees or family members of retirees are eligible for Medicare during open enrollment. Medicare health coverage is secondary coverage for UC active employee plans. During Open Enrollment, retirees not eligible for Medicare may enroll in any of the employee plans. Employees who retire but are not yet eligible for Medicare stay in their current medical plan until another qualifying event or next year’s Open Enrollment.

Members asked Ms. Sheehan-Watanabe how does she inform retirees about health care benefits and she informed them that she hosts joint annual faculty and staff presentations with the Emeriti Center. Members agreed that emeriti health care does not receive a lot of central administrative support. Members plan to ask the new Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel for more support in this area.

Emeriti Conferral Requests
The committee received 8 applications requesting conferral of Emeritus status. They reviewed each applicant’s documents, supporting letters, and their respective departmental recommendations and all 8 conferral requests were approved. The committee recommended that each of the following individuals be granted the Emeritus title:

David Hirsch, Librarian for Jewish, Middle Eastern, and South Asian Studies
Hrayr Karagueuzian, Department of Cardiology
Julie Noble, Department of Pediatrics
Nancy Feldman, Department of Medicine
Steven Rottman, Department of Emergency Medicine
Stuart Biegel, Department of Education
Tai Yoo, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Science
William McCarthy, Department of Health Policy and Management

In Memoriam Statements
The following In-Memoriam Statements were approved by the committee and published on the system wide University of California Academic Senate In-Memoriam Online site. Please click here to view the In-Memoriam statements that were published for the 2017-2018 Academic Year. A list of the published In-Memoriams is enclosed as follows:

Walter Coulson, Department of Pathology, 2018
Guy Juillard, Department of Radiology Oncology, 2018
Lionel March, Department of Design, 2018
James Catterall, School of Education, 2018
Alexander Welsh, Department of English, 2018
Ann Bergren, Department of Classics, 2018
Donald Mulder, Department of Surgery, 2018
William McGovern, School of Law, 2018
Olga Kagan, Department of Slavic and Eastern European Languages, 2018
Charles Goodwin, Department of Communication, 2018
Bernice Wenzel, Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, 2018
Roberts Smith, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, 2018
John Freidmann, Department of Architecture and Urban Planning, 2017
Andrew Dixon, School of Dentistry, 2017
Forrest Adams, Department of Pediatrics, 2017
Verene Schumaker, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, 2017
Christian Herrmann, Department of Neurology, 2017
Harold Williams, School of Management, 2017
William Warren, School of Law, 2017
Paul Guth, School of Medicine, 2017
Dennis Cope, School of Medicine, 2017
Roger Kendall, Department of Ethnomusicology, 2017
Judy Howard, Department of Pediatrics, 2016
Rita Rodgers, Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, 2015
Peter Hammond, Department of Anthropology, 2014
George Hilton, Department of Economics, 2014
Robert Burr, Department of History, 2014
James B. MacQueen, Department of Management, 2014
Carol Newton, Department of Biomathematics, 2014
George Bartzokis, Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, 2014
Geoffrey Mess, Department of Mathematics, 2014
Alfred S. Yue, Department of Materials Sciences and Engineering, 2014
Valerie Hunt, Department of Kinesiology, 2014
Bernard Nefkens, Department of Physics and Astronomy, 2014
Michael Intriligator, Department of Economics, 2014
James Maloney, Department of Cardiothoracic, 2014
Elliot Elgart, Department of Art, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Weiss, Professor Emeritus of History, Chair
Robert Frank, Professor Emeritus of Neurobiology
King-Kong Cheung, Professor Emerita of English
Judith Gasoon, Professor Emerita of Biological Chemistry
Sanford Jacoby, Professor Emeritus of Management

October 23, 2018
Faculty Welfare Committee 2017 - 2018 Annual Report

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The principal charge of the Committee on Faculty Welfare (FWC) is to advise the Division and confer with administrative agencies on all matters involving the economic welfare of the faculty, including but not limited to the level of salaries, salary determination methodology, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing and conditions of employment. The committee consists of nine members, the Chair of the Emeriti Affairs Committee as an ex-officio member, and two student representatives (1 graduate student and 1 undergraduate student). The chair is also a member of the Statewide Faculty Committee. Appended to this Report is a list of issues ongoing that this year’s committee calls to the attention of the incoming chair and members.

Summary
In the past year, the Faculty Welfare Committee has heard from several leaders on issues affecting faculty welfare. The committee also reviewed and opined on several Senate matters.

Academic Senate Chair’s Update
Academic Senate Chair Sandra Graham opened the committee meeting by thanking members for serving on the committee. She provided a brief update on issues that FWC would review this year.
Chair Graham informed the committee that they would review issues including Emeriti/Retiree health plans, Geffen Academy enrollment, and Faculty Center negotiation concerns.

The threatened reduced University support of Emeriti/Retiree health plans - Over the summer elements in UCOP and the Regents tried to eliminate current support levels for retiree premiums. However, a System wide Senate faculty/administration task force was appointed to make recommendations on the future of University support for retiree health.

Chair Graham asked the committee to be vigilant with Geffen Academy and the degree to which it actually meets its supposed goal of supporting faculty recruitment and retention by providing high quality and affordable middle school, and secondary education to the children of faculty.

The continuing financial and governance problems of the Faculty Center- The committee’s sincere hope is that the impending crisis will finally induce all parties to come together and save this institution that is so essential for the UCLA faculty. The Committee is committed to working with all parties, including other Senate committees and the Emeriti Association, and most importantly with the board and campus administration.

Geffen Academy
Geffen Academy was originally designed in part to attract and retain the best faculty and staff by offering those with children a quality, cutting-edge education option close to campus. The 100-million-dollar gift agreement indicated that up to 50 percent of student seats would be allotted to students of UCLA Faculty. Members of FWC expressed their
concerns about Geffen Academy to School Head Carnochan Catalan. The original vision of David Geffen’s gift was to have UCLA faculty and staff children compose 50% of the available slots, with the other 50% going to the Los Angeles community at large. Now, however, the number of UCLA children is well below 50%, and in particular, members are concerned that the number of UCLA faculty children is quite low. While the leadership of the school is aware of this issue, members think it is imperative to bring these numbers up as soon as possible. For the 2018-2019 year Dr. Carnochan Catalan reported that 63 of the 184 newly enrolled students for Fall 2018 are from “UCLA families.” But of this 63, just 13, 7%, have parents with Senate titles; an additional 31 parents identified themselves as having some sort of non-Senate academic appointment, which would presumably be mostly Clinical Professor and Adjunct appointments, and 19 children have UCLA non-academic staff parents.

The second concern is closely related, which is the cost of tuition. Unlike some peer schools, such as the University of Chicago Lab School, the Geffen Academy offers no discount to UCLA faculty. While there is financial aid available, for many faculty families the cost is simply too high. Members have heard from colleagues who expressed shock and disappointment about the high cost of Geffen tuition, $31,000 in 2018/19. To truly achieve its purpose as a tool of recruitment and retention, members think the cost for UCLA faculty needs to come down. The committee suggested using the Chicago Lab School tuition assistance program. The Chicago Lab School provides tuition assistance for faculty; in fact tuition is half price for all faculty students. Another option would be to have Deans kick in some fraction of the tuition, offsetting what faculty pay directly. Chair Lopez asked if tuition assistance for faculty was possible and Professor Goldberg informed him that tuition assistance will not come from Geffen, and is the responsibility of the university.

**Faculty Mentoring Program**
Associate Vice Chancellor Christine Dunkel-Schetter visited the committee to discuss Faculty Development programs. As Associate Vice Chancellor, she oversees programs administered by the Academic Personnel Office. AVC Dunkel-Schetter encouraged members to visit the Academic Personnel website that contains information for new faculty (e.g., housing, childcare, early education) and for all faculty on career development (e.g. time off for family care, work/life balance, dual career policy, teaching resources, mentoring resources). AVC Dunkel-Schetter also provided a list of programs offered to support faculty development. A few of the programs she discussed included the Council of Advisors, the Emericorp program, and the Hellman Fellowship. The Council of Advisors is a program in which departments provide every new/junior faculty member with a mentor in the department. The Council of Advisors mentoring program matches a junior faculty member with a senior faculty mentor from a different department/discipline in a confidential relationship. Faculty may apply for this program at any time. The Emericorp program is a mentoring program for mid-career faculty. The Junior Faculty Manuscript Workshops helps faculty in departments that require or encourage a book for tenure. This program provides funds for a one-day book symposium with outside experts and UCLA faculty, interested faculty are encouraged to apply. The Academic Personnel Review Workshop assists with preparing dossier for fourth-year appraisal and tenure review. This workshop is held twice during the academic year and faculty invitations are issued in advance. In addition to workshops, AVC Dunkel-Schetter also mentioned various fellowships that are offered to enhance faculty development. The Hellman Fellowship offers up to $25,000 for Assistant Professors in all schools (except Dentistry and Medicine). The deadline to apply for this program is typical at the end of March.
Events and Transportation and Parking Services Annual Report
Lisa Koerbling and Renee Fortier visited the committee to provide a transportation program update and FY 18-19 parking fee update. Director Koerbling informed the committee that UCLA Transportation facilitates access to 22,700 parking spots in 27 structures and 24 lots. The department also subsidize public transportation, vanpools, carpools, bicycle, pedestrian infrastructure, campus shuttles and incentive programs. UCLA Transportation estimates that more than 78,000 visitors travel to campus daily. The increase the amount of traffic.

Transportation and parking services priorities are to ensure safe access and reduce the demand for parking. UCLA’s focus on sustainable transportation has helped reduce parking demand, traffic volumes and improve mobility. Incentives such as the Earn-A-Bike bicycling program, public transportation subsidies and carpool permits has helped with this goal. In the Earn-A-Bike program riders receive a $400.00 bike in exchange for their parking permit. Three percent of employees and 4 percent of students now commute by bicycle. Public transportation subsidies include a fifty percent subsidy on transit passes for the Big Blue Bus, Culver City Bus and LA Metro just to name a few. Benefits of these programs aid in recruitment and retention of staff and continuing students, reduce the demand for parking and provide flexible arrival and departure times. Nine percent of employees and fifteen of students commute by transit.

The transportation department recently added Uber and Lift pick up zones around campus to reduce traffic congestion. A popular new mode of transportation on campus is the use of Bird Scooters. Bird electric scooters connect to a mobile application that allows anyone with a phone and a valid driver’s license to access and ride the devices. Riders can scoot around for as long as they want, at speeds of up to 15 mph, and leave the scooters anywhere, including the side of the road, in front of classrooms or by apartment complexes, once they have arrived at their destinations. The increasing use of the Bird Scooter are now causing additional concerns on campus. The Transportation department is working with UCPD to make sure riders do not ignore rules by not wearing helmets and riding on sidewalks. Users are allowed to ride only on bike lanes and roads. UCPD started issuing citation on February 7th and will eventually start issuing tickets. The department is encouraging the manufacturers of the Bird Scooters to implement GO fencing tracking device on the scooters to prevent students from riding them on campus.

New parking programs include a license plate permit pilot program and Parking Structure 3 (PS3) rooftop permit parking. The license plate permit parking will allow riders to use their license plates as parking permits. The use of virtual license plate permits will save money on printing parking permits and save time. The PS3 rooftop parking permit program will allow riders to park on the roof of structure three. Other parking improvements include adding additional charging stations for electric vehicles.

UC Health Care Taskforce
Gerald Komisky, a member of the system wide UC Health Care Taskforce provided an update on current health care benefits and changes. He informed the committee that there were not any significant changes to health care benefits this year. The UC system still offers a total of five medical plan options; two HMOs and three PPO options. The University renewed its contract with Health Net. The new health net contract is a three-year contract with the option to renew after two years. Optum provides behavioral health benefits for HMO plans, Health Net Blue & Gold, Kaiser and Western Health Advantage, and Anthem Blue Cross provides behavioral health benefits for PPO plans, UC Care, UC Health Savings Plan and Core. During Open Enrollment, retirees not eligible for Medicare
may enroll in any of the employee plans except UC Health Savings Plan. Individuals enrolled in the UC Health Savings Plan when they retire may continue in the plan as a retiree until they, or a covered family member, becomes entitled to Medicare.

In regards to retiree health, current and projected cost increases of UC’s health benefits for retirees are greater than inflation and growing faster than the university’s budget. UC spends hundreds of millions of dollars annually for retiree health benefits, with future costs expected to rise. In the face of rising health care costs, UC must evaluate options to ensure the long-term financial viability of the retiree health benefits program and manage costs.

In early 2018, the Office of the President convened the retiree health benefit work group to explore potential strategies and develop health care options for retirees. The retiree advisory group was charged with considering plans to sustain retiree benefits. The work group has yet to announce potential adjustments, however, many speculate that the University wants to limit its liability moving forward.

**Review of Negotiated Salary Trial Program**
The Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) allows ladder and in-residence faculty in participating schools and divisions such as faculty who hold at least half-time appointments in the Fielding School of Public Health or the Division of Life Sciences of the College of Letters and Science to voluntarily contribute external funding resources toward their total UC salary. The NSTP, like the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, utilizes external fund sources to support a portion of the total compensation for participating faculty, providing incentives to generate additional non-state funding. The committee shares the concerns of other UCLA and System-wide Senate committees that this program will contribute to more unequal compensation for faculty and declining faculty involvement in undergraduate education, without substantially increasing faculty retention.

**Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations**
The committee reviewed the Presidential Policy on Open Access. This policy extends the principles of the University’s existing open access policies to theses and dissertations prepared by the University’s graduate students. Specifically, this policy requires theses or dissertations prepared at the University to be deposited into an open access repository, and made freely and openly available to the public, unless the graduate student obtains an embargo. The policy does not affect students’ copyright ownership rights in their theses or dissertations. The committee decided not to opine on this issue.

**APM 285, 210,133,740,135 and 235**
The committee reviewed the second system of proposed revised APM Sections 285, 210-3,133,740,135 and 235. Revisions to these polices have been made during two previous consultation periods. Recommendations received during the first system wide review have been incorporated in the second system wide review of the proposed policy revisions.

Revisions made in the second system wide review consists of changing the series title from “Lecturer with Security of Employment Series” to Security of Employment Series. (SOE)” Acting Titles have been included in the Security of Employment Series. Under Academic expectations and evaluations, the innovation criteria were removed as a requirement of “Teaching Excellence”. Performance specifications of this series have been revised from the title of “Professional and Scholarly Achievement and Activity” to title of “Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity” In addition creative
activities are now defined in Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity. As for compensation and salary scale, the steps and advancement periods for the SOE series will be the same as those for the Professor series. The committee decided not to opine on this issue. Members agreed with the recommendations set forth on the second system-wide review.

**Review of Senate Bylaw 128**
The committee reviewed Senate Bylaw 128 Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts of Interests are a common subject because faculty members have multiple personal interests. The proposed bylaw outlines the reporting of conflicts of interest within committees, and encourage members to raise the concern for potential conflicts of interests. Members agreed with the revisions.

**Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay**
The committee reviewed the Presidential Policy on Supplement to Military Pay. The policy is scheduled to end on June 30, 2018. Under the current policy, the university provides eligible employees with supplemental payments equal to the difference between the employees University base pay and their military pay and allowances until the end of an employee’s active military duty, or until June 30th, 2018. The committee decided to not opine on this policy.

Respectfully submitted,

David Lopez, Department of Sociology  
Julie Bower, Department of Psychology  
Hilary Coller, Department of Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology  
Satiro De Oliveira, Department of Pediatrics  
Jean-Francois Blanchette, Department of Information Studies  
Veronica Cortinez, Department of Spanish and Portuguese  
Susan Slyomovics, Department of Anthropology  
Richard Weiss, Department of History  
Jie Jay Zheng, Department of Ophthalmology  
Tzung Hsiai, Department of Bioengineering

October 23, 2018
Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion 2017–2018 Annual Report

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The primary mission of the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has been to provide advice to the university administration on policies/programs to advance faculty diversity, including the recruitment, advancement and retention of women and underrepresented minorities. The committee consists of nine voting faculty, two graduate student representatives and two undergraduate student representatives.

Summary
In the past year, the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has developed several ideas to increase diversity efforts on campus, as articulated below.

Diversity Efforts at UCLA
Several key faculty leadership members reported departmental efforts to increasing diversity. These include working closely with faculty search committees, faculty search briefings, organizing forums and meetings for department members to discuss free speech, implicit bias, micro aggression and climate issues. Key faculty members included:

- Professor Sandra Graham, UCLA Academic Senate Chair
- Jerry Kang, Vice Chancellor for Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion, CODEI ex officio
- Professor Abel Valenzuela, Chancellor’s Advisor on Immigration Policy
- Professor Christine Dunkel-Schetter, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development
- Professor Patricia Ganz, Chair of the Council on Academic Personnel
- Professor Beth Lazazzera, Chair of the Undergraduate Council

Academic Senate Chair’s Update
Academic Senate Chair Sandra Graham addressed the committee by thanking members for serving on the committee. She provided a brief update on issues that CODEI would review this year. The most pressing issue is working with the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council to enhance the guidelines for the Diversity Section within the Program Review Manual. Chair Graham noted that both Councils appreciate the time and effort put forth by CODEI to solidify their involvement in the program review process. The Councils were generally supportive of continuing CODEI’s participation with amended conditions.

Student Advisory Board Informational
Evelyn Carter, a Bruin X Research Scientist and Brad Fingard, a member of the Student Advisory Board visited the committee to provide information about the board. Last spring, Vice Chancellor Jerry Kang started the application process for the Office of Equity, Diversity and
Inclusion Student Advisory Board. This board was formed so that the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion could gain a better perspective of student needs through the lens of students from both undergraduate and graduate schools at UCLA.

As a Board Member, students serve as advisors, liaisons, and problem solvers to support the Office’s mission of building equity for all. As of this year, students have organized into committees that address concerns such as the fair allocation of student funds. Their first major task was to enhance the existing funding process to consider innovative ideas, coalition building, better incorporating marginalized groups and other mechanisms that promote diversity, equity and inclusion. The advisory board is currently working on developing diversity training for student organizations.

**Immigration Policy Update**

Over the past year, the Chancellor’s Advisory Council on Immigration Policy has examined how federal immigration policies could affect UCLA’s campus. The council, which was co-chaired by Professors Asli Bâli and Abel Valenzuela, produced a report that offered recommendations for addressing the needs of international and immigrant students, researchers, staff and faculty.

One of the recommendations was to establish a position in the Chancellor’s office to carry on immigration policy work. Chancellor Block recently announced the appointment of Dr. Valenzuela as Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Immigration Policy. He is responsible for implementing many of the report’s recommendations and for informing UCLA about immigration policy changes that may affect the campus.

Dr. Valenzuela started his presentation with a five-minute video from a document entitled *Undocumented and Afraid*. The film depicts the struggles and fears a UCLA undocumented student faces daily. After the video, he informed the committee that his main role is to serve as an advocate for the allocation of resources. Although he does not have a budget, he works closely with the EDI office and the Chancellor’s office to provide psychological and legal direct services to students. Currently there are 700 undergraduate students and 50 graduate students who self-identify as undocumented students. He is focused on the adoption of new policies and protocols to mitigate the likely impact of immigration policy changes for particular members of our community. Dr. Valenzuela has created a reference guide for faculty and students, and drafted an International Visitors Protocol Letter for visitors under the travel ban. Moving forward he would like to convene committees on Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) immigration policy, and The Temporary Protection Status (TPS) immigration Policy.

**Faculty Development Programs**

Associate Vice Chancellor Christine Dunkel-Schetter and Sheenah Jones visited the committee to discuss Faculty Development programs. As Associate Vice Chancellor, she oversees programs administered by the Academic Personnel Office. AVC Dunkel-Schetter encouraged members to visit the Academic Personnel website that contains information for new faculty (e.g., housing, childcare, early education) and for all faculty on career development (e.g. time off for family care, work/life balance, dual career policy, teaching resources, mentoring resources). AVC Dunkel-Schetter provided a list of programs offered to support faculty development. A few of the programs she discussed included the Council of Advisors and the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity program.

The Council of Advisors (COA) is a program she inherited when she became Associate Vice Chancellor. The COA is a mentoring program that matches junior faculty with senior faculty members from a different department/discipline in a confidential manner. Currently 60 junior
faculty participates in this program. Faculty may apply for this program at any time. The Emericorp program is a small mentoring program that pairs mid-career faculty with Emeriti faculty. The Junior Faculty Manuscript Workshops helps faculty in departments that require or encourage a book for tenure. This program provides funds for a one-day book symposium with outside experts and UCLA faculty, interested faculty are encouraged to apply.

The Academic Personnel Review Workshop assists with preparing dossiers for fourth-year appraisal and tenure review. This workshop is held twice during the academic year and faculty invitations are issued in advance. In addition to workshops, AVC Dunkel-Schetter also mentioned various fellowships that are offered to enhance faculty development. The Hellman Fellowship offers up to $25,000 for Assistant Professors in all schools, except Dentistry and Medicine. Faculty in the School of Medicine works closely with the Senior Associate Dean of Diversity Affairs Lynn Gordon. The Dual Program is another program that is for the recruitment of highly sought and retention of highly valued faculty where a partner needs employment. The Faculty Development Office (FDO) assists in locating positions for spousal hires. The FDO is also participating in the tracking of retention data and the improvement of tracking processes. They have developed a retention form to be completed after each retention. FDO are administering surveys to faculty who were retained at UCLA.

The National Center for Faculty Development & Diversity program (NCFDD) is a nationally recognized, virtual faculty development center serving over 80,000 members from over 450 colleges and universities in the United States. The NCFDD provides training, mentoring, and supportive communities for faculty, graduate students, and postdocs. Their programs and services help new faculty to increase writing productivity, maintain work-family balance, and create broad networks of collegial support on their campus. UCLA has just renewed its institutional membership. AVC Dunkel-Schetter encouraged members of CODEI to register for the program and take full advantage of the membership benefits. Membership benefits include monthly core curriculum webinars and peer mentor matches. Currently 100 faculty participate in this program.

**Council of Academic Personnel (CAP) Chair**

Patricia Ganz, the chair of the Council of Academic Personnel (CAP), visited the committee to discuss how CAP evaluates diversity when reviewing dossiers. CAP is responsible for the review of all personnel actions involving faculty holding academic titles. All advances that involve a change in rank are subject to CAP review. Faculty who submit dossiers for personnel actions should highlight their contributions to diversity issues in their research, teaching or service activities so that CAP can recognize these contributions in its evaluation of the candidate’s file. In 2015, the Office of the President issued Academic Personnel policy section 210-1(d) that provided guidelines to help review committees evaluate diversity. APM 210-1(D) advised the committee to consider the mentoring and advising of students and faculty members, particularly from underrepresented and underserved populations, should be given due recognition in the teaching or service categories.

When reviewing dossiers, the council pays special attention to recruiting, engaging and supporting students from underrepresented communities, discussing issues of importance in minority communities, or conducting research on issues in marginalized communities. However, there is no consistency in reviewing diversity. Although, members are encouraged to consider diversity when reviewing dossiers, diversity enhances the overall dossier but does not weigh the same as teaching and research. Chair Ganz agrees that it is important to raise the significance of diversity at the departmental level. She attends various orientations on north and south campus to discuss the importance of diversity in dossiers. CODEI members suggested including
a self-statement or contribution to diversity statement in dossiers up for review. CODEI members agreed that a contribution to diversity statement should be a mandatory requirement for each division. Currently, some departments require this statement while others do not. Members suggested encouraging Academic Senate Leadership to push for the requirement of diversity statements. In this respect, a memo will be prepared to be sent to the Chair of the Academic Senate.

Selection of DEI Awards Recipients
The committee selected the winners of the 2018 Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Awards. A total of seven recipients were selected. The names are as follows:

- David Nguyen, Undergraduate Student Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Award, Department of Sociology
- Cristina Echeverria, Graduate Student Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Award, Department of Environmental Engineering
- Erin O’Leary-Sanders, Staff Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Award, Office of College Academic Counseling
- Heather Maynard, Faculty Student Development DEI Award, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Chandra Ford, Faculty Research on Diversity DEI Award, Department of Community Health Sciences
- Denise Chavira, Faculty Community Service and Praxis DEI Award, Department of Psychology
- Victoria Sork, Career Faculty Commitment to Diversity DEI Award, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

Diversity Section H Proposal
The Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council approved the Diversity Section H guidelines.
The revised guidelines are enclosed below.

This section should describe departmental efforts to foster diversity, equity and inclusion for faculty, staff and students, and to promote a departmental climate that embraces diversity. Diversity encompasses but is not limited to gender, gender identity, race (especially but not only with regard to underrepresented minorities), ethnicity, citizenship, disability, sexual orientation, and age. Broadly, this section should describe the composition and climate in the department and how they compare with the prior review. It should also document accomplishments, efforts and plans that have advanced or are intended to advance diversity, equity and inclusion.

Specifically, the diversity, equity, and inclusion dimensions of each of the following areas should be addressed, unless that population is not part of the unit or program (e.g., no postdoctoral scholars).

1. Explain the role of divisional equity advisors, departmental officers or committees, or others with specified responsibilities with regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the department.

2. Faculty: searches and recruitment, including developing a candidate pool and the hiring process; promotion; climate; and retention

3. Graduate students: efforts to diversify the pool of qualified applicants; the admissions process; recruitment and financial support; advising and mentoring practices; retention; and departmental
climate and community for graduate students. Address feedback on diversity and climate
provided by students in the exit survey and the survey of continuing students provided by the
Graduate Division. Address any disparities (e.g., URM vs. non-URM, or international vs.
domestic) in student outcomes such as advancement to candidacy, time-to-degree, or degree
completion.

4. Undergraduate students: Address any disparities (e.g., URM vs. non-URM, or international
vs. domestic) in student outcomes such as attrition/persistence in the major, time-to-degree or
degree completion.

5. Postdoctoral scholars: efforts to diversify the pool of qualified candidates; consideration of
diversity in hiring; advising and mentoring practices; and departmental climate and community
for postdoctoral scholars.

6. Staff: efforts to ensure a diverse pool of qualified candidates; consideration of diversity in
hiring; departmental climate and community for staff. Chair Sternini will review these
suggestions and meet with the council chairs to determine the next steps of this process.

Beth Lazazzera, the Undergraduate Council Chair, and members of CODEI also discussed the
idea of members of CODEI participating in the pre-site meetings with program chairs, instead
the exit meeting. CODEI’s participation in the pre-site meetings will be an excellent way for
CODEI to align with the mission of program review while recognizing the strengths and
achievements in diversity, but also identifying and discussing issues of concern. CODEI’s
members will continue to write issue statements highlighting strengths and weaknesses with
regards to diversity, equity and inclusion uncovered in the programs self-reviews that will serve
as a guiding document during the meeting with the program chair. Each issue statement will be
submitted to the councils 6 weeks before the pre-site meeting. CODEI members will also
continue working closely with the office of diversity, equity and inclusion.

Program Review Issue Statements
CODEI continued to participate in the Academic Senate’s 8-Year Program Review. Returning
members were assigned two programs to review and new members were assigned one
program to review. Members reviewed the following programs:
  • Department of Life Sciences Core Curriculum
  • Department of Statistics Department
  • Molecular Toxicology IDP
  • Department of Environmental Health Sciences
  • School of Education
  • Department of University Studies
  • Department of English
  • Department of Human Genetic
  • Department of Molecular, Cellular and Integrative Physiology
  • School of Nursing
  • Department of French and Francophone Studies
  • Department of East Asian Studies

Senate Items for Review
The committee reviewed and responded to several Senate items for review at the request of the
Senate Chair:
Review of Negotiated Salary Trial Program Report
The Negotiated Salary Trial Program (NSTP) allows ladder and in-residence faculty in participating schools and divisions such as faculty who hold at least half-time appointments in the Fielding School of Public Health or the Division of Life Sciences of the College of Letters and Science to voluntarily contribute external funding resources toward their total UC salary. The NSTP, like the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, utilizes external fund sources to support a portion of the total compensation for participating faculty and providing incentives to generate additional non-state funding.

Members agreed that the program aids in the retention of faculty and supports the taskforce recommendation to extend the program for four more years. However, they are concerned that negotiated driven salaries may lead to compensations disparities including gender, race and ethnicity disparities. While enrolled faculty did not appear to differ significantly by gender or race/ethnicity compared to the overall faculty composition in participating departments, the trend of lower percentages of women, African-American and Hispanic/Latino faculty participation warrants monitoring. Members feel it is important to continue to monitor participation of under-represented minority faculty carefully.

APM 285, 210, 133, 740, 135 and 235
The committee reviewed the second system of proposed revised APM Sections 285, 210-3, 133, 740, 135 and 235. Revisions to these polices have been made during two previous consultation periods. Recommendations received during the first system wide review have been incorporated in the second system wide review of the proposed policy revisions.

Revisions made in the second system wide review consists of changing the series title from “Lecturer with Security of Employment Series” to Security of Employment Series. (SOE)” Acting Titles have been included in the Security of Employment Series. Under Academic expectations and evaluations, the innovation criteria were removed as a requirement of “Teaching Excellence”. Performance specifications of this series have been revised from the title of “Professional and Scholarly Achievement and Activity” to title of “Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity” In addition creative activities are now defined in Professional and/or Scholarly Achievement and Activity. As for compensation and salary scale, the steps and advancement periods for the SOE series will be the same as those for the Professor series. The committee decided not to opine on this issue. Members agreed with the recommendations set forth in the second system-wide review, however, there was some concern about the discrepancy of the SOE lecturers, who would now earn sabbatical leave while the professors in-residence do not.

Senate Bylaw 128
The committee reviewed Senate Bylaw 128 Conflicts of Interest. Conflicts of Interests are a common subject because faculty members have multiple personal interests. The proposed bylaw outlines the reporting of conflicts of interest within committees, and encourage members to raise the concern for potential conflicts of interests. Members agreed with the revisions.

Review of APM Section 675, Veterinary Medical Salary Administration
Members reviewed the System wide Review of Proposed New Academic Personnel Manual (APM), Section 675; Veterinary Medicine Salary Administration (APM-675). The proposed new policy is responsive to the UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine’s (SOVM) request to modify the current Veterinary Medical School Strict Full-Time (SFT) Salary Plan. The goal of the proposed APM policy is to allow faculty in SOVM an opportunity to earn and retain outside non-
clinical compensation as is possible for other faculty in the professorial ranks. Members agreed with the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

Catia Sternini, Departments of Medicine and Neurobiology, Chair
Veronica Santos, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Antoinette Gomes, Department of Radiological Sciences
Lorrie Frasure-Yokley, Department of Political Science
Martin Martin, Department of Pediatrics
Albert Courey, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Anna Taylor, Department of Neurobiology
Rose Maly, Department of Family Medicine

October 23, 2018
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Committee on Continuing and Community Education mission is to advance programs in continuing and community education that meet the public’s needs, which maintains UCLA’s reputation for academic excellence, which promotes innovative methods of instruction and supports the mission of the University. The CCCE focuses on educational issues and academic programs for non-matriculated students who are not registered or enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate degree program. It considers the educational, organizational, technological, legal and economic dimensions of continuing and community education at UCLA, seeking to advance the University’s contribution to society and its position as a leading research institution.

Summary:
The Committee on Continuing and Community Education met a total of five times throughout the academic year and discussed several key topics. Among the most prominent:

1. Campus-Wide Strategic Reports
2. UCLA Extension- An Overview of Services, Going Global and Sustainability
3. Programs, Community Outreach and Partnership

Campus-Wide- Strategic Reports:
During the Fall quarter, Senate Leadership requested the Committee’s feedback on the Campus Wide Strategic Reports. The Committee reviewed two of the reports, the Classroom Advisory Committee Report and the Global Outreach-Task Force Report. Members were provided with an overview on both reports. The committee discussed the reports extensively identifying areas as it related to space utilization, sustainability, global and continuing education given the mandate to increase enrollment. The following feedback and recommendations were summarized in two letters to Senate Leadership.

Campus-Wide Strategic Reports:
Classroom Advisory Committee Report_CCCE Response Final.pdf
Global Outreach-Global task Force Report_CCCE Final.pdf

UCLA Extension:
An Overview of Services
UCLA’s University Extension (UNEX) celebrates 100 years. The program first began as an extension of UC Berkeley two years before the UCLA campus was founded in 1919. UNEX a
“Mini University” maintains its own marketing, enrollment services, Registrar, classroom management, Financial Aid, Career and Alumni Services. UNEX’s purpose is to provide personal and professional development across careers and for a lifetime. Enrollment is open; there are no specific requirements to enroll in a course. UNEX is self-supporting, generating its own tuition revenue with six areas of emphasis and over 108 Certificate Programs. UNEX has three offsite locations; Westwood, Downtown Los Angeles, and Woodland Hills. One-third of the courses offered are taken online. Geographically UNEX’s primary market is from Southern California. However, students are enrolled from all 50 states as well as internationally.

Four priorities were identified in the 2015 Strategic Plan; I. Collaborate with Partners II. Extend Our Reach III. Serve Students First IV. Reimagine Learning.

**Transfer Certificate Program**

The Undergraduate Council approved a one-year General Studies Certificate pilot program. Students who have completed high school but are not yet ready for college will do a 13th year taking general education courses in preparation for undergraduate work. Also, a pilot program with Shoreline Community College- American Academic program was approved and general education courses- English as a Second Language ESL will be offered.

UNEX’s David Goldman, Program Director for UNEX’s Humanities and Sciences, shared information about two partnerships; the first with Da Vinci Charter School offering a package of humanities courses to approximately 30 to 40 students in their “13th year the “gap year.” The participants are provided with a coach, ongoing advising and an internship. The second program with Shoreline Community College who collaborates with recruitment partners to develop and retain a diverse international student, population. Shoreline recruits, houses and provides nonacademic support to international students and UNEX provides the transfer certificate package of courses to prepare the students to transfer to an undergraduate program. These two partnerships give UNEX the opportunity to build and expand into high school settings who need additional resources to support student success.

**Going Global- UCLA Ventures into Online Learning**

In April of 2015, EVC Waugh asked University Extension to take on the initiative to increase UCLA’s presence. If UCLA plans to remain competitive, it is essential for UCLA to have a presence globally. UCLA’s online program has been re-named “UCLA Online.” Research has proven no difference in the learning outcomes for those students who learn within a face to face environment versus online. Reasons for going global; UCLA is ranked #1 in [America](https://www.niche.com/universities/ucla/), ranked #10 as a global University and #13 in the world as a brand. UCLA is also extremely popular in Asia. Though the plan is for UCLA to go global, to protect the integrity of an undergraduate degree obtained from UCLA, undergraduate degrees will remain in a traditional “brick and mortar” format. However, to offset the anticipated budget cutbacks, other revenue streams are being explored. Given UCLA’s late start in Online education, the Universities focus will remain on quality and target such markets; professionals, postgraduates, and adults with time challenges. The Target date to publicly launch UCLA Online is January 2019. Programs using UNEX’s online platform- Dentistry, GIS, and Graduate Education. Other programs and Departments are using some of the services but more in a Hybrid format; smart technology, live lectures, and other trainings.
Sustainability
In light of the Daily Bruin article posted on January 26, 2018- “UCLA Extension to lay off around a quarter of its employees.” Information was shared regarding UNEX’s ability to sustain. UNEX faces the following challenges; the modernizing of extension (relocating from the location at Le Conte & Gayley to space in the Wilshire building and Lindbrook); the launching of UCLA Online-UCLA Global; along with overcoming an over 13 million dollar deficit in revenue due to enrollment declines. The enrollment shortfalls caused for a 20% to 25% reduction in staff anticipated by June 30, 2018. The employees to be laid off- union reps with the least amount of seniority and non-union staff based on skills. Current Extension staffing is too large, a lot of manual work and the lack of technology. Course offerings need to be scaled down to meet current industry demands and trends. New industry standards are placing more value on skills sets and less on the actual degree earned. There was also a noticeable decline in international enrollment, which generates much of Extension’s revenue. The reorganization has lead to an examination of UNEX’s development and operations. A consulting group was hired and reported the need to reduce ninety positions to meet budgetary goals. Fifty of the ninety positions have already been cut; either the position was not refilled, or employees left after learning of the possible layoffs. Reorganization plans were submitted to Human Resources.

Three challenges identified; marketing (digital and personalization), a complete review of the student services offered as well as the student lifecycle and instructional design.

Programs Outreach and Community Partnerships Recap, Recommendations & Initiatives
The Committee’s charge was to learn more about already existing partnerships that support underrepresented students. During the Fall quarter, Professor Wes Campbell met with members to discuss the Department of Physics’ proposal and application process with the American Physics Society Bridge Program (APS). The APS Bridge Program’s goal is to eliminate the achievement gap between undergraduate and graduate participation, building a large base of institutions that will admit and retain underrepresented ethnic and racial minority (URM) students into graduate programs.

Members then heard from David Goldman, Program Director- UNEX for the Humanities and Science presented a transfer certificate program developed by University Extension with a primary aim to attract more international and transfer students.

Angela Scales, Senior Director of Bruin Connections and Alyssa Penner, Associate Director, Partnerships UCLA and Alumni Career Programs met with members to share the work being done to serve underrepresented students. Through outreach, partnerships and working with the Alums a community engagement approach has been taken building bridges and closing the gaps between classroom “theory” and real experiences.

The committee discussed further the need for partnerships and the building of community relationships. For the AY 2018-19, CCCE will invite departments, who are known to have successful outreach and recruitment plans. The Committee is interested in learning how the outreach is funded- what funding mechanism are used, staffing, return on investment data, department partnering, etc. A lot is happening at UCLA, but it is not known- the departments
operate in silos. For the 2018-19 academic year and given current CCCE member’s connection to the following departments, it was suggested that Nursing, Medicine, and Dentistry be invited to begin and address their current efforts, opportunity areas, ways to expand and community outreach ideas with CCCE.

Respectfully submitted,
CCCE 2017-18:

Barbara Bates-Jensen, Nursing
Minsong Cao, Medicine; Radiation Oncology
Ian Coulter, Dentistry
Marco Giovannini, Head and Neck Surgery
Mark Kaplan, Social Welfare
Paul Ong, Urban Planning
Jessica Rett, Linguistics
Wayne Smutz, University Extension
Robert Weiss, Public Health
Jorge Torres, Chemistry and Biochemistry, CHAIR

Submitted: October 16, 2018
COMMITTEE ON DEVELOPMENT 2017-2018 ANNUAL REPORT

To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The university Committee on Development (COD) is advisory to the administration primarily through the Vice Chancellor of External Affairs. The committee is charged with surveying and evaluating any development activities by the division and its agencies; advocating direct support for human capital; recommending development policies to the Vice Chancellor and others in the administration; and in cooperation with the administration and the Executive Board, organizing the active participation of Senate members in development projects.

Summary

In the past year the Committee on Development has implemented ideas to increase development and philanthropy efforts on campus and gain commitment of faculty to advancing the future and academic vision of the university. In addition, the Committee received briefings on a variety of development areas.

The Committee held two meetings in 2017-18 and a workshop/event.

Briefings focused on:

The UCLA Centennial Campaign

The Committee received regular updates on the Centennial Campaign from Associate Vice Chancellor of Development Laura Parker.

- $3.9 billion has been raised to date (May 2018). The initial goal was $4.2 billion but it may be surpassed.
- Increase the endowment goal and the endowment by fiscal year.

Key objectives of the Campaign are:

- Strengthen endowment: increase the endowment balance; grow the endowment for students, faculty and programs; secure new endowed chairs.
- Broaden the base: raise the number of annual student and alumni donors; engage alumni donors during the campaign; increase annual sustainable support.

Committee activity focused on:

The October 2017 Faculty Development Workshop: “Anatomy of a Major Gift”

The Committee on Development focused much of its effort planning and executing the third major development workshop event for the Senate faculty entitled, “Anatomy of a Major Gift.” The Committee recognized that faculty are interested in development and learning more about the
process. The Committee recognizes that the intellectual vision of UCLA cannot be realized without a strong commitment to institutional development and philanthropy, and that UCLA faculty are among the very best and most effective agents in representing the university and engaging with potential donors and community partners. The Committee on Development felt strongly that it wanted to repeat the successful workshop event to encourage faculty across campus to learn more about the development process and to become more involved in UCLA fundraising activities.

In close partnership with external affairs, COD planned its third-ever faculty development workshop: a five-hour interactive information session to provide interested faculty with concrete exposure to what development work entails. The goal of the event is to promote greater faculty awareness about, and participation in UCLA development and fundraising activities. The workshop took place on October 17, 2017 at the Luskin Conference Center. Key features of this event included:

- A lunch was provided at the beginning of the event to stimulate relationship building with development staff and other faculty.
- Enhanced workshop format included three speakers who provided information on the language, format, style, and authenticity of an effective pitch. Rhea Turteltaub addressed faculty to help in “demystifying development” at UCLA.
- Improved critique system allowing for donors and development staff to provide faculty more specific and concrete feedback on pitch quality and effectiveness. Constructive criticism is proven valuable to our faculty and was the primary request of attendees following the previous 2 workshops.

We are also pleased to report that development offices around campus are also using this event as a model for their own engagements.

The COD also spent a fair portion of time discussing and planning the launch of a Faculty Forward Campaign (FFC) associated with the UCLA Centennial Campaign. After much discussion, this is still under consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Loo, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Michael Palazzolo, Pulmonary & Critical Care
Stefan Timmermans, Sociology
David K. Yoo, Asian American Studies
Lixia Zhang, Computer Science
Andrea Hevener, Medicine, CHAIR

October 9, 2018
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Graduate Council is a faculty committee of the Academic Senate consisting of twenty appointed members with delegated authority over graduate programs on the UCLA campus. The Dean of the Graduate Division serves as an ex officio member without a vote. Four graduate student representatives are appointed by the Graduate Student Association. Professor Julio Vergara served as the Chair of Graduate Council; Professor Willeke Wendrich served as Vice Chair. The Council met on sixteen occasions during the year.

Much of the preliminary work for the Graduate Council is considered in three standing subcommittees of the Council: The Administrative Committee, the Committee on Degree Programs, and the Fellowships and Assistantships Committee. This year, the Council continued the work of the Graduate Student/Postdoctoral Scholar Well-being Ad hoc Committee. Additionally, as usual, the Graduate Council appointed Designated Representatives from amongst its membership to the Committees on Instruction & Technology (CIT) and Continuing & Community Education (CCCE); Yong Kim and Mark Kaplan represented the Council on these committees, respectively.

Additionally, Caroline Streeter represented the Council on the statewide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA). Chair Vergara served as an ex-officio member of the Executive Board and as needed represented the Council in meetings with other campus committees and councils. As requested, Chair Vergara met with department chairs, vice chairs, and others across campus who sought Graduate Council responses to, or advice on, various matters. Chair Vergara, along with Undergraduate Council Chair Beth Lazazzera, apprised Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Waugh on trends and key issues that arose during the 2017-18 Program Review Process. Chair Vergara also participated in discussions revolving around the process for UCLA’s reaffirmation of accreditation by WSCUC (WASC).

Some of the Graduate Council’s administrative responsibilities, such as the approval of minor program changes, proposals for courses, and the appointment of thesis and dissertation committees, are delegated to the Dean of the Graduate Division. These delegated activities are reviewed each year before the delegation is renewed.

Administrative Committee

Consisting of the Dean of the Graduate Division, Chair, Vice Chair of the Graduate Council, Chairs of the standing subcommittees, and one designated member, the Administrative Committee (Admin) is responsible for vetting the draft reports of Academic Senate program reviews before they are presented to the full Council. It is also empowered to act for the Council when appropriate. This committee sometimes meets jointly with the Administrative Committee of the
Undergraduate Council. In AY 2017-18 the Graduate Council’s Administrative Committee met on six occasions to discuss draft program review reports. Members of the Administrative Committee included Julio Vergara (GC Chair), Willeke Wendrich (GC Vice-Chair & CDP Co-Chair), David Glanzman (CDP Co-Chair), Thomas Vondriska (FAC Chair), and Andrea Kasko (Designated Member).

**Committee on Degree Programs**

The Committee on Degree Programs (CDP) reviews proposals to establish new degrees, comments on proposals for new academic units, and reviews Appendix V actions related to graduate degree programs, requests for major changes in graduate degree program requirements, admissions and enrollment policies, exceptions for membership on master’s and doctoral committees, and graduate education policy matters in general. In 2017-18, the CDP was co-chaired by professors Willeke Wendrich and David Glanzman. Members included Rosina Becerra, Jean-Claude Carron, Renate Lux, Caroline Streeter, Dorothy Wiley, Olga Yokoyama and Julio Vergara (ex officio). Associate Dean Joseph Watson, Assistant Dean-Academic Services April de Stefano, and Associate Registrar Claire McCluskey were regular invited guests who provided valuable insights during the committee’s deliberations. During the 2017-18 academic year, the committee met on eight occasions and considered new degree programs and other graduate student degree related matters as indicated below:

**Graduate Program Proposals**

The following proposals were considered by the Committee on Degree Programs:

**New Degree/Certificate Programs**

- Proposal from the Department of Human Genetics in the David Geffen School of Medicine for a Master of Science Graduate Degree Program in Genetic Counseling (*proposal discussed November 8, 2017*)
- Proposal from the Department of Education for a revision to their Certificate in Advanced Quantitative Methods in Educational Research (*proposal discussed on January 24, 2018*)
- Proposal from the Fielding School of Public Health for a Global Health Schoolwide Certificate (*proposal discussed on January 24, 2018, April 17, 2018*)
- Proposal from the Fielding School of Public Health for a 3+2 program (*proposal discussed January 24, 2018*)
- Proposal from the Department of Communication for a Doctor of Philosophy Program in Communication (*proposal discussed February 14, 2018, April 17, 2018*)
- Proposal from the School of Law for a Master of Legal Studies Graduate Degree Program (*proposal discussed on February 14, 2018, May 8, 2018*)
- Proposal from the Anderson School of Management for a Dual Master of Financial Engineering – Asia Pacific with the Guanghua School of Management at Peking University – Master of Finance (M.Fin) (*proposal discussed March 7, 2018, April 17, 2018*)

**Name Changes**
• Proposal from the Department of Physics and Astronomy for a name change to their graduate programs-Master of Science in Astronomy and Astrophysics and PhD in Astronomy and Astrophysics *(proposal discussed April 17, 2018)*

**Curricular Changes**

• Proposal from the Anderson School of Management to Change Existing (First Quarter) Master of Science in Business Analytics Courses Offered Online to On-Campus *(proposal discussed April 17, 2018)*

• Proposal from the Labor and Workplace Studies IDP to offer a Labor and Workplace Studies 375 Course *(proposal discussed April 17, 2018)*

• Proposal from the Office of Instructional Development/Graduate Division to Offer a 495 Series Seminar using the Graduate Student Professional Development (Grad PD) Course Designation housed in the Graduate Division *(proposal discussed May 29, 2018)*

• Proposal from the Samueli School of Engineering to Allow Select Students from their Schoolwide Engineering Online Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Program to take On Campus Courses *(proposal discussed May 29, 2018)*

• Proposal from the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning (CIRTL)/Graduate Division to Offer a Course using the Graduate Student Professional Development (Grad PD) Course Designation housed in the Graduate Division *(proposal discussed May 29, 2018)*

**Appendix V Actions**

• Proposal from the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program *(proposal discussed May 29, 2018)*

**Delegated Actions**

• Twenty-four requests for exception to permit non-Senate faculty to serve on master’s and/or doctoral committees from Applied Statistics, Art History, Community Health Sciences, Computer Science, Earth Planetary and Space Sciences, Environmental Science and Engineering, Geophysics and Space Physics, Health Policy and Management, Human Genetics, Latin American Studies, Physics and Biology in Medicine, Statistics, Urban Planning, *(requests considered on November 8, 2017, January 24, 2018, April 17, 2018, May 8, 2018)*

• Ten requests for substantive changes to 2017-18 program requirement changes from Anthropology, Clinical Research, Economics, Film and Television, Islamic Studies, Linguistics, Nursing, Philosophy, Spanish, Theater and Performance Studies *(requests considered on May 8, 2018 and May 29, 2018)*

**Policy Updates/Clarifications**

• Proposal from the Graduate Division to revise existing policy regarding the Master’s Degree and Doctoral Degree Award Sequence *(proposal discussed on November 22, 2017)*

• Proposal from the Graduate Division to revise existing policy regarding Doctoral Advancement to Candidacy and Awarding of the Degree *(proposal discussed on November 22, 2017)*
Proposal from the Graduate Division to revise the Change of Major Process (proposal discussed on November 22, 2017)

Fellowships and Assistantships Committee

The Fellowships and Assistantships Committee (FAC) is empowered to act for the Council on fellowship and assistantship matters, and it recommends policy on standards for Academic Apprentice Personnel, and support issues generally.

Several members of the FAC were involved in the review and rating of applicants for the Dissertation-Year Fellowship program, the Graduate Research Mentorship program, and the Graduate Summer Research program.

In 2017-18, the committee was chaired by Professor Thomas Vondriska. FAC members included: Mirella Dapretto, Brian Kite, Joseph Loo, Julio Vergara (ex officio). Associate Dean Norma Mendoza-Denton attended as a regular guest as did Assistant Dean of Fellowships and Financial Services, Ana Lebon, and Manager of Fellowships and Financial Services, Sherman Chew.

During the 2017-18 academic year, the committee met on one occasion. The topics of discussion included the TA shortage, Fellowship Application and Review Processes, Funding for Graduate Students, and a proposal from the College to classify the College Academic Advising (CAAR) position under the Graduate Student Researcher title code.

Graduate Student/Postdoctoral Scholar Well-being Ad hoc Committee

Given the Graduate Council’s interest in improving and enriching graduate student/postdoctoral scholar intellectual and academic life, it established the Graduate Student/Postdoctoral Scholar Well-being Ad hoc committee to discuss ways to promote student/postdoctoral scholar well-being.

In 2017-18, the committee was chaired by Professor Carola Suarez-Orozco. Committee members included: Victor Bascara, Andrea Kasko, and GSA Representative David DiTullo. Associate Dean Susan Ettner, Graduate Division Case Manager Armando Flores, and SAIRO Director Kristen McKinney attended as regular guests.

During the 2017-18 academic year, the ad hoc committee met on three occasions. The topics of discussion included The University of California Graduate Student Well-Being Survey Report (UCOP), Graduate Student/Postdoctoral Scholar Well-being Ad Hoc Report, Undocumented Graduate Students & the Undocumented Graduate Students Report,

Academic Senate Program Reviews

One of the Graduate Council’s primary tasks is to review the quality of all graduate degree programs, with the exception of the J.D., L.L.M., M.D., and D.D.S. degrees. Program reviews
normally occur at eight-year intervals, and the review schedule is staggered to allow for a manageable number of reviews per year. The Graduate and Undergraduate Councils hosted a joint session on November 3, 2017 to apprise members of the review process and expectations.

In AY 2017-18 the Graduate Council led five reviews and participated in another ten reviews that were led by the Undergraduate Council. The following reviews were conducted in AY 2016-17:

External reviews

- East Asian Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (Site Visit: April 19-20, 2018)
- Department of Education (Site Visit: February 22-23, 2018)
- Department of English (Site Visit: February 15-16, 2018)
- Department of Environmental Health Sciences (Site Visit: January 11-12, 2018)
- Department of French and Francophone Studies (Site Visit: March 1-2, 2018)
- Department of Human Genetics (Site Visit: February 21-22, 2018)
- Life Sciences Core Education (Site Visit: November 27, 2017)
- Molecular Toxicology Interdepartmental Degree Program (Site Visit: January 18-19, 2018)
- Molecular, Cellular, and Integrative Physiology Interdepartmental Degree Program (Site Visit: February 12-13, 2018)
- School of Nursing (Site Visit: February 26-27, 2018)
- Department of Statistics (Site Visit: January 22-23, 2018)
- University Studies (Site Visit: February 5, 2018)

2017-2018 Program Review Themes

While each report is individualized and nuanced, there were many themes that consistently appeared throughout the reports.

These are:

High Priority Issues

- Climate: Many climate issues have surfaced in recently conducted academic program reviews. Improving climate is challenging. In recent years, when climate concerns have been discovered in the course of a program review, experts—both internal and external to the university, have been brought in to assess the situation. In cases where serious climate issues have been verified, reviews have remained open, and strategies for improvement have been proposed and implemented. However, assessing the impact of these strategies is challenging—both for the Councils and the units under review. For their part, the Councils need to determine that adequate progress has been made before a review can be closed. This may require conducting multiple climate assessments over a long period. In some cases, departments under review have stated that continued Academic Senate involvement is potentially a good thing, as it could prevent departments from backsliding. In other cases, the departments believe that Senate involvement is unnecessary. As each review unfolds, the Councils must determine when their
involvement facilitates departmental progress, and when the presence of the Senate impedes the efforts underway.

As the Councils continue to grapple with these issues, we strive to identify actions that departments can take, and ways in which we can measure the progress that departments make. The Councils are endeavoring to create an approach that is consistent as possible across all units. It is only fair that each unit has clearly communicated expectations about the process, expectations for progress, and what the Councils require to close the review. At the same time, the Councils must ensure that reviews are not prematurely closed. We must ensure an inclusive and equitable climate exists for all students.

- **Space:** Deficiency of space is an issue faced by most units on campus. However, it is challenging to address this issue. Addressing space concerns often forces Administration to prioritize one unit over another. To help the Councils grapple with this issue, it would be useful to provide each review team with a space analysis and space issues statement under review. This statement could be provided to the Councils by the Deans, the Campus Space Committee, or whichever entity the EVC/Provost believes would be most appropriate. Ideally, this document would not only analyze the space currently occupied by the unit (faculty offices, lab space, TA space, seminar rooms, storage, space utilized by emeriti, etc.), but would also include benchmarks with similar information from other units within the same school or division.

  As part of this process, each Dean should perhaps be asked to create a concise, transparent policy regarding the use of space over which they have authority. As space on campus is primarily a zero sum enterprise, transparency would help to reduce the confusion and animosity that results due to competition for space.

  Appendix 30, the current policy pertaining to use of space by emeriti, states that each department should, “to the maximum extent possible, provide facilities and services to those who remain professionally active... whenever possible, provide adequate office and laboratory space (individual, when feasible, or shared) for our retired faculty.” For departments, emeriti are valued family members; it is not fair to put department chairs in the position of having to remove emeriti faculty from offices and labs in order to address the instructional and research needs of their unit. Each Dean should support their unit chairs—perhaps by working to appoint departmental space committees—to identify the needs of each program and balance that against the needs of emeriti. These efforts could help to inform each dean as they explore the creation of decanal policies on space.

- **Graduate Student Funding, Labor, and Market:** As was noted last year, graduate funding for most programs is low relative to that of competitors, and the cost of living in Los Angeles (especially housing) continues to climb. Some departments struggle to fund graduate students at a halfway livable level, forcing students to work multiple jobs. Inconsistency and cuts to block grant funding exacerbates these issues and makes it
challenging for departments to plan ahead and offer competitive, multi-year funding packages. Non-resident tuition and in-absentia restrictions are also serious issues in some departments. Everyone wishes there were more funding for graduate education, but we lack solutions. It is time to recognize that a supply-demand balance between graduate students and graduate teaching labor is elusive (and can become distorted by departments urged to accept more graduate students in order to cover teaching, rather than for the training purposes of graduate education). Job prospects have shifted in many fields, putting new pressures on graduate training and opening up the question of what the PhD (especially) is, particularly in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

- **IDPs, ORUs, and CIIs:** One of UCLA’s greatest strengths is its ability to allow faculty-led research and teaching collaborations to form organically and grow over time. This system produces significant interdisciplinary research and collaborations across campus. At the same time, this system creates some tensions—none of which are unique to our campus—that were highlighted in many reviews and review closures.

  In general, faculty engagement in many IDPs is low, with service obligations disproportionately borne by 1-2 faculty members. Many IDPs, and in some cases the Dean under which the program sits, expressed a desire for more control over the FTEs which contribute to their academic programs. Some responses discussed potentially reorganizing an IDP into a Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction (CII) structure, or forming closer ties with ORUs by sharing fiscal control and responsibilities with an aligned center. Others recommended formally transferring a portion of FTE lines into the IDP, which would allow the IDP more control. In some cases, there are curricular weaknesses that cannot be addressed because the IDP (and sometimes Dean) has no ability to hire faculty to teach in the needed areas.

  Some programs, as noted by the external reviewers, could easily climb in the rankings if the university were to invest more resources into the program. Instead, many of the IDPs are seen as boutique programs. Separate lines of reporting, lack of faculty engagement, uncoordinated development efforts, and a lack of student funding all contribute to the perception that some IDPs are perpetually existing on “on life support.” Deans expressed consternation with this situation, as they have no control over the appointments made by/to centers, and in some cases, they expressed a belief that certain IDPs should not be under them.

  The Councils recommend that the EVC/Provost convene a group to formulate a concrete strategy with guidelines that not only differentiate between CIIs and IDPs, but that aim to resolve the structural issues these units face when coordinating with ORUs by regularizing and formalizing interactions between these units. This group should consider how best to structure FTE allocations, fiscal control, and faculty commitment and responsibilities. Once a strategy is developed, existing units can be brought into conformance with the guidelines established by the group. Potential routes to follow are (i) making a formal commitment to IDPs by granting the programs their own FTEs and equitable control over half-time program positions; (ii) allowing the fiscal issues that pertain to the IDP’s
teaching mission to be under the joint purview of the Center affiliated with the IDP; (iii) putting on file memoranda of understanding (MOUs), between the Dean and the departments with faculty participating in the IDP, that stipulate the level of individual faculty commitment and responsibility to teaching for the IDP; and (iv) exploring the feasibility of a CII model or other organizational framework for coordinating the IDP with other units (i.e. departments) and resources (i.e. ORUs) on campus.

- **Resource Scarcity and Interdisciplinarity:** The scarcity of resources on campus has created an environment which is beginning to harm interdisciplinary research, teaching, and service. Faculty interviewed during some program reviews indicated that they are not only told that they should not teach outside of their home department, but they are also advised not to participate on dissertation committees outside of their department or serve on non-departmental committees. Departments are under the impression that the university emphasizes departmental contributions (as calculated via student credit hours and service) over service to the campus. They also believe that, for a department to ‘claim’ the work of their faculty, all teaching must be done via the subject areas the department controls. Some departments have stopped offering cross-listed courses, or delisted courses which were formerly offered by multiple units in order to increase the department’s student credit hours. Faculty in these departments have stated that their department wants to ‘receive credit’ for the student credit hours associated with the course. They also want to be the only unit able to offer the course over the summer, so that they can retain a portion of the revenue.

To help combat this perception, Academic Planning and Budget (APB) should consider employing strategies that go beyond assigning student credit hours to departments on the basis of a subject code. APB should strive to demonstrate the ways in which faculty contribute to the campus—not just to their primary department. Such a system would ideally focus on how faculty contribute, as opposed to where they contribute. This would allow departments to benefit from the service, research, and teaching contributions the FTEs they hold make to the university, regardless of where the specific contributions are made. Such a system could help to ensure our faculty feel free to teach, research, and serve in the areas where their strengths are most impactful.

**Priority Issues**

- **International Institute:** All of the academic programs in the International Institute are IDPs. Any discussion of IDPs, CII, and ORUs should perhaps first focus on the structure and future of the International Institute and creating a structure that allows the units there to thrive.

- **Junior Faculty, Split Appointments and Mentoring:** As noted last year, some departments, especially those that are smaller, experience problems when they have too high a proportion of their faculty with joint or split appointments. While recognizing the benefits of interdisciplinary research, smaller departments have been hit especially hard by this practice. Deans and Departments should work to identify an ideal ratio of ‘core’
and split appointments. This would no doubt differ for each unit based on the total number of FTE they house.

Departments must take care to not exploit faculty with split appointments, and deans and departments must take special care to make sure that junior faculty, women and faculty of color (who are more likely to have split appointments in some parts of campus) are not asked to work harder than their peers. We recognize that hiring across the campus increasingly is opportunistic, and this often leads to split appointments. We worry, however, that faculty are working hard and being double counted.

Somewhat related to this topic is the issue of mentoring for junior faculty. This year, many junior faculty indicated that they are receiving unclear/uneven messages regarding tenure and promotion. This is especially true for faculty who are appointed in multiple departments. As disciplines evolve, expectations for tenure no doubt evolve as well. Deans should work with departments to create clear expectations for junior faculty. They should also explore the institution of mentoring programs to assist junior faculty as they acclimate to the university. Such a program should not only focus on research, but also on teaching and service. With the bulk of teaching now being done by lecturers, departments need to find ways of integrating non-senate faculty into the creation and oversight of curriculum, and the governance of academic programs. The campus must critically evaluate the decade-long shift from a campus with the majority of teaching done by ladder faculty to one in which lecturers now shoulder the majority of the teaching duties. Needless to say, our fervent hope remains that UCLA will reconsider and restore the balance.

• **Graduate Division:** As the nature of the PhD evolves, so too must the ways in which we measure the success of our programs. Many programs have begun altering their curriculum to help prepare students for industry and positions outside of the academy. Graduate Division needs to explore ways of measuring success that go beyond time-to-degree and the rate of placement into tenure track positions. Graduate Division should work with departments to longitudinally track alumni, their career trajectories, and their satisfaction with their program.

**Issues to Monitor**

• **Course Release:** Related to the issues noted with Centers and Split Appointments, the practice of course release might profit from reevaluation. Extensive use of course release hits departments (especially smaller departments) incredibly hard and can be detrimental to students, faculty, and academic programs. Rather than across-the-board reduction of course releases, we recommend that deans work with departments and faculty to stagger course releases throughout the year to ensure that departments have adequate faculty to offer courses and perform administrative duties. The deans may also consider working with faculty to determine other forms of compensation.
• **Undergraduate Education:** This year, in response to long-standing concerns regarding the Foundations of Scientific Inquiry General Education (FSI GE) area (which were also raised in the Academic Senate review of this area), an Ad Hoc Committee was formed by the Undergraduate Council to examine the FSI GE requirement. The committee was not satisfied with the current learning goals of the requirement. Indeed, there were no stated goals. After creating Student Learning Goals for this area, the committee agreed to temporarily reduce the current requirement in order to divert the resources saved to improving and assessing the curriculum. Each FSI GE course will be required to undergo recertification over the next 3 years, after which the entire curriculum will be assessed. This conversation has gained momentum, and other deans would like to conduct a similar evaluation of the GE areas to which they contribute. It is possible that these conversations will result in a General Education reform effort that could significantly alter the current General Education landscape at UCLA.

• **Program Review:** Some departments have begun transferring their formal academic programs to other units, such as the Graduate Programs in Bioscience. Nevertheless, these departments remain as training environments for postdoctoral scholars, graduate students, and junior faculty. This has resulted in departments with no academic programs, such as Biological Chemistry. Conversely, there are programs that exist outside of traditional academic units, such as the School-wide Master of Public Health, the School-wide Master of Science in Engineering (an online degree program), the Luskin School of Public Affairs B.A., and many freestanding minors that call for new approaches. The Senate and Administration need to establish review processes that account for the novel nature of these units and programs.

**Progress Reviews**

The following programs were reviewed in previous years and submitted progress updates or met with the Council Chair (s), in AY 2017-18 in response to recommendations made by the Graduate Council (and Undergraduate Council, where applicable) in the Academic Senate program review report. The following program reviews were closed:

- African Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (*closed May 25, 2018*)
- American Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (*closed June 8, 2018*)
- Archaeology Interdepartmental Degree Program (*closed June 8, 2018*)
- Department of Architecture and Urban Design (*closed May 25, 2018*)
- Department of Art (*closed June 8, 2018*)
- Department of Asian American Studies (*closed June 1, 2018*)
- Department of Chicana and Chicano Studies (*closed June 8, 2018*)
- Department of Gender Studies (*closed May 11, 2018*)
- General Education Scientific Inquiry (*Undergraduate Council Only – closed June 8, 2018*)
- Institute of the Environment and Sustainability (*closed June 8, 2018*)
• International Development Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (closed June 1, 2018)
• Department of Italian (closed June 8, 2018)
• Latin American Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (closed May 25, 2018)
• Department of Materials Science and Engineering (closed June 8, 2018)
• Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (closed May 25, 2018)
• Department of Physics and Astronomy (closed June 8, 2018)
• Department of Social Welfare (closed May 25, 2018)

Interim Reports

The following programs submitted interim reports to the Graduate Council in response to recommendations made by the Graduate Council in the Academic Senate review report. The reviews themselves have not been closed:

• Department of Ethnomusicology (discussed on June 8, 2018; The Graduate Council voted to lift the suspension of admissions to the Ethnomusicology graduate programs)
• Anderson School of Management (discussed on June 1, 2018)

Proposals

The Graduate Council considered the following proposals for new degree programs, new departments/schools, program and department name changes, and interdisciplinary certificates for matriculated graduate students:

• Proposal from the Indo-European Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program for a Master of Arts Degree Program in Indo-European Studies (proposal discussed December 15, 2017)
• Proposal from the Department of Biological Chemistry to discontinue the PhD program in Biological Chemistry and transfer the existing Master of Science to the Molecular Biology Interdepartmental Degree Program (proposal discussed December 15, 2017)
• Proposal from the Department of Human Genetics to establish a Master of Science Professional Degree Program in Genetic Counseling (proposal discussed January 19, 2018)
• Proposal from the Department of Education for a Revision to the Interdisciplinary Certificate in Advanced Quantitative Methods in Educational Research (proposal discussed February 2, 2018)
• Proposal from the Fielding School of Public Health for Accelerated/Early Admission of UCLA Undergraduates to the Department of Environmental Health Sciences Master of Science and Master of Public Health Programs (proposal discussed February 2, 2018, February 16, 2018)
• Request from the Undergraduate Council to Provide Feedback on the Herb Albert School of Music Proposal for a Global Jazz Studies Interdepartmental Degree Program (proposal discussed March 16, 2018)
• Proposal from the Fielding School of Public Health for a Global Health Certificate (proposal discussed April 27, 2018)
• Proposal from the Department of Physics and Astronomy to change name of Graduate Programs – Master of Science in Astronomy and Astrophysics, PhD in Astronomy and Astrophysics (proposal discussed on April 27, 2018)
• Proposal from the Department of Communication to establish a Doctor of Philosophy in Communication (proposal discussed on April 27, 2018)
• Proposal from the Anderson School of Management to establish the Master of Financial Engineering – Asia Pacific at UCLA and the Guanghua School of Management at Peking University – Master of Finance (presented and discussed on May 11, 2018)
• Proposal from the School of Law to establish a Master of Legal Studies Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Program (presented and discussed on May 25, 2018)
• Proposal from the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program (discussed on June 8, 2018)
• Proposal from the Anderson School of Management to Change the Name of its Global Executive MBA for Asia Pacific Program

Policy Issues

The Graduate Council discussed and opined on a number of policy issues, generally in connection with system-wide reports and/or working documents, but also issues originating at the UCLA divisional level, including:

• Delegation of Authority and Annual List of Dean’s Actions (presented on October 6, 2017)
• UC Senate – Taskforce Report on the Negotiated Salary Trial Program (discussed on October 6, 2017)
• Report of the UCLA Classroom Advisory Committee (discussed on October 20, 2017)
• UCLA Taskforce on Civic Engagement (discussed on October 20, 2017)
• UCLA Taskforce on Education Innovation (discussed on November 17, 2017)
• UCLA Taskforce on Research Innovation (discussed on November 17, 2017)
• Supplement to Annual List of Dean’s Actions (discussed on November 17, 2017)
• Graduate Division Proposal regarding Dean’s Special Action (DSA) Cases for Graduate Admissions (discussed on November 17, 2017)
• Graduate Division Proposal regarding Official Transcripts for Graduate Admissions (discussed on November 17, 2017)
• UCLA Taskforce on Global Outreach (discussed on December 1, 2017)
• UCLA Taskforce on Institutional Effectiveness (discussed on December 1, 2017)
• Graduate Division Proposal regarding Revising to the UCLA Doctoral Committee Constitution Minimum Standards (discussed on December 15, 2017)
• UC Senate – Proposed Presidential Policy on Open Access for Theses and Dissertations (discussed on January 19, 2018)
• Proposal from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry to Allow Departmental Scholars to TA Upper Division Courses (discussed on January 19, 2018)
• UC Senate – Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128, Conflicts of Interest (discussed on February 2, 2018)
• Proposal from Patricia Turner, Dean of Undergraduate Education, to add Learning Outcomes to the Course Inventory Management System *(discussed February 2, 2018 and February 16, 2018)*
• Filing Fee Policy *(discussed on March 16, 2018 and June 8, 2018)*
• Graduate Division Proposal to clarify the Dean’s Special Action (DSA) Waiver Process *(discussed on April 13, 2018)*
• Graduate Division Proposal Regarding Academic Disqualification Policy Updates & Data Presentation *(discussed on April 13, 2018 and April 27, 2018)*
• Appendix XII Workgroup – Proposed Revisions *(discussed on April 27, 2018)*
• Labor and Workplace Studies 375 Course Proposal *(discussed on May 11, 2018)*
• Proposal to Revise UCLA Academic Senate Bylaw 155 *(presented and discussed on May 11, 2018)*
• Classroom Scheduling Policy Suggestion *(presented and discussed on May 11, 2018)*
• Proposed Changes to Bylaws of the Graduate Council-Appendix III *(presented and discussed on May 11, 2018)*
• UC Senate – Proposed Presidential Policy on Disclosure of Financial Interests and Management of COI in Private Sponsors of Research and Revised APM – 028 *(discussed on May 11, 2018)*
• Graduate Division Proposal to Revise the Minimum GPA Standard for Graduate Admissions *(presented and discussed on May 25, 2018 and June 1, 2018)*
• Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) participation in Program Review *(discussed on June 1, 2018)*
• Guidance from the Graduate Council on Gender Identity Questions for Graduate Admissions Application *(presented and discussed on June 8, 2018)*
• Graduate Division Proposal to Revise the Graduate Admissions Application Essay Prompts *(presented and discussed on June 8, 2018)*

**Discussions and Presentations**

In addition to considering various proposals, program reviews and policy issues, the Graduate Council heard from a number of campus constituents in AY 2017-18. The functions of these presentations ranged from providing overviews of campus services and initiatives to requesting exceptions to policy. The Council welcomes these interactions, which broaden the membership’s knowledge of the graduate experience at UCLA.

• Update on the Graduate Admissions System presented by Dean Robin Garrell *(presented October 20, 2017)*
• Update on Graduate Division Projects/Initiatives presented by Dean Robin Garrell *(presented October 20, 2017)*
• Graduate Student & Postdoctoral Scholar Well-Being Ad hoc Committee: Report on Undocumented Graduate Students *(presented and discussed on February 16, 2018)*
Mentoring and Evaluation for Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP) Workgroup Final Report & Recommendations *(presented and discussed on April 13, 2018)*
- Five Year Planning Perspective *(discussed on April 27, 2018)*
- Academic and Administrative Calendars 2023-2031 *(discussed on May 11, 2018)*

**Major Initiatives**

**Mentoring and Evaluation for Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP)**
The Graduate Council and Graduate Division appointed a workgroup called Mentoring and Evaluation for Graduate Academic Progress (MEGAP), whose charge is to address the evaluation of graduate student academic progress and the role of mentoring in enhancing student experiences and success.

The need for the MEGAP Workgroup emerged from increased campus, UC, and national attention to graduate student academic success and the subsequent progression of master’s and doctoral degree recipients into increasingly varied careers. Academic success takes many forms, including timely progression through degree milestones, research productivity, successful execution of individual and team projects, degree completion, and development of the skills and competencies of the profession. A growing body of literature has shown engaged mentoring, consistent departmental evaluation and timely feedback to graduate students about their degree progress, coupled with proactive engagement by students in the mentoring relationship, contribute to student success and to a culture of excellence in the department. In turn, these characteristics make the department more attractive to prospective applicants and foster good will among alumni.

At UCLA, student surveys and the Academic Senate program reviews revealed that graduate student mentoring and advising are issues of concern in many departments, while in others the practices earn high praise. The MEGAP Workgroup was charged with developing recommendations, best practices and tools that departments can use to apply these principles in the local context.

**Decision on Delegation of Graduate Admissions**

During meetings held on December 1st and December 15th, 2017, the Graduate Council discussed extensively the possibility of authorizing a pilot program in which admissions authority could be delegated to individual Schools within the university. After carefully pondering every angle of the pros and cons implied in a potential change in delegated authority, at its December 15th meeting, the Graduate Council accorded unanimously (12 ayes, 0 nay, 1 abstention) to renew its support to Section 500.2 of the “Guidelines for the Graduate Admissions Process...” document, purportedly delegating the responsibility of graduate admissions to the Graduate Dean.

Before reaching this decision, Graduate Council members reviewed the following background information/materials:

1) Your presentation at the November 17th, 2017 Graduate Council meeting requesting consideration of the possibility that the Council create a pilot program whereby admissions
authority is delegated to selected Schools. (It should be noted that Sandra Graham, Chair of the UCLA Academic Senate, attended this meeting.) After your presentation, members of the GC were given the opportunity to ask questions regarding your vision on the motivational forces that may justify a potential change in the delegation of graduate admissions from being centralized at the Graduate Division, to a plan allowing selected Schools to devise their own admissions processes. Members also inquired about the expectations and administrative advantages that such a measure would entail, and the potential consequences that decentralization of the admission process may have on the UCLA campus.

2) Multiple verbal reports on current admissions practices by Dean Garrell (ex-officio member) and by qualified personnel from the Graduate Division who attended meetings (as standing guests) in which delegation or a potential re-delegation of authority was discussed. These discussions pertained to, among other issues, the admissions crisis that took place in Fall 2017 caused by the unforeseen announcement made by DecisionDesk to cease all operations on November 30, 2017.


4) Copies of emails from Deans Judy Olian and Jody Heymann from the Anderson Graduate School of Management (AGSM) and the Fielding School of Public Health (FSPH), respectively, to you and Dean Garrell, in which they explain their plans to implement changes to admissions processes to their respective schools under delegated authority.

5) A Memorandum, addressed to all members of the Graduate Council, from Dean Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, Graduate School of Education & Information Studies (GSEIS), in which he expresses his desire for a change to the delegation of admissions authority to the GSEIS for the Fall 2019 academic year.

The Graduate Council’s decision to reject the implementation of a pilot program that would (even on a trial basis) confer admissions authority to selected Schools, and to (instead) endorse the current stipulation in section 500.2-A of the Graduate Council guidelines that “The Graduate Dean is delegated the responsibility of developing, establishing, and supervising administrative procedures and practices to carry out the policies promulgated by the Graduate Council under SR 510...” was summarily based on the following compelling arguments:

1) UCLA’s position as a world leader in education was achieved, and is supported and advanced, by the concerted efforts of individuals across the spectrum of scholarship, education, research and training. These individuals, along with their respective departments and schools, continue to operate under the aegis of UCLA. The Graduate Council believes that a key component of this success is the centralized branding and administration of graduate education, an integral component of which is the selection and admission of the graduate student pool.

2) Shared governance with the Academic Senate, a main tenet of the University of California, gives the University faculty not only voice in the operation of the University, but also responsibility in the way the University operates. The Graduate Council encompasses the faculty voice in matters related to graduate education, including the admission process. Delegating graduate admissions authority to Schools, thus potentially allowing multiple admission units to operate distinctively on the campus, would severely complicate and weaken the Graduate
Council’s ability to convey the faculty’s unified message regarding this significant component of graduate education. Furthermore, a decentralized graduate admission system would hinder the consistent implementation of high academic recruitment standards across campus.

3) The emergency situation that the Graduate Division faced due to the failure of a contracted admissions platform cannot be used as an excuse to justify a change in the policy regarding the delegation of admissions authority that has been in place for decades. A change in policy at this juncture would set a dangerous precedent for the shared governance principles that the Graduate Council is delegated to support and sustain.

Despite the unanimous decision to negate the delegation of graduate admissions authority to selected Schools, the Graduate Council is sensitive to their needs to maintain efficiency and excellence in graduate admissions. The Graduate Council also appreciates the substantial inconveniences that were experienced due to the challenges faced with the admissions systems in 2017-18. In response to these concerns, the Graduate Council will work with the Graduate Division to critically review ways to streamline current admissions processes and facilitate individual schools’ efforts to adopt the new online admissions system. The Graduate Council also recommends that the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost consider committing additional resources to support the Graduate Division’s mission in this regard.

Thank you for considering our response on this important issue. Please let us know if you would like further information regarding our recommendations.

Closing remarks

Academic Year 2017-18 was a demanding yet productive year for the Graduate Council. Every member played a role in executing the many assigned tasks and reviews, and did so in a collaborative and collegial way. Chair Vergara wishes to acknowledge all appointed members, as well as student representatives Nitish Bhagia, David DiTullio, Kia Karbasi, Rebecca Katz, Yutong Wang; Dean Robin L. Garrell, Associate Deans Joseph Watson, Norma Mendoza-Denton, Susan Ettner; Assistant Dean-Academic Services April de Stefano; Assistant Dean-Diversity, Inclusion, and Admissions Maggie Gover, and Assistant Dean-Fellowships and Financial Services Ana Lebon for all of their contributions this year. The year culminated with a reception hosted by Chair Vergara and Dean Garrell in celebration of all of the work managed by the Graduate Council in 2017-18.

Respectfully submitted:

Victor Bascara, Asian American Studies
Michele Basso, Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences (ended 2/19/18)
Rosina Becerra, Social Welfare
Jean-Claude Carron, French and Francophone Studies
Mirella Dapretto, Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences
Daniel Ennis, Radiological Sciences
David Glanzman, Integrative Biology and Physiology/Neurobiology
Mark Kaplan, Social Welfare
Andrea Kasko, Bioengineering
Yong Kim, Dentistry
Brian Kite, Theater
Joseph Loo, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Renate Lux, Dentistry
Caroline Streeter, English
Carola Suarez-Orozco, Education
Thomas Vondriska, Anesthesiology
Willeke Wendrich, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, VICE CHAIR
Dorothy Wiley, Nursing
Olga Yokoyama, Humanities
Julio Vergara, Physiology, CHAIR

September 2018
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

Overview

The Committee on Committees (ConC) consists of nineteen elected members of the Academic Senate at UCLA, including sixteen representatives of campus constituencies, as apportioned by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction, and three at-large members. During Academic Year 2017-18 Professor Christina Palmer served as the Committee on Committees’ Chair and UCLA’s Divisional representative to the System-wide University Committee on Committees and Professor Nicholas Brecha served as its Vice Chair. Seat 3 (Humanities), Seat 5 (Languages and Literatures), Seat 6 (Arts & Architecture), Seat 14 (Radiology/Pathology), Seat 15 (Primary/Family Care), and Seat 17 (At-Large) remained vacant. Sixteen meetings were held in 2017-18 to manage the Committee on Committees’ various responsibilities and to ensure the full staffing of the Academic Senate’s standing committees. Committee members enjoyed a collegial and productive year.

The principal charge of the Committee on Committees is to recommend to the Legislative Assembly the appointment of the Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the twenty-three standing committees (and three standing subcommittees) of the UCLA Division of the Academic Senate, as well as the divisional representatives on the fifteen system-wide standing committees. The Committee on Committees also serves in an advisory role to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel by providing its recommendations of candidates to serve on the administrative search and review committees of high-level administrators at UCLA, and to the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) by providing slates of divisional representatives to serve on system-wide administrative search and review committees.

The functioning of the Academic Senate depends critically on the success of the Committee on Committees in identifying and recruiting qualified faculty members for committee positions, which clearly requires the election of knowledgeable and fair-minded representatives to the Committee on Committees. All Academic Senate members are strongly encouraged to participate in the nomination and election of respected colleagues to the Committee on Committees during the Academic Senate’s annual elections.

Tasks and Accomplishments

The scope of Committee on Committees’ activities is described below in some detail in an effort to provide an overview of its tasks, and to encourage Senate faculty members to volunteer for service and to contribute to the shared governance of the University. This year, the Committee...
on Committees revived the practice of assigning ConC liaisons to Academic Senate committees. The role of the liaison is to improve the communication and relationship between the Committee of Committees and the Standing Committees/Councils of the Senate for which it nominates and selects membership.

Through the liaisons, ConC hopes to accomplish the following:

- **Information gathering** – The liaison will be the main point of contact for matters regarding membership, with special attention paid to any and all bylaw requirements, and committee needs for relevant experience and expertise.

- **Succession Planning** – The liaison will serve as the mechanism for assisting the Committees/Councils to identify incoming Chairs and Vice-Chairs (when appropriate) and help to engage in succession planning.

- **Collaborative Working** – The liaison will engage with the leadership of the Committees/Councils to better understand the work, areas of interest, and goals of the committee so that the Committee on Committees is able to identify optimal and suitable members.

As a liaison, ConC members:

- Communicated with leadership of the assigned Council/Committee quarterly to ensure that membership needs are shared and discussed.
- Shared findings with ConC leadership in between meetings (when urgent) or provided an oral report during a ConC meeting when that specific Committee/Council’s membership was up for discussion.

The Committee on Committees was able to complete the majority of its tasks this year in a timely manner, concluding 2017-18 with making all, but nine appointments to the Academic Senate’s standing committees and subcommittees for the 2018-19 Academic year, including chairs and vice chairs.

With respect to the Committee on Committees’ recruitment of 2018-19 committee members, the average acceptance rate was 64%, and over 50% for most of the committees, as detailed in the chart below. Recruitment was the most difficult for the Council on Academic Personnel (CAP), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Graduate Council (GC), and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) for which 80 invitations were sent to fill 28 vacancies. Several candidates reported sabbaticals, while others were concerned about the additional workload that the proposed appointments would carry (particularly notable for CAP, Undergraduate Council, and the Graduate Council).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Name</th>
<th># Positions</th>
<th># Vacancies</th>
<th>% Rotation</th>
<th># Invitations</th>
<th>% Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Freedom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Personnel (ClinCAP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing &amp; Community Education</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeriti Affairs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Lectureship</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Advisory</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction &amp; Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library &amp; Scholarly Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budget</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilege &amp; Tenure</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Grants Program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Jurisdiction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Admissions (CUARS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Council</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UgC Honors, Awards &amp; Prizes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operationally the Committee on Committees is very mindful of ensuring that campus diversity (with respect to gender, ethnicity, discipline, etc.) is reflected adequately on all committee appointments and nomination slates. The Committee on Committees makes a concerted effort to appoint and recommend faculty members who would do the best possible job serving on particular committees, while being mindful of each committee’s responsibilities, recent history, and current membership composition. The Committee on Committees seeks input regarding the process from the faculty at large (when it distributes its annual call for committee volunteers), from the various committees (often via the committee’s chair and/or administrative liaison), and on occasion from department chairs and deans. For each committee opening, the Committee on Committees develops a short list of candidates, rank-orders the names, and proceeds to invite faculty after the Committee on Committees reaches a consensus. Member manuals were also developed to assist committee members with more easily identifying prospective candidates.
from within their designated constituencies and to provide clear and succinct information about various aspects of the Committee on Committees’ charge.

Given its promotion of disciplinary diversity, among other factors, the Committee on Committees encourages all Senate faculty members to consider volunteering for service on the Academic Senate’s standing committees. The Committee on Committees would like to emphasize that recruiting faculty to serve on the large number of Senate standing committees is very challenging and respectfully reminds Senate faculty of the importance of shared governance, the existence of which is dependent to a very large extent on service on Academic Senate committees.

**Standing Committees of Academic Senate** - The standing committees for which the Committee on Committees appointed the Chair, Vice Chair and new members are listed below:

- Academic Freedom *(1 new appointment)*
- Council on Academic Personnel *(6 new appointments)*
- Charges *(3 new appointments)*
- Continuing and Community Education *(2 new appointments)*
- Development *(5 new appointments)*
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion *(3 new appointments)*
- Emeriti Affairs *(2 new appointments)*
- Faculty Research Lectureship *(2 new appointments)*
- Faculty Welfare *(4 new appointments)*
- Graduate Council *(4 new appointments)*
- Grievance Advisory *(2 new appointments)*
- Instruction and Technology *(3 new appointments)*
- Intercollegiate Athletics *(3 new appointments)*
- International Education *(1 new appointment)*
- Library and Scholarly Communication *(4 new appointments)*
- Council on Planning and Budget *(6 new appointments)*
- Committee on Privilege and Tenure *(2 new appointments)*
- Council on Research *(5 new appointments)*
- Rules and Jurisdiction *(1 new appointment)*
- Teaching *(1 new appointment)*
- Undergraduate Council *(7 new appointments)*
- Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools *(2 new appointments)*

**Standing Subcommittees of the Academic Senate** - The three standing subcommittees for which the Committee on Committees appoints members are listed below:

- ClinCAP – a subcommittee of the Council on Academic Personnel *(1 new appointment)*
- Faculty Grants Program – a subcommittee of the Council on Research *(5 new appointments)*
- Honors, Awards and Prizes – a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council *(6 new appointments)*

**System-wide University Committees** – the Committee on Committees recruited divisional representatives for the following UC system-wide committees:
With respect to making appointments to system-wide committees, the default practice for many years has been to appoint the chair of the equivalent divisional committee as the divisional representative on the system-wide committee. However, it was noted that the term of appointment on system-wide committees is typically two years, whereas the term of a divisional chair appointment is typically one year, which creates a conflict with ensuring continuity of the Los Angeles’ Division in system-wide discussions, if not its assumption of more leadership roles within the UC Academic Senate. The Committee on Committees also often defers its recommendation of a system-wide representative to the chair of the equivalent divisional committee. However, in the interest of striving for multi-year appointments on the system-wide committees, the Committee on Committees should be mindful of the irregular terms of service and be more pro-active with recommending candidates to the divisional chair, especially when it encourages completion of the system-wide committee terms. Additionally, given that many system-wide committee meetings are conducted via teleconference and/or are web-based, the Committee on Committees recommends having divisional committee chairs and vice chairs, as well as alternate system-wide committee representatives, participate in these meetings to encourage more familiarity with the system-wide discussions. A broader group of faculty familiar with system-wide issues would be very useful when considering system-wide committee membership succession.

**Divisional Administrative Search Committees** – the Committee on Committees provided a slate of candidates to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost for the following search/advisory committees:

- Dean of the Anderson School of Management
- Dean of the Herb Alpert School of Music
- Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer

**Divisional Administrative Five Year Reviews** – the Committee on Committees provided slates of candidates to the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel for the following administrative review committees:

- Chair of the Department of Anesthesiology and Perioperative Medicine
- University Librarian
System-wide Administrative Search and Review Committees – the Committee on Committees provided slates of candidates to the University Committee on Committees for the following search and review advisory committees:

- University of California, Riverside Chancellor Review Committee

Divisional Miscellaneous Committees – the Committee on Committees recruited or recommended representatives for the following committees:

- Faculty Representative to the Transportation Service Advisory Board (Events & Transportation)
- Gold Shield Selection Committee (Gold Shield Chair)
- Grading Ad Hoc Committee
- Office of Instructional Development Advisory Committee
- WSCUC (WASC) Steering Committee

System-wide Miscellaneous Committees/Awards/Panel/Advisory Board – the Committee on Committees recruited or recommended representatives for the following committees:

- California Council on Science and Technology (CCST) Board of Directors
- Carcinogen Identification Committee
- Oliver Johnson Award
- Scientific Review Panel on Toxic Air Contaminants
- System-wide Academic Senate Editorial Committee (Anthropology, Environmental Science, Premodern History, Sociology, Criminology, American Studies Areas)
- System-wide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee (SLASIAC) Standing Subcommittee on Copyright Policies
- UC Firearm Violence Research Center Advisory Board

Interactions with Administration and Committee Chairs - the Committee on Committees consulted with the following administrators in executing its primary charges:

- Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel – the Committee on Committees maintains a consultative relationship with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel, who is asked to vet the Committee on Committees’ candidates for the Academic Senate’s governance committees, including the Council on Academic Personnel. The governance committees deal with sensitive personnel issues and actions, and the intent of the consultative relationship is to determine whether prospective candidates have conflicts or other issues that may be known to the Vice Chancellor, but not to the Committee on Committees.

Closing remarks

The Committee on Committees would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge and express its appreciation to the large number of colleagues that are currently serving, or are preparing to serve, on a committee and/or have agreed to serve in another capacity that promotes shared governance of the
University. The Committee on Committees would like to close by once again urging all Senate members to volunteer for service, a hallmark of shared governance in the University of California, and more often than not, a very rewarding and interesting experience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nicholas Brecha, Department of Neurobiology, VICE CHAIR
Dinesh Chhetri, Department of Head and Neck Surgery
Subramanian Iyer, Department of Electrical Engineering
Helga Leitner, Department of Geography
Leah Lievrouw, Department of Information Studies
Rosa Matzkin, Department of Economics
Vickie Mays, Department of Psychology
Diane Papazian, Department of Physiology
Charalabos Pothoulakis, School of Medicine
Beate Ritz, Department of Epidemiology
Olga Yokoyama, Humanities
Aradhna Tripati, Department of Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences
Christina Palmer, Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, CHAIR

August 2018
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Council on Research (COR) is the Academic Senate’s primary pathway of communication with the Vice Chancellor for Research and with the various directors within the research administration as required, to advise on issues pertinent to the faculty research mission and policy. COR, as specified by divisional bylaw 75.3, is responsible for fostering research; for formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures; and for advising the Vice Chancellor for Research.

COR met seven times during the 2017-18 academic year. This report briefly outlines the Council’s activities during the year.

ACTIVITIES

COR’s Faculty Grants Program

The Faculty Grants Program (FGP) consists of both the Faculty Research Grants (FRG) and the Research Enabling Grants (REG). The Faculty Grants Program is an annual, merit-based competition that provides research support to the faculty of UCLA. Funds which support the Faculty Grants Program are provided to the Council on Research by the Office of the Chancellor. The REG and FRG funds are awarded through a committee review process that evaluates the merit of the proposal, the appropriateness of the proposed use of the funds and the feasibility of completing the project within one year.

The application and review processes were streamlined and shortened considerably in comparison to prior funding cycles. COR received positive feedback as a result of this change. The Council on Research tasked its Faculty Grants Program Committee with the totality of the reviews. The final funding decision was made by the Council members.

The Council implemented a new online application system in 2017-18 for the 2018-19 funding cycle in the Academic Senate’s Data Management System (DMS). Reviews were also handled in this system.

For the 2017-18 year (2018-19 funding cycle), the FRG grants were funded up to the level of $10,000 while the REG grants were funded up to the level of $2,000. The total amount disbursed for the 2018-19 research grants cycle is $1,378,017.95.

The awards were distributed in the following way:
### Academic Title:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>AWARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Emeritus</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of FRGs and REGs awarded per Division/School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL/DIVISION</th>
<th>AWARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science:</td>
<td>Per Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanities</td>
<td>• 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Life Sciences</td>
<td>• 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical Sciences</td>
<td>• 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Sciences</td>
<td>• 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson School of Management</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Geffen School of Medicine</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fielding School Public Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Information Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herb Alpert School of Music</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luskin School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Arts and Architecture</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre, Film, Television and Digital Media</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few Council on Research members also participated in the review process for the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research’s Grand Challenges.

**Travel Grants Program**

Each Academic Senate faculty member is eligible to apply for funds to pay their expenses in order to present research results at one domestic or international conference per year. Support is granted for the personal presentation of results of original research and/or creative activity at conferences and meetings of recognized scholarly societies. Domestic travel awards are limited to $700 per trip, while International awards are limited to $1,350 per trip. The total number of travel grants awarded (domestic and international) was 273 for $202,143.

**Organized Research Units**

Presently, the Organized Research Units (ORUs) report to Deans and are reviewed by the office of the Vice Provost of Interdisciplinary and Cross-Campus Affairs. Up until 2017, ORUs had not been adhering to the Regent’s policy of regular five year reviews. COR, in collaboration with the office of the Vice Provost of Interdisciplinary and Cross-Campus Affairs, is responsible for suggesting potential reviewers and providing issues statements on the various reports.

The ORUs reviewed in 2017-18 were:

- African Studies Center
- American Indian Studies Center
- Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies
- Center for Near Eastern Studies
- Molecular Biology Institute

**University Committee on Research Policy**

In 2017-18, the University Committee on Research Policy held eight meetings in the Office of the President, in Oakland. All meetings were attended by either Leif Havton or Richard Desjardins.

The main topics discussed throughout the course of the year were:

Reproducibility and authentication issues in the biological sciences: a few members formed a subgroup to discuss the issue of defining UC’s role in the area. The university has vested interest in ensuring that the work of its scientists and researchers is reproducible. In the event that the members may agree on a suggested policy, there may be another way of translating the issue.
COR Chair and UCLA representative on UCORP Leif Havton was part of a sub-group of three tasked with following up on the issue of authentication for biological sciences.

**MRU Review - Institute of Transportation Studies:** Evaluation of the systemwide (multi-campus) value of the unit as well as quality of the work. The review focused on operations, governance, organization, inclusion of graduate and undergraduate students, and how the MRU encompasses the mission of UC. In consultation with the Academic Senate committees on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and Graduate Affairs (CCGA), UCORP makes a recommendation that the MRU continue as-is, continue with some changes, or disestablish.

**Laboratory Fees Research Program:** The Program received 30 proposals for collaborative, multi-campus projects that included one or more national labs. Seven total awards were made in the targeted areas: two in cybersecurity, three in climate science, and two in national security through the social sciences, for a total of $25 million.

**OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE**

The Council on Research commented on the following issues in 2017-18:

- Amendment to Bylaw 128
- New Presidential Policy on Conflict of Interest
- Revisions to Appendix XII
- Task Force on Strategic Planning Report on Civic Engagement
- Task Force on Strategic Planning Report on Education Innovation
- Task Force on Strategic Planning Report on Global Outreach
- Task Force on Strategic Planning Report on Institutional Effectiveness
- Task Force on Strategic Planning Report on Research Innovation

**Closing remarks**

2017-18 was a challenging yet productive year for the Council on Research. Every member played a role in executing the many assigned tasks and reviews, and did so in a collaborative and collegial way. We appreciate the willing and open approach to sharing information of Vice Chancellor for Research Roger Wakimoto.
Chair Havton wishes to acknowledge Vice Chair Richard Desjardins, all appointed members, as well as student representatives and especially the Council’s Analyst Elizabeth Feller, for all of their contributions this year.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Bensinger, Microbiology, Immunology and Molecular Genetics
Judson Caskey, Management
Jaunian Chen, Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology
Yongho Sungtaek Ju, Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Robin D.G. Kelley, History
Ohyun Kwon, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Julian Martinez, Human Genetics
Richard Desjardins, Education, Vice Chair
Leif Havton, Neurology, CHAIR
Appendix A

2018-19 Funding Cycle Faculty Grants Program Recipients

Faculty Research Grants (Awards up to $10,000)

Anesthesiology

- Rodrigues Vacas, Susana – Blood brain barrier dysfunction affecting post-surgery cognitive recovery in Obstructive Sleep Apnea

Anthropology

- Acabado, Stephen – Co-opting Colonialism: Responses to Iberian Conquest in the Philippines
- Debenport, Erin – Strategic (In)visibilitys in the Pueblo Borderlands
- Li, Min – Origin and Dynamics of the Shang Civilization in Bronze Age China (Phase II)
- Perry, Susan – Behavioral flexibility in white-faced capuchins across the lifespan
- Schachner, Gregson – Tracing Ancestral Hopi Social Networks through Ceramic Production and Exchange
- Smith, Monica L. – Excavations at Kankeihuda, India: A Newly-Discovered Ancient Port on the Indian Ocean

Architecture and Urban Design

- Osman, Michael – Augmenting the Architect

Art History

- Baker, George – The Artist as Archaeologist: Painting and the Underground
- Cohen, Meredith – Gothic architects, masons, and sculptors in the city circa 1250-1450
- Gerstel, Sharon – Crossing Time: The Church of Hagioi Theodoroi, Vamvaka
- Mathur, Saloni – Art Criticism in South Asia
- Von Falkenhausen, Lothar – Economic Trends in South China: 850-221 BC

Asian American Studies


Asian Languages and Cultures

- Duthie, Torquil – Imagining the World in Premodern Japan
- Hanscom, Christopher – The Return of the Political in Contemporary South Korean Fiction
- Lee, Namhee – Afterlives of the 1980s Minjung Movement: The Culture Wars and the Triumphant Discourse in South Korea
- Lippit, Seiji – Heterotopias of Postwar Japan: Black Markets and the Conversions of Empire
- Shih, Shu-Mei – Indigenous Knowledge, Taiwan: Comparative and Relational Perspectives
- Sohn, Sung-Ock – Discourse and epistemic stance in conversation
- Tao, Hongyin – Claiming incompetency in interaction: A cross-linguistic investigation of Mandarin and English discourse patterns

Bioengineering

- Schmidt, Jacob – Hydrogel-backed nanopores for single protein detection and characterization

Biological Chemistry

- Probing the organization and function of sexual dimorphism in the brain
Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Caram, Justin – Using supramolecular dye aggregates as photochemical antenna templates to create metallic nanowires
- Diaconescu, Paula – Switchable catalysis as a tool for the synthesis of novel multiblock copolymers

Chicana/o Studies
- Blackwell, Maylei – Oaxacan Indigenous Women’s Transborder Organizing and Community Making
- Lopez Gaspar de Alba, Alma – Black and Brown Artivism: African American and Chicanx Public Art

Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Mohanty, Sanjay – Electrochemical stimulation of microorganisms for enhanced nitrate removal in stormwater biofilters

Classics
- Blank, David – The atomist aesthetics of Philodemus in Book 8 of On Rhetoric
- Morris, Sarah – Archaeological Artifacts from Ancient Methone, Greece
- Papadopoulos, John – Preparing and digitizing the Lofkend Archaeological Project for a Long-term Digital Repository
- Purves, Alex – Index and Proof-checking for forthcoming book Homer and the Poetics of Gesture (OUP 2018)

Communication Studies
- Joo, Jungseock – Detecting and Decoding Gender Stereotypes in Media Photographs: A Computational Approach

Community Health Sciences
- Gipson, Jessica – Understanding men’s and women’s perceived risk of pregnancy: An in-depth exploration in rural Malawi

Comparative Literature
- Gana, Nouri – Bastard Nation: A History of Cultural Dissident in Tunisia (1934-2011)
- Kaufman, Eleanor – Letters from the Archive: Western Jewish Settlers in the Long Twentieth Century
- Macfadyen, David – Training Humanities Students in Blockchain Technology
- Stahuljak, Zrinka – Medieval Fixers and France-Iceland Circulation

Dentistry
- Klokkevold, Perry – Effect of Adjunctive Laser Therapy on the Periodontal Microbiome: A Twelve-Month, Randomized, Controlled, Split-Mouth Clinical Study
- Pirih, Flavia – Evaluating the Efficacy of a CXCR3 Antagonist in Peri-Implantitis
- Tran, Nini – Comparison of C. albicans and S. mutans levels and Analysis of Fungal Diversity in Diabetic Children

Design | Media Arts
- Mendez, Rebeca – CircumSolar, Migration: Alaska

Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences
- Peltzer, Gilles – Present-day deformation in Afar
- Wasson, John – Composition and origin of iron meteorite group IC; classification of new irons

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
- Zapata, Felipe – A phylogenetic comparative functional genomic study of a Californian plant radiation
Economics

- Fajgelbaum, Pablo – Optimal Urban Transport Networks

Education

- Orellana, Marjorie – Apprenticeship in Graduate Learning II: Learning from with and from Kids at the UCLA Community School
- Rose, Mike – When the Light Goes On: A Study of Student Engagement with School
- Webb, Noreen – Promoting Students’ Mathematical Competence through Active Classroom Participation

English

- Carruth, Allison – Novel Ecologies book project
- Deloughrey, Elizabeth – “The Art of Oceanic Futures”
- Goyal, Yogita – Runaway Genres: Global Afterlives of Slavery
- Jager, Eric – Duke John’s Skull: The Murder that Made the Hundred Years’ War
- Kelly, Henry – Inquisition in Fourteenth-Century England
- Looby, Christopher – Public Prints: Serial Form and American Fiction, 1792-1885 (chapter title: “Seriality and Sectionalism: The Bostonians in the Century Magazine”)
- Makdisi, Saree – Hawksmoor’s London
- Sharpe, Jennifer – Immaterial Archives: Lost Past, Salvaged Futures
- Snelson, Daniel – Reissues: Periodical Platforms on the Internet
- Yenser, Stephen – Contemporary American Poetry

Film, Television, Digital Media

- Bergstrom, Janet – F.W. Murnau, A Visionary Filmmaker at Work
- Flanagan, Kristine – Feature documentary, BODY PARTS
- Greene, Shelleen Maisha – Embodiment and Black Aesthetics
- Kim, Gina – Monkey House
- Mamber, Stephen – Apps for Media Study
- Scott, Ellen – Cinema’s Peculiar Institution: a Book Project and Digital Humanities Extension

French and Francophone Studies

- Brozgal, Lia – Ahmed at the Synagogue: Translating a Jewish Childhood in the Muslim Mediterranean
- Melzer, Sara – De-Gendering the Tango: Sensational Knowledge
- Murat, Laure – Woman as Symptoms or Madness at Work

Geography

- Clark, William – Immigrant home-ownership trajectories: access to home-ownership in volatile housing markets
- Kay, Kelly – Sugar water: The shifting dynamics of land use, water rights, and social and environmental justice in Maui, Hawaii

Germanic Languages

- Kim, David – Literary History Against the Grain: Toward a New Genealogy of Literature

Head and Neck Surgery

- Wang, Marilene – Exon 8 single nucleotide polymorphism of the GAN gene correlates with tumor recurrence and metastasis in head and neck cancer

History

- Derby, Lauren – Tracing the History of Fugitive Hunting Subcultures on Hispaniola
- Ford, Caroline – The Paris Housing Crisis and the Rise of Architectural Modernism, 1890-1940
• Goldberg, Jessica – A new way into medieval demography
• Howe, Daniel – Examples of Failure in American Religious Freedom: The Cases of Quakers, Mormons, Catholics, Jews
• Lal, Vinay – Gandhi and the Politics of the Image
• Marotti, William – The Art of Revolution: Politics and Aesthetic Dissent in Japan’s 1968
• Nash, Gary – The Writings of Warner Mifflin
• Reill, Peter – Enlightenment, Empire and Ethnology: Prince Maximilian Wied-Neuwied’s Expeditions to the New World
• Stacey, Peter – Roman social philosophy and Renaissance political theory
• Worger, William – Simeon Wilhelm: Atlantic Traveler 1800-1817

Information Studies
• Posner, Miriam – Data Troubles: Approaching Data in the Humanities

Integrative Biology and Physiology
• Chandler, Scott – A comparison of jaw opener and jaw closer motor neuron susceptibility to degeneration during the progression of Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis in mice
• Narins, Peter – A collaborative field of study of the effects of environmental factors on hearing in Cururu toads
• Rowat, Amy – How does matrix stiffness amplify cellular response to stress hormones?
• White, Stephanie – Transcriptional targets of speech-related FoxP2 in an animal model for vocal learning

Law
• Horwitz, Jill – Regulation of Prescription Opioids: Effects on Prescribing and Misuse
• Langer, Maximo – Beyond the Adversarial and Inquisitorial Systems and Common and Civil Law. The Origins, Present and Future of Comparative Criminal Procedure
• Lopucki, Lynn – Method for Corporate Law Comparison
• Michaels, Jon – Neoliberal Socialism
• Steinberg, Richard – International Justice and Reconciliation: Attitude Convergence or Polarization Through ICC Trials?
• Volokh, Eugene – Our Virtual Future
• Wang, Alex – (1) Greening China’s Belt and Road Initiative? Soft Power with Chinese Characteristics; (2) Environmental Crimes & Ecological Civilization in China

Linguistics
• Goldstein, David – New horizons in linguistic phylogenetics
• Hayes, Bruce – Does sentence construction respect phonological constraints?
• Hyams, Nina – The Sounds of Silence: Sluicing in early grammar (continuing project)
• Jun, Sun-Ah – Quantifying the macro-rhythm to study prosodic typology
• Mahajan, Anoop – Morphological and Semantic Alternations in South Asian Languages
• Munro, Pamela – Linguistic Studies of Two Endangered Languages: Chickasaw and Garifuna
• Schutze, Carson – Testing the acceptability of ‘who’-free relatives in English
• Sportiche, Dominique – What makes an anaphor an anaphor?
• Sundara, Megha – The role of phonotactics in the learning of morphology
• Zuraw, Kie – An R package for Maximum Entropy Optimality Theory

Management
• Ahmadi, Reza – Network Architecture and Sustainability of Joint Liability
• Dai, Hengchen – Structuring Cost-Effective Incentives to Motivate Better Health Decisions
• Sakakibara, Mariko – Corporate Strategy and Knowledge Flows: Tracking Human Capital Movements
• Wasserman, Melanie – Gender and the Transition from School to Work: New Evidence from Mentorship Data

Materials Science and Engineering
• Kakoulli, Ioanna – Multimodal hyperspectral imaging spectroscopy – an emerging process analytical tool for in situ analysis of complex archaeological paintings
Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

- Jin, Lihua – Micromechanics of Double Network Polymers
- Khalid Jawed, M. – Computational foundations for inelastic deformation of shells
- M’Closkey, Robert – Technique for compensation of parasitic coupling in micro-scale resonators

Medicine

- Fan, Zhaoyang – Quantitative intracranial plaque imaging for the assessment of medical therapeutic response towards personalized secondary stroke prevention

Medicine – General, Health Services

- Leung, Lucinda – Explaining racial/ethnic differences in hypertension and diabetes control in VA patient-centered medical homes

Medicine, SFV Program

- Leung, Felix – Pilot studies to assess TRPV1 antagonists on adipose tissue distribution in obese mouse model(s)

Molecular, Immunology and Molecular Genetics

- Miller, Jeffrey – Mutagenic Synergy between and Chemotherapeutic and Antimicrobial Agents
- Uittenbogaart, Christina – Characterization of unique T follicular regulatory cells: Do they contribute to HIV persistence?

Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology

- Hirsch, Ann – Plant growth promoting bacteria and their importance for the development of sustainable agricultural systems to eliminate the use of chemical pesticides

Music

- Danielpour, Richard – Recording of Celestial Circus, the Four Elements, and Piano Fantasy
- Krouse, Ian – Armenian Requiem Mastering
- Lefkowitz, David – Timbre Analysis: Research and Computing Support
- Rhie, Kay – A four-day residency at UCLA with a Boston-based chamber music ensemble Winsor Music

Musicology

- Levitz, Tamara – Decolonizing Musicology: A Twentieth-Century History

Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

- Burke, Aaron – The Remains of the Day” Understanding Early Iron Age Consumption in Canaan through Residue Analysis of Ceramic Vessels
- Cooney, Kathlyn – 21st Dynasty Coffins Project – Phase IX
- Cowe, Peter – Biblical Exegetics, Christian Poetics, and Ecclesiastical Praxis in Late Antiquity: A Corpus of Poems by Ephrem the Syrian in Armenian Translation
- Poonawala, Ismail – Amir al-Basri: Ismail or Unorthodox Twelver Shii-mystic
- Schniedewind, William – Finger of the Scribe: How Scribal Education Shaped the Hebrew Bible
- Wendrich, Willemina – Mapping Metals: the Shire Archaeological Project

Neurology

- Scalzo, Fabien – Eloquence Mapping of Regional Brain Tissue Fate in Acute Stroke

Neurosurgery

- Wang, Anthony – Enhancing Tumor Immunogenicity with RRV to Potentiate DC Vaccination in Diffuse Midline Glioma H3K27M Mutant (DIPG)
Nursing
- Hanna, Mary – Investigating the Cardiovascular Toxicity of Exposure to Electronic Hookah Smoking
- Samuel-Nakamura, Christine – A pilot feasibility study exploring the relationship between the environment and American Indian/Alaskan Natives residents in Los Angeles County

Ophthalmology
- Aldave, Anthony – Elucidating the role of transcription factor OVOL2 in the pathogenesis of posterior polymorphous corneal dystrophy

Pediatrics
- Perry, Katherine – The effect of epigenetics on CKD-mediated osteoblast maturation failure

Philosophy
- Cumming, Samuel – Counterfactuals and Abductive Inference, A Cross-Linguistic Study
- Greenberg, Gabriel – Iconic and Symbolic Representation

Physics and Astronomy
- Kang, Zhongbo – Exploring the hot medium in the Universe right after the Big Bang
- Williams, Gary – Oscillating Thermal Expansion of Helium Films Adsorbed on Carbon Nanotubes

Political Science
- Golden, Miriam – Political Selection and Incumbency Effects: An Empirical and Theoretical Exploration

Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Science
- Waschek, James – Astrocyte modulation of fear cognition via PACAP receptor signaling

Psychology
- Baker, Bruce – Transition to adulthood: Longitudinal study of youth with development disabilities from adolescence to young adulthood
- Blaisdell, Aaron – A test of the Modified Law of Effect, a new and powerful model of reinforcement learning
- Lee, Steve – Familial and psychophysiological correlates of aggression in Mexican American girls
- Lu, Hongjing – Neural basis of self-recognition from body movements: An fMRI study
- Parkinson, Carolyn – Testing for the Spontaneous Neural Encoding of Social Network Knowledge
- Repetti, Rena – Positive Emotion, Psychological Distress, and Relationship Functioning
- Robles, Theodore – Social Experiences of Latinx Students in Cultural Living Communities
- Shams, Ladan – Sonifying Electrocardiograms to Aid Clinicians in Detecting Heart Pathologies
- Silvers, Jennifer – Neural computations of valuing parents versus peers as a predictor of behavior in adolescence

Radiation Oncology
- Low, Daniel – COPD Surgical Response Modeling with Free Breathing CT

Radiological Sciences
- Pool, Kara-Lee – Implementation of diagnostic ultrasound and ultrasound guided breast biopsies for diagnosis of palpable breast masses in resource-poor surgical centers in South Africa

Slavic, East European and Eurasian Languages and Cultures
- Lenhoff, Gail – The History of Peter, Prince of the Golden Horde, and his Clan in Russia (1258-1686)
- Vroon, Ronald – A Critical Commentary on Velimir Khlebnikov’s Late Poetry (1920-22) and Annotation of Unpublished Manuscript Variants

Social Welfare
• Abrams, Laura – “The Meaning of Life”: The Experience of Leaving Prison After a Juvenile Life Sentence
• Karimli, Leila – Effect of cash transfers on children’s multidimensional deprivation: Multilevel longitudinal analyses using data from the Uganda Social Assistance Grants for Empowerment (SAGE) Program.
• Sociology
• Ayala, Cesar – U.S. Colonial Taxation in Puerto Rico in Peace and War
• Brown, Karida – The Origins of Racial Inequality in Education

Spanish and Portuguese
• Dagenais, John – Books and Libraries in Medieval Spain

Surgery
Tillou, Areti – Establishment of an Institution Wide Quality Improvement Project Registry and Collaborative

Theater
• Metzger, Sean – The Pacific in Asian American Theater
• Oswald, Sylvan – High Winds
• Splint, Marike – The Biography of a House

Urban Planning
• Mukhija, Vinit – The American Dream and the Remaking of the Chinese American Suburbs of Los Angeles

World Arts and Culture | Dance
• Froot, Daniel – Pang! – Stories of Families Around the Country Hungering for Change, in Three Podcast Episodes
• Marks, Victoria – Appalachian Spring Revisited
• Yu, Cheng-Chieh – “Throwing Face”, a choreographic project

Research Enabling Grants (Awards up to $2,000)

African American Studies
• Mays, Kyle – "We Are Still Here!": Indigenous Hip Hop, Resisting (settler) Colonialism, & the Politics of Possibility

Art History
• Woods-Marsden, Joanna – a book entitled Gendered Identity in Titian’s Court Portraits
• Kunzle, David – The Rebirth of the English Comic Strip 1847-1870

Asian American Studies
• Burns, Lucy – Crossovers: Globality and Performance at This Time

Asian Languages and Cultures
• Bodiford, William – Textual History of a Modern Medieval Zen Classic
• Iwasaki, Shoichi – Grammaticalization and Pragmatization of Demonstratives in Asian Languages

Chicana/o Studies
• Carpio, Genevieve – Tinted Windows: African American Countermobility in the Postwar City, 1939-1947
• Plann, Susan – Unaccompanied Moroccan Minors Coming of Age in Madrid
Classics
- Kirkland, Bryant – A Critique of Pure Nativism: Herodotus in Athenian Origins

Earth, Planetary, and Space Sciences
- Ingersoll, Raymond – Provenance and petrofacies of the upper Miocene Castaic Formation, southern California
- Newman, William – The Frequency of Catastrophic Meteorite Impacts on Earth

Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
- Zimmer, Richard – Animal-sediment relations and a field test of the mutualism hypothesis
- Zimmer, Cheryl – Environmental limits on mutualism in a novel predator-prey system

Economics
- Weill, Pierre-Olivier – Investor welfare and dealer trading activity in the corporate bond market

Education
- Gomez, Kimberley – Implications of Technology for First Generation College Students

English
- Burwick, Fred – Time in Romantic Drama
- Cheung, King-Kok – Why Is The Sympathizer by Viet Thanh Nguyen a Great Asian American Novel?
- Cohen, Michael – The Poetry of Charles Brockden Brown
- Fisher, Matthew – Chaucer’s Other Scribe
- Hornby, Louise – Cloud Cover
- Little, Arthur – Shakespeare and Race Theory
- Novak, Maximil – The Defoe Canon Revisited
- Rowe, Karen – Optical Illusions: Native Women in Early American Magazines, 1780-1800
- Stefans, Brian – Voices of the City: Los Angeles Poetry 1850-1950 & Extremes and Moderations: Los Angeles Poetry from the McCarthy to the Punk Eras.
- Thomas, Arvind – Consultation of Four Little-known Medieval Manuscripts of two Holy Women for a Chapter of my Second Book Project
- Watson, Robert – Measure for Measure, Volpone, Cultural Evolution and its Discontents, poetry
- Yarborough, Richard – Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl (a critical edition); Uncle Tom’s Cabin & Onkel Tom’s Hutte; biography & collected works of James D. Corrothers

Ethnomusicology
- Lee, Katherine – The Korean Orphan Choir: Songs of Faith, Joy, and Gratitude
- Racy, Ali – The Homeland in the Music of Syrian and Lebanese Immigrants in the United States
- Rees, Helen – A Voice from the Himalayas: Naxi Folksinger He Jinhua
- Savage, Roger – Philosophical Anthropology, the Hermeneutics of Liberation, and the Search for Justice
- Taylor, Timothy – Working Musicians: Labor and Creativity in Film and Television Production

French and Francophone Studies
- Stefanovska, Malina – “From Emotions to Passions in non-fictional writings (1680-1850)

Geography
- Carney, Judith – African Animals and the Transatlantic Slave Trade

Health and Policy and Management

DMS 7–89
• Abel, Emily – History of Concepts and Fatigue

History
• Getty, John – History and Persistence of Russian Funeral and Burial Practices
• Loewenberg, Peter – “Max Weber, Sigmund Freud, Charismatic Power, and Political Leadership”
• Lydon, Ghislaine – Caravans and Conquest in Colonial Africa: A Trans-Saharan Perspective
• Ruiz, Teofilo – Barcelona in 1868: The Protests Against the Sea and The Cambridge History of the Mediterranean

Information Studies
• Blanchette, Jean-Francois – Battle for the Soul of the Written Page: PDF as Open Standard
• Srinivasan, Ramesh – Exploring AI in Uganda: How Diverse Values Influence and Shape Automation

Italian
• Re, Lucia – Lucia Drudi Demby: A Literary Portrait

Law
• Abel, Richard – Comparative Sociology of Legal Professions, 1988-2018
• Abou El Fadl, Khaled – And God Knows the Soldiers: Islamic Law in Tradition and Today – Second Edition
• Achiume, Emily – Migration as Decolonization Book Project
• Anabtawi, Iman – The Twilight of Enhanced Scrutiny in Delaware Merger and Acquisition (M&A) Jurisprudence
• Bali, Asli – From Revolution to Devolution: The Future of the State in the Middle East
• Bank, Steven – The Democratization of Tax Avoidance
• Banner, Stuart – The Intersection of Corporate Governance and Bankruptcy Law
• Carbado, Devon – Discrimination on the Basis of Racial Orientation
• Dienstag, Joshua – The Human Boundary: Freedom, Citizenship and Democracy in the Post-human Age
• Dolovich, Sharon – Eighth Amendment Use of Force
• Eby, Ingrid – Deportation Mills
• Eichensehr, Kristen – Foreign Sovereign Amici in the Lower Courts
• Emerson, Blake – The Public’s Law: A Progressive Vision of American Democracy
• Gardbaum, Stephen – The Horizontal Effect of Constitutional Rights in South Africa
• Greenberg, Mark – Legal Interpretation as the Epistemology of Law
• Lichtman, Douglas – Naughty Words, Naughty Images, and the American Movie Experience
• Lopez, Gerald – Legal Analysis
• Malloy, Timothy – Risk Analysis: The Role of Prevention and Resilience
• Moran, Rachel – The Undocumented and the Anti-Democratic
• Motomura, Hiroshi – Migrants, Refugees, or Citizens? Borders and Communities in an Anxious Age
• Munzer, Stephen – Silence as Christian Experience and Practice
• Netanel, Neil – Unfair Competition in Jewish Law, Common Law, and Civil Law
• Oh, Jason – The Case for Not Taxing Bitcoin (as Property)
• Olsen, Frances – Poisoning the Grass Roots
• Park, James – Securities Fraud and the Rise of the Public Corporation (Part II)
• Patel, Sunita – Turning to the Bench: Civil Rights Injunctions as a Hail Mary
• Re, Richard – State Stare Crisis
• Riley, Angela – Economic Development in Indian Country
• Sander, Richard – Housing Integration in the 1960s
• Schwartz, Joanna – Qualified Immunity Selection Effects
• Stone, Rebecca – The Inevitable Dependence of Corrective Justice on Distributive Justice
• Stone, Katherine – How a Sacred Cow Became a Golden Calf: Three Stages in the History of the Federal Arbitration Act
• Winkler, Adam – When the Constitution Came Alive: The Unheralded Constitutional Revolution of the 1910s
Linguistics
- Rett, Jessica – A cross-linguistic study of the semantics of temporal relations
- Sharvit, Yael – Truth predicates and operators across languages

Management
- Darby, Michael – Synergistic Technologies: The Case of De Nova and Incumbent Entry into Bionanotechnology

Musicology
- Fink, Robert – Motown 1960s: Analyzing Popular Music Tonality through informed Corpus Study
- Knapp, Raymond – The Television Musical

Philosophy
- Armstrong, Joshua – Philosophy and the Simulation of Language Evolution
- Lawrence, Gavin – Collected Aristotle papers. Practical philosophy papers. Plato papers.
- Roush, Sherrilyn – Epistemic Justice and the Principle of Total Evidence
- Shiffrin, Seana – What philosophers can learn from lawyers about deception

Political Science
- Hazlett, Chad – Learning to Live Together: the effect of living together on prejudicial attitudes between ethnic majority and minority students in Chinese university dormitories
- James, Scott – “Switching Sides: Position Change on Record Votes In the House of Representatives, 1934-2015”
- Lohmann, Susanne – Universities and the New Nationalism

Psychology
- Krull, Jennifer – Single Subject Groups in Multilevel Models

Scandinavian Section
- Tangherlini, Timothy – Exploring the Danish Royal Copper Engraving collection from a deep learning perspective

Slavic, East European and Eurasian Languages and Cultures
- Koropeckyj, Roman – The Field of Little Russian Literature

Sociology
- Emigh, Rebecca – A Comparative and Historical Perspective on the Relationship between Writing and Orality
- Luft, Aliza – Sacred Treason: How French Bishops Defected from Vichy to Save Jews during the Holocaust
- Ortiz, Vilma – Latinos and Racialization

Spanish and Portuguese
- Cortinez, Veronica – Tradition and Innovation in Chilean Cinema
To the Legislative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division:

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) is the Academic Senate’s primary pathway for communication with the UCLA Administration with respect to planning and budget issues. CPB works to forcefully, clearly, and collegially represent the faculty interests and concerns in these areas in the spirit of shared governance. CPB met twelve times during the 2017-18 academic year. This report briefly outlines the Council’s activities during the year.

CPB spent some time discussing a variety of issues at the campus level such as the UCLA Strategic Planning Reports resulting from the Task Forces charged by the Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost with developing a strategic direction in different areas: education, global presence, civic engagement, institutional effectiveness, and research infrastructure.

Briefings from the office of Academic Planning and Budget as well as from the office of the Vice Chancellor of Finance/CFO. Members were able to review a draft presentation from UCLA to the regents. Senior leaders from UCLA Administrative offices joined CPB meetings to inform the Council about the progress of budget analysis, proposed changes to campus budget processes, outcomes, and other UCLA-specific budget matters.

**Reports from the Strategic Planning Task Forces**

- Education Innovation
- Civic Engagement
- Global Outreach
- Institutional Effectiveness
- Research Innovation

The Council commented on the five reports over the course of three meetings in the fall quarter. In summary, input from the Academic Senate and student organizations should have been sought out during the planning stages and in the formation of the task forces. Such input should have been made a priority. Some of the reports had a corporate feel to them and gave the impression that the task at hand was to manage a corporation and not a university. While administrative adjustments might come easy to Leadership, the proposed changes will likely impact faculty and students the most and it is important that UCLA maintain its inclusive, cooperative culture.

**Vice Chancellor of Finance/CFO Search**
Two Council members were invited to participate in the Search Committee appointed to oversee the search for a new Vice Chancellor of Finance, Budget and Capital Programs and Chief Financial Officer (VC/CFO).

**Official Correspondence**

CPB also commented on the following proposals and issues in 2017-18:
- 2023-31 Calendars
- Academic Personnel Manual 675 Veterinary Medicine Salary Administration
- Amendment to Senate Bylaw 128
- Amendment to Senate Bylaw 155
- Anderson School of Management EMBA Asia Pacific Name Change
- Appendix V Actions: Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD; Math-Atmospheric and Oceanic Studies
- BA in Music Education Proposal
- Call for WASC Representatives
- Climate Science Major Proposal
- Conflict of Interest Policy
- Dual Master of Financial Engineering Asia Pacific Proposal
- Endowed Chairs
- Five Year Planning Perspectives
- Global Jazz Studies IDP Proposal
- MA in Indo-European Studies Proposal
- Master of Legal Studies Proposal
- Negotiated Salary Trial Program Taskforce Report
- PhD in Communication Proposal
- Real Estate Reports
- Revisions to Appendix XII
- Strategic Planning Task Force Reports on: Civic Engagement, Education Innovation, Global Outreach, Institutional Effectiveness, and Research Innovation.
- Urban Humanities Minor Proposal

**Interaction with Committees**

**Academic Senate Program Reviews**

CPB members devote significant time to participation in Eight Year Reviews, in coordination with the Undergraduate (UgC) and Graduate Councils (GC). CPB Vice Chair Bruce Carlin facilitated the Council’s discussions on the various programs which are evaluated for financial review, based on importance, interest and at the bequest of the UgC and GC.

Programs evaluated by CPB in 2017-18 were:
- Life Science Core Education
- Education
Common issues identified across programs reviewed in 2017-18 included: enrollment changes, faculty replacement and demographics, graduate student funding and support, lack of space or misuse of current space, program funding and resources, staff support and short to long term vision.

Classroom Advisory Committee
Professor Eleanor Kaufman and Chair Carol Bakhos served on the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost’s Classroom Advisory Committee, charged with studying, reviewing, and making recommendations on how to improve and increase usage of existing classroom and laboratory space, as well as maximizing student study spaces. Members were also charged with considering emerging trends and practices in pedagogy and their implications for learning spaces to identify classroom characteristics that promote an effective and inclusive learning environment. A final report with recommendations was sent to the Executive Vice Chancellor and distributed to the campus and Academic Senate committees for feedback. Bakhos and Kaufman briefed members on the work of the committee and its recommendations throughout the year. Some of the issues that CPB had identified throughout the 2016-17 academic year have to do with general access to Anderson School of Management and Law School classrooms and the use of space on the Hill. The Council suggests learning more about the utilization of Anderson and Law School classrooms and exploring whether there is a possibility to make classrooms available to the College.

CPB members noted that the report’s space inventory is a thoughtful and thorough analysis but realize that not all inventoried space can be shared on campus, such as labs.

Campus Space Committee
Chair Carol Bakhos attended the meetings and briefed the Council on the multiple topics discussed at various meetings in 2017-18.

Meeting updates included:
- A $5 million gift was made to UCLA to rebuild the Botanical Gardens. Many gifts come with the condition that they need to be matched by the University.
- There are plans to increase student housing on campus and in the Westwood Village area.
- General updates on capital projects under development.
- Capital Financial Plan Update.
- Space Governance: opportunities to relocate space on campus.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET ACTIVITY

In 2017-18, the University-wide Committee on Planning and Budget held ten meetings in Oakland (Office of the President); all meetings were attended by Professor Eleanor Kaufman. UCPB focused on a few recurring themes, notably internal and external budget and planning pressures around enrollment, self-supporting programs, response to State Audit and Budget Act, indirect cost recovery, retiree health benefits and pension, and transfer enrollment.

A few of the major issues discussed throughout 2017-18 were:

- **State Budget:** The California State Auditor released a one-year progress report on UCOP’s implementation of the 2017 audit of UCOP budget practices and expenditures, which found that UC had fully implemented six of the ten recommendations that were due by April 2018. The State released the $50 million which had been withheld from the 2017-18 budget. Substantive progressive updates were received from State Government Relations and the Office of Federal Government Relations.

- **Institute of Transportation Studies Five-Year Review:** the Review Committee recommended continuing the ITS for another five years and suggested ways to strengthen collaboration and coordination across its campus branches. The final report incorporated comments and suggestions from UCPB members.

- **Faculty Salaries:** UCPB returned to the issue of Academic Council’s plan to close the gap, which is of 8.4%, between UC faculty salaries and those at UC’s Comparison 8 group of institutions over three years.

- **Retiree Health:** UCPB discussed the decision by UCOP to rescind the previously approved increase to the UCRP employer contribution rate from 14% to 15% and instead transfer additional funds from STIP to UCRP to meet ARC. UCPB urged the University to maintain the 15% UCRP employer contribution rate target consistent with Regents policy.

- **Huron Consulting Review of UCOP:** included a proposal to transition the administration, budget, and employees of the UC Education Abroad Program to UC Santa Barbara. The UC President charged two advisory committees with considering the Huron Consulting Group’s recommendations concerning UC Health and UC DANR.

- **Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs:** four proposals were reviewed and approved, including UCLA’s Doctor of Nursing Practice. UCPB discussed concerns that it has no way of assessing the financial performance of SSGPDPs after they have been established.
Closing remarks

2017-18 was a challenging yet productive year for the Council on Planning and Budget. Every member played a role in executing the many assigned tasks and reviews, and did so in a collaborative and collegial way. We appreciate the willingness of administrators to attend our meetings, in particular, Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer Steve Olsen, Associate Vice Chancellor Jeff Roth, and Administrative Vice Chancellor Michael Beck, and look forward to continued and developing collaboration. It is vital to the work of the council that lines of communication remain open and that we continue to fulfill the principle of shared governance that we value dearly.

Chair Bakhos wishes to acknowledge Vice Chair Bruce Carlin and UCPB Representative Eleanor Kaufman, all appointed members, as well as student representatives and especially the Council’s Analyst Elizabeth Feller, for all of their contributions this year.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorota Dabrowska, Biostatistics, Statistics
Paula Diaconescu, Chemistry and Biochemistry
John Paul Finn, Radiological Sciences
Marco Iacoboni, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences
Jaana Juvonen, Psychology
Eleanor Kaufman, Comparative Literature, English, French and Francophone Studies
Kathleen McGarry, Economics
Jens Palsberg, Computer Science
Carlos Portera-Cailliau, Neurology
Igor Spigelman, Dentistry
Arthur Stein, Political Science
Zhaoyan Zhang, Head and Neck Surgery
Bruce Carlin, Management, Vice Chair
Carol Bakhos, Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, CHAIR

August 27, 2018
October 17, 2018

To: The Academic Senate  
Los Angeles Division  

RE:  2017-2018 Undergraduate Degrees  

During the academic year 2017-2018, 8381 candidates received the Bachelor’s degree (A.B. or B.S. or B.A.S.). For 43 of the candidates, the Senior-residence rule was suspended. The range of units was from .5 to 18 units.  

Copies of the September, 2017, through June, 2018, lists of candidates for degrees (both graduate and undergraduate) may be obtained from the Office of the Registrar.  

Sincerely,  

Frank Wada  
University Registrar
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
   - U.C. Berkeley: 1 student with 7.5 units
   - U.C. Davis: 4 students with a range of 2 to 18 units
   - U.C. Extension: 2 students with a range of 2 to 18 units
   - U.C. Irvine: 2 students with a range of 2 to 11 units
   - U.C. Japan: 1 student with 9 units
   - U.C. Korea: 1 student with 18 units
   - U.C. Summer: 2 students with a range of 3 to 4 units
   - Other Institutions: 1 student with 15 units

II. Other Irregularities:
   NONE.

Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
   NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
   NONE

School of the Arts and Architecture
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
   Other Institutions: 1 student with 4 units

II. Other Irregularities:
   NONE
Herb Alpert School of Music
September 15, 2017
(15 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
NONE

School of Theater, Film and Television
September 15, 2017
(9 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
NONE

School of Nursing
September 15, 2017
(0 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
NONE
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**
   - U.C. Davis: 3 students with 10 units each
   - U.C. Extension: 1 student with 6 units
   - U.C. Granada: 1 student with 18 units
   - U.C. Summer: 2 students with a range of 1 to 10 units
   - Other Institutions: 1 student with 5 units

II. **Other Irregularities:**
   NONE

---

Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science
December 15, 2017
(112 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**
   NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**
   NONE

---

School of the Arts and Architecture
December 15, 2017
(9 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**
   NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**
   NONE
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
NONE

School of Theater, Film and Television
December 15, 2017
(5 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
NONE

School of Nursing
December 15, 2017
(0 Candidate)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
NONE
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
   U.C. Davis: 2 students with a range of 4 to 6 units
   U.C. Extension: 2 students with a range of 2 to 4 units
   U.C. Riverside: 1 student with 6 units
   U.C. Summer: 1 student with 2 units
   Other Institutions: 1 student with 14 units

II. Other Irregularities:
   NONE

Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science
March 23, 2018
(63 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
   NONE

II. Other Irregularities:
   NONE

School of the Arts and Architecture
March 23, 2018
(15 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. Exceptions on the Senior Residence:
   Other Institutions: 2 students with a range of 7 to 8 units

II. Other Irregularities:
   NONE
Herb Alpert School of Music  
March 23, 2018  
(0 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**  
NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**  
NONE

School of Theater, Film and Television  
March 23, 2018  
(20 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**  
NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**  
NONE

School of Nursing  
March 23, 2018  
(0 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**  
NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**  
NONE
Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**
   - U.C. Belgrano: 1 student with .5 units
   - U.C. Davis: 2 students with 5 units each
   - U.C. London: 1 student with 1 unit
   - U.C. Salamanca: 1 student with 2 units
   - U.C. Summer: 1 student with 7 units
   - Other Institutions: 3 students with a range of 3 to 8 units

II. **Other Irregularities:**
    NONE

Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science
June 15, 2018
(577 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**
    NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**
    NONE

School of the Arts and Architecture
June 15, 2018
(128 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**
    NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**
    NONE
Herb Alpert School of Music  
June 15, 2018  
(49 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**  
NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**  
NONE

School of Theater, Film and Television  
June 15, 2018  
(61 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**  
NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**  
NONE

School of Nursing  
June 15, 2018  
(45 Candidates)

Suspension of the Regulations of the Academic Senate:

I. **Exceptions on the Senior Residence:**  
NONE

II. **Other Irregularities:**  
NONE
August 31, 2018

Sandra Graham, Chair  
Academic Senate

Dear Chair Graham,

I am writing in response to your request for the Graduate Council’s coordination of the Appendix V proposal to discontinue the PhD program in Cellular and Molecular Pathology.

The Council reviewed the proposal at its meeting on June 8, 2018, and considered the Executive Board’s recommendation to invoke the Appendix V procedure’s “alternate dispute resolution” and designate the action as “friendly.” The ultimate unanimity of the votes taken by the Pathology faculty results in a “friendly action” with respect to conforming to Appendix V procedures. Additionally, the Council on Planning and Budget approved the request its meeting on June 4, 2018.

The Graduate Council considers that an expedited review, forgoing the normal full vetting of the proposal, is appropriate in this case. The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the proposal and supporting documents related to the action and, in its memo dated June 19, 2018 confirmed that the Graduate Council followed appropriate procedure. The Graduate Council recommends divisional approval by the Legislative Assembly at its meeting in fall 2018.

If have any questions or require any additional information, please feel free to contact me via Graduate Council Analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Julio Vergara, Chair  
Graduate Council
June 19, 2018

To: Julio Vergara, Chair
Graduate Council

From: Linda Bourque, Chair
Rules & Jurisdiction

Re: APPENDIX V—Proposal to Discontinue PhD program in Cellular and Molecular Pathology

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the proposal to discontinue the Ph.D. in Cellular and Molecular Pathology and finds it consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

cc: Kumar Rajaram, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Chris Niemann, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Linda Mohr, CAO, Academic Senate
Estrella Arciba, Graduate Council Analyst
Marian M. Olivas, R&J Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
June 11, 2018

Linda Bourque, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Appendix V Proposal: Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine Proposal to Discontinue Ph.D. in Cellular and Molecular Pathology

Dear Professor Bourque,

The Academic Senate received a proposal from the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine for the discontinuance of its PhD program in Cellular and Molecular Pathology. The Graduate Council is serving as the designated committee for this Appendix V action, and would appreciate your review and input to determine if there is any nonconformity.

The Graduate Council has determined the proposal to be a “friendly” action, and unanimously endorsed it at its June 8, 2018 meeting. Given the favorable votes of the Pathology and Laboratory Medicine faculty, the Council voted (14 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions) to approve this action. The Council on Planning and Budget also voted in favor of the proposed discontinuation of the graduate degree program.

Pending the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction’s approval, the proposal will then be forwarded to the Executive Board for inclusion on the first Legislative Assembly agenda in fall 2018.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via Graduate Council Analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.

Thank you in advance for your input and contributions to this important process.

Sincerely,

Julio Vergara
Chair, Graduate Council

cc: Marian Olivas, Analyst, Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction
Estrella Arciba, Analyst, Graduate Council
June 5, 2018

Julio Vergara
Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Appendix V Action to Discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD

Dear Professor Glanzman and Professor Wendrich,

At its meeting on June 4, 2018, the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposal from the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine in the David Geffen School of Medicine to discontinue the cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD. After a brief discussion, members voted to approve the action (10 approved, 0 opposed, 0 abstain). However, members noted that only about half of the eligible faculty (10 out of 19) voted in favor of the proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at cbakhos@humnet.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu or x62470.

Sincerely,

Carol Bakhos, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Estrella Arciba, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
    Elizabeth Feller, Committee Analyst, Council on Planning and Budget
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
To: Julio Vergara, Chair, Graduate Council

From: David Glanzman, Co-Chair, Committee on Degree Programs
       Willeke Wendrich, Co-Chair, Committee on Degree Programs

Date: May 30, 2018

In Re: Appendix V Proposal to Discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program

Dear Chair Vergara,

The Graduate Council’s Committee on Degree Programs (CDP) reviewed the proposal from the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine in the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program at its meeting on May 29, 2018.

I am pleased to report that the CDP was favorably disposed to the proposal and members elected to endorse the proposal and to move it forward in the Senate’s review process. Upon satisfactory responses from all relevant Senate committees, the proposal will be scheduled for presentation and approval by the Graduate Council. If you have any questions or concerns about this response, please feel free to contact us via the Graduate Council’s analyst, Estrella Arciba, at earciba@senate.ucla.edu.
May 25, 2018

Provost and Executive Vice President Michael Brown  
University of California Office of the President  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607

Dear Michael:

I am writing to inform you that the Executive Board of the UCLA Academic Senate has voted to initiate an Appendix V action to review the Department of Biological Chemistry’s proposal to discontinue the independent Cellular and Molecular Pathology Ph.D. For your reference, enclosed is the letter from UCLA Academic Senate Chair Sandra Graham informing me of this action, as well as related correspondence.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Associate Vice Chancellor Jeff Roth or me.

Sincerely,

Scott L. Waugh  
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Enclosure

cc: Jocelyn Surla Banaria, Assistant Director, UC Academic Senate, UC Office of the President  
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, UC Academic Senate, UC Office of the President  
Joseph Bristow, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Erika Chau, Executive Director, Academic Personnel Office  
Susan Cochran, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Sandra Graham, Chair, Academic Senate  
Fredye Harms, Principal Policy Analyst, UC Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, UC Office of the President  
Beth Lazazzera, Chair, Undergraduate Council
Rebecca Lee-García, Director of Program Analysis, Academic Planning & Budget
Kelsey Martin, M.D., Ph.D., Dean, David Geffen School of Medicine
Robert May, Vice Chair, UC Academic Senate, UC Office of the President
Claire McCluskey, Associate Registrar, Registrar’s Office
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
Kimberly Peterson, Interim Chief of Staff to the Provost, UC Office of the President
Chris Procello, Analyst, Institutional Research and Academic Planning,
    UC Office of the President
Jeff Roth, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning and Budget
Laurie Summers, Assistant Provost, Chancellor’s Office
Eric Wells, Committee Analyst, Academic Senate
Shane White, Chair, UC Academic Senate, UC Office of the President
May 18, 2018

Scott L. Waugh  
UCLA Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Re: Appendix V Proposal: Discontinuation of the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program

Dear Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Waugh,

The Executive Board reviewed the request to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology Ph.D. Program in the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine at its meeting on May 17, 2018. By unanimous consent, the Board approved the initiation of the Appendix V action and formally assigned the Graduate Council as the designated committee. It is the Board’s understanding that the Graduate Council will consult with other Senate committees as necessary, including the Council on Planning and Budget, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (for bylaw and process review), as well as relevant administrators and students it deems appropriate.

It is the Executive Board’s desire to complete the review process and schedule approval of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting on June 7, 2018. Therefore, the Senate requests that the Office of the President be notified of the impending action.

Sincerely,

Sandra Graham  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

cc: Estrella Arciba, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council  
Joseph Bristow, Vice Chair, Academic Senate  
Susan Cochran, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
Rebecca Lee-Garcia, Director, Academic Planning and Budget  
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Jeff Roth, Associate Vice Chancellor, Office of Academic Planning and Budget  
Laurie Summers, Assistant Provost, Chancellor’s Office
May 18, 2018

Julio Vergara
Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Appendix V Proposal: Discontinuation of the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program

Dear Professor Vergara,

The Executive Board reviewed the request to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology Ph.D. Program in the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine at its meeting on May 17, 2018. By unanimous consent, the Board approved the initiation of the Appendix V action and formally assigns the Graduate Council as the designated committee. It is the Board’s understanding that the Graduate Council will consult with other Senate committees as necessary, including the Council on Planning and Budget, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (for bylaw and process review), as well as relevant administrators and students it deems appropriate.

The Executive Board will schedule approval of the Legislative Assembly once Graduate Council’s review is complete.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Sandra Graham
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

cc: Estrella Arciba, Committee Analyst, Graduate Council
Johnathan Braun, Chair, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
Joseph Bristow, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Susan Cochran, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
January 17, 2017

Professor Emeritus Julio Vergara
Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Discontinuation of Cellular and Molecular Pathology Ph.D. Program

Dear Dr. Vergara,

I am writing to inform the Graduate Council of my department’s plan to discontinue its independent Ph.D. graduate program, Cellular and Molecular Pathology.

As background, Cellular and Molecular Pathology (CMP) has been a longstanding PhD graduate program in our department. In 2013, the Graduate Program in Biosciences (GPB) established 10 Home Areas associated with seven Ph.D. programs. Although CMP was not one of the GPB Ph.D. programs, our faculty voted to become part of GPB and faculty members joined their preferred area(s). In the past 4 years, faculty have recruited and trained Ph.D. students through Home Areas and feedback has been strongly favorable. At the university level, GPB formation and the consequent reorganization required that several DGSOM graduate programs suspend or discontinue admissions. CMP suspended admissions in 2016 (approved Pathology faculty vote).

The UCLA Graduate Council had set 2018-19 for our graduate program either to discontinue or undergo full review as independent active program. Our faculty met to discuss a motion to discontinue CMP on November 15, 2017, followed by a period of public comment through November 30. No opposing discussion or comments to the motion emerged. A formal faculty vote followed (ending Dec 22, 2017). Of nineteen eligible faculty, 13 voted: 10 in favor of discontinuation, one opposed, and two abstained.

Therefore, I convey the decision by the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD. Program.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Braun, M.D., Ph.D.
Professor and Chair

Cc: Estrella Arciba, Eric Wells; Kelsey Martin, Greg Payne; Peter Tontonoz
April 2, 2018

Professor Emeritus Julio Vergara  
Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Discontinuation of Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD. Program

Dear Dr. Vergara,

I am writing to support the proposal by the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine to discontinue its independent Ph.D. graduate program, Cellular and Molecular Pathology.

As background, Cellular and Molecular Pathology (CMP) has been a longstanding PhD graduate program. The Graduate Program in Biosciences (GPB) established 10 non-departmental Home Areas beginning 2013. Each of our faculty joined their preferred area(s) at GPB inception, and faculty feedback in past 4 years has been strongly favorable. At the university level, GPB formation required that existing DGSOM graduate programs discontinue or suspend admissions. CMP suspended admissions in 2016 (approved Pathology faculty vote).

The UCLA Graduate Council had set 2018-19 for our graduate program either to discontinue or undergo full review as independent active program. The Pathology faculty met to discuss a motion to discontinue CMP on November 15, 2017, followed by a period of public comment through November 30. No opposing discussion or comments to the motion emerged. A formal faculty vote followed (ending Dec 22, 2017). Of nineteen eligible faculty, 13 voted: 10 in favor of discontinuation, one opposed, and two abstained.

Based on the foregoing, I am in support of the decision by the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine to discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD. Program.

Sincerely,

Kelsey C. Martin, MD, PhD  
Dean, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA  
Gerald S. Levey, M.D., Endowed Chair  
Professor, Biological Chemistry  
Professor, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences

Cc: Estrella Arciba, Eric Wells, Greg Payne, Jonathan Braun, Peter Tontonoz
Dear Estrella,

Please find in this email:
1. As previously sent in Jan 2018, the original report by the department on the rationale for CMP discontinuation, and a report on the faculty vote
2. The support letter for this discontinuation by Dean Kelsey Martin
3. Roster of remaining students.

Please don’t hesitate to let me know about anything further that may be required.

JB
Jonathan Braun, M.D., Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine
UCLA Health System
E:  jbraun@mednet.ucla.edu
P: (310) 825-0650
F:  (310) 267-4486

Below is the roster for the remaining students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>UID</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Mentor Home Areas</th>
<th>Fund Manager / Source</th>
<th>Dissertation Defense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hong      | Jason      | 502-843-124 | Teitell | 1. Cell and Developmental Biology (CDB)  
2. Immunity, Microbes & Molecular Pathogenesis  
3. Molecular Pharmacology | Rio Cruz Pathology | Passed Oral Quals 10/14/16 | Expected to defend Fall 2018 |
| Kershaw   | Kathleen   | 904-134-020 | Dawson | 1. Molecular Pharmacology  
2. Cell and Developmental Biology (CDB)  
3. Immunity, Microbes & Molecular Pathogenesis | Janine Lui Pathology | Due to defend 3/7/2018 |
| King      | Jennifer   | 802-503-000 | D. Rao  | 1. Molecular, Cellular & Integrative Physiology  
2. Gene Regulation  
3. Molecular Pharmacology | Laura Juhl, STAR Prog Coord  
Med-Admin | Due to defend 6/16/2018 |
| Seet      | Christopher | 304-103-516 | Crooks | 1. Cell and Developmental Biology (CDB)  
2. Immunity, Microbes & Molecular Pathogenesis  
3. Molecular Pharmacology | Veronica Munoz Pathology | Due to defend 3/15/2018 |
| Tran      | Cynthia    | 803-730-609 | Dr. Ram Raj Singh  | 1. Immunity, Microbes & Molecular Pathogenesis  
2. Molecular Pharmacology | Juan Vaquerano, Division Mgr  
Med-Rheumatology | Expected to defend Spring 2019 |

*Students are funded in the lab that they work in. The students' respective fund managers are listed.

From: Arciba, Estrella <earciba@senate.ucla.edu>
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 1:43 PM
To: Braun, Jonathan M.D. <JBraun@mednet.ucla.edu>
Cc: Vergara, Julio <jvergara@mednet.ucla.edu>
Subject: RE: Discontinuation of Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program

Dear Professor Braun,

The Graduate Council is requesting the following in preparation for the review of the proposal for the discontinuation of the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD program:
1. Letter of Support from the Dean of the School of Medicine
2. Brief description of number of current students in the program (if any) and how they will be supported should the discontinuation be approved

Thank you,
Estrella Arciba
Principal Committee Analyst
UCLA Academic Senate
3125 Murphy Hall Box 951408
Los Angeles, CA 90095
www.senate.ucla.edu

From: Braun, Jonathan M.D. <JBraun@mednet.ucla.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 4:24 PM
To: Vergara, Julio <jvergara@mednet.ucla.edu>
Cc: Tontonoz, Peter <ptontonoz@mednet.ucla.edu>; Payne, Gregory <gpayne@mednet.ucla.edu>; Martin, Kelsey C. <kcmartin@mednet.ucla.edu>; Arciba, Estrella <earciba@senate.ucla.edu>; Wells, Eric <ewells@senate.ucla.edu>; Baum, Linda <lbaum@mednet.ucla.edu>
Subject: Discontinuation of Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD Program

Dr. Vergara,

Please see attached. I look forward to your direction on next steps.

Jon
Jonathan Braun, M.D., Ph.D.
From: Jeff Roth, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Planning & Budget
Date: April 25, 2018
Re: Resource Analysis

I am writing in response to the request for a resource analysis of the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine’s proposal to discontinue its independent PhD program in Cellular and Molecular Pathology. The Department’s proposal states that a main reason for this change is due to the establishment of the Graduate Program in Biosciences, which required that existing DGSOM graduate programs discontinue or suspend admission. The proposal also describes that discontinuing the program will not affect the faculty, current students would be allowed to finish the program, and prospective students have and will continue to be routed to the GPB program.

This change seems to better align resources and I support the decision to close and discontinue the Cellular and Molecular Pathology PhD program.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jeff Roth
Associate Vice Chancellor
Academic Planning and Budget

cc: Scott Waugh, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
Steven Olsen, Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer
Kelsey CC. Martin, M.D., Ph.D., Dean
Gerald S. Levey, M.D., Endowed Chair
Johnathan Braun, M.D., Ph.D., Chair
Hi Linda,

Can the attached appendix V be added to the next Exec Board meeting for designation.

Thank you,

Estrella