NOTICE OF MEETING

MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

Dear Colleagues:

Please join me and other members of the Senate Cabinet and your school representatives for the Divisional Senate Assembly meeting scheduled for:

Thursday, May 28, 2015
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room, 338 Aldrich Hall

I encourage all Assembly representatives to attend this meeting, and to hear interesting updates on Senate business. Please RSVP to senate@uci.edu by Tuesday, May 26, 2015 so that we are able to confirm a quorum. I hope to see you on May 28th.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

William Molzon
Academic Senate Chair
Irvine Division

The agenda for this meeting can be found on the Academic Senate Website at senate.uci.edu/office/divisional-senate-assembly/meeting-agendas/.
AGENDA OF THE REGULAR MEETING
DIVISIONAL SENATE ASSEMBLY
Thursday, May 28, 2015, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room - 338 Aldrich Hall

ORDER OF BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>1. Approval of Minutes of April 23, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>2. Special Orders – Consent Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Proposal to Revise School of Education Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Proposal to Amend the HSSoE Bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Revisions to Chapter II. Section I. General Requirements (IB 505-530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNOUNCEMENTS</td>
<td>3. Announcements by Chair William Molzon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Academic Council Meeting of Wednesday, May 27, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Divisional Senate Assembly Representatives for 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Divisional Senate Assembly Survey Results:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. 3% Salary Increase: Discussion of possible options to recommend for the implementation of a faculty salary adjustment equivalent to 3% of the salary pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Self-supporting Programs: Discussion of self-supporting programs policies and procedures and how best to proceed as a campus with these efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Strategic Planning: Discussion of recommendations to make to the Chancellor about UCI’s strategic plan based on his articulated goals at his investiture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>4. Announcements by Other Administrative Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>5. Reports of Special Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Reports of Standing Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Motions Before the Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION</td>
<td>8. Remarks by Chancellor Howard Gillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>9. Unfinished Business: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. University and Faculty Welfare: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. New Business: None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Roll Call: Attendance Sheet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alan Terricciano, Chair Elect – Secretary
Academic Senate Irvine Division
* Agenda items deemed noncontrover-sial by the Chair of the Divisional Senate Assembly, in consultation with the Senate Cabinet, may be placed on a Consent Calendar under Special Orders. Approval of all business on the Consent Calendar requires a single unanimous vote. At the request of any Divisional Assembly member, any Consent Calendar item may be extracted for consideration under “New Business” later in the agenda. [From Bylaw 158(D)]

All members of the Academic Senate and of the University community shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Divisional Senate Assembly, but only members of the Divisional Senate Assembly may make or second motions or vote. However, the Chair (or designated representative) of a standing or special committee of the Division may move or second action on reports of that committee.

Note: Documents pertinent to the agenda items for the meeting are posted on-line electronically on the Academic Senate’s Home Page on the World Wide Web. The Academic Senate’s Home Page is listed on UC Irvine’s Home Page Directory for “Campus Administration” (URL address: http://www.senate.uci.edu). Individual members of the Senate may receive hard copies of these documents upon request to the Academic Senate Office.
1. MEETING:
A regular meeting of the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly was called to order by Chair William Molzon at 3:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 23, 2015, in the Academic Senate Conference Room, 338 Aldrich Hall. Members of the Administrative staff and members of the University community were present.

2. MINUTES:
Action: The minutes of February 12, 2015 were approved as read.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHAIR WILLIAM MOLZON:

Academic Planning Group (APG):
APG is currently working to develop a new ten-year strategic plan for the campus. The planning groups will be working on the development of the new strategic plan into the summer.

APG is entering its second round of the High Impact Hiring Plan (HIHP) initiative. Senate Chair Molzon mentioned that this round of proposals is meant to encourage the broadest level of participation from all areas of the campus. APG is currently reviewing proposals on a rolling basis to assess whether the nominees meet the standard of quality and impact required by this initiative. Senate Chair Molzon announced that APG is also considering projects in the Interschool Academic Initiatives program, and successful proposals will receive funding of up to $150,000 a year for 3 years.

ASUCI Flag Issue:
Senate Chair Molzon communicated that he drafted a letter on behalf of the Senate about this issue. Senate Chair Molzon reported that he has met with one of the ASUCI leaders and will be talking with one of the other students soon, after which he will provide the ASUCI students leaders a hard copy of the letter.

Academic Council Statement on Academic Freedom and Civility
The Academic Council modified and endorsed a statement on Academic Freedom and Civility drafted by the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF). The statement emphasizes the preeminent value of academic freedom and free speech in the context of recent efforts to encourage civil discourse on campus. Senate Chair Gilly requested that each campus disseminate the statement to their faculty and make it available on their respective Senate websites. The Senate will post the statement online alongside relevant sections from the APM.

Visits by Governor’s Staff:
Senate Chair Molzon advised that staff members from the Governor’s Office and the Department of Finance are continuing to tour the UC campuses. The staff members are also
expected to attend a portion of upcoming Senate committee meetings including the Academic Council, BOARS, UCEP, and UCPB.

**Health Care Plans:**
The Office of the President continues to study the feasibility of a self-funded UC Care HMO plan to replace the Health Net Blue and Gold HMO. The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and its Health Care Task Force think it is impractical to implement the HMO in 2016, but are cautiously open to a 2017 roll-out, as long as employees at all campuses have adequate access to care under the plan.

**Transfer Admission Pathway Project**
Senate Chair Molzon provided an update on the UC Transfer Admission Pathways Project. The goal of the project is to provide a clear set of standards for transfer admissions from any community college into any UC campus. Chair Molzon noted that the process for nominating faculty to participate in the project happened rather quickly and that the Senate had the opportunity to review the nominations to ensure faculty inclusion.

**UCI Diversity Games**
Senate Chair Molzon encouraged Cabinet members to participate in the Chancellor’s sponsored Anteater Equity Games taking place on Tuesday, May 5, 2015 in Aldrich Park.

4. **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHANCELLOR HOWARD GILLMAN:**
Chancellor Gillman thanked all those who attended his investiture on March 31, 2015, and commended Senate Chair-elect Terricciano and the faculty from the Claire Trevor School of the Arts for their artistic contributions to the investiture.

Enrique Lavernia has been appointed Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, effective July 1. Lavernia is a renowned scientist who currently serves as Dean of the College of Engineering at UC Davis.

Howard Federoff has been appointed as Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine effective July 1. Federoff is a nationally recognized clinical and research leader who currently serves as the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences and Executive Dean of the School of Medicine at Georgetown University.

The year-long search for the new Vice Provost for Teaching and Dean of Undergraduate Education is being finalized.

UC Irvine is in the position to increase faculty and student growth within the next 6 to 7 years. The Chancellor hopes to increase core faculty by approximately 22% and start to plan for increasing the number of students and the ways in which we deliver education.

The Chancellor notes that if UC Irvine wants to be in the top 20 research institutions, we have to increase research expenditures. UCI currently spends $300 million, in comparison to UC San Diego at $1 billion, and UC Davis at $750 million.

Under the leadership of Vice Provost for Academic Planning Judy Stepan-Norris, the Provost’s office has organized workgroups as part of the strategic planning process. The
output of these workgroups will lead to the drafting of a strategic planning document by the fall that will be distributed for comment and discussion in the coming year.

The Chancellor answered questions about the need for faculty FTEs in the School of Medicine. The Chancellor stated that we need to enhance the basic sciences and grow on the clinical side. He noted that the new Vice Chancellor will need to determine how best to build out the School of Medicine and the appropriate business plan to achieve these goals.

There was a discussion about the student faculty ratio in departments where student numbers are high and research dollars may not match those numbers. The Chancellor noted that we need to build where there is student interest and demand and that the modifications to the budget model last year reflects that commitment.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS: None

6. SPECIAL ORDERS – CONSENT CALENDAR

7. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES: None

8. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES: None

9. MOTIONS BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY

Proposed Revision to the Academic Integrity Policy
Issue: CSE was tasked with rewriting Appendix VIII: UCI Academic Senate Policy on Academic Honesty in the Senate Manual to address issues of inconsistent administration across schools, lack of a clear appeals process for students, and a complex faculty reporting process. CSE has unanimously endorsed the proposed policy and recommends updating the current policy with the proposed draft.

Discussion: Chair Glazer, from the Council on Student Experience, provided the Assembly with further information on the proposal and answered questions raised by some of the Assembly members about the policy and its implementation.

Motion: The Assembly unanimously endorsed the proposal.

Proposal to Establish a 4+1 Degree in Art History
Issue: The Art History Department of the School of Humanities is proposing the addition of a terminal Master’s degree to the existing BA program. The Council on Educational Policy reviewed and approved the undergraduate portion of the degree proposal. Graduate Council reviewed and approved the graduate portion of the degree proposal. The Council on Planning and Budget endorsed the financial plan.

Discussion: Invited guests, Professor Bert Winther-Tamaki and Graduate Academic Programs Manager Kate Triglia provided the Assembly with further information on the proposal.

Motion: The Assembly unanimously endorsed the proposal.
Proposal to Establish a BS in Data Science

Issue: The Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Science is proposing a new Bachelor of Science in Data Science. This new major will be established in the Department of Statistics with the faculty in the Department of Computer Science offering several courses in the program. The Council on Educational Policy has reviewed and endorsed the proposal. The Council on Budget and Planning has reviewed and endorsed the financial plan.

Discussion: Invited guest, Professor Padhraic Smyth, provided the Assembly with further background on the proposal.

Motion: The Assembly unanimously endorsed the proposal.

10. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS: None

11. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

12. REPORTS OR COMMENTS ON UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE: None

13. NEW BUSINESS: None

14. ROLL CALL: Attendance Sheet

15. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.
Minutes Prepared by: Wendy Chamorro
Attest: Alan Terricciano, Chair Elect-Secretary
Divisional Senate Assembly
2014-15 Schedule of Meetings

FALL QUARTER 2014

Thursday, October 30, 2014
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room, 338 Aldrich Hall

WINTER QUARTER 2015

Thursday, February 12, 2015
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room, 338 Aldrich Hall

SPRING QUARTER 2015

Thursday, April 23, 2015
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room, 338 Aldrich Hall

Thursday, May 28, 2015
3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Academic Senate Conference Room, 338 Aldrich Hall
**EX OFFICIO**
University President, Janet Napolitano
Academic Senate Chair, William Molzon, ‘15
Academic Senate Chair Elect-Secretary, Alan Terricciano, ‘15
Parliamentarian (Non-voting Member), Dan Hirschberg, ‘15

**Representatives to the Universitywide Assembly** (8 Reps)
Sameer Ashar, ‘16
David Kay, ‘16
John Lowengrub, ‘15
Darryl Taylor, ‘15

*Alternates:*
Olivier Civelli, ‘15
Brian Cummings, ‘16
Andromache Karanika, ‘16
Guoqing (Harry) Xu, ‘15

**Council Chairs** (8 Reps)
Academic Personnel, Jean- Luc Gaudiot, ‘15
Educational Policy, Simon Penny, ‘15
Faculty Welfare, William Parker, ‘15
Graduate Council, Carol Burke, ‘15
Planning & Budget, Abel Klein, ‘15
Research, Computing & Libraries, Rufus Edwards, ‘15
Student Experience, Amihai Glazer, ‘15
Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools, Gilbert Gonzalez, ‘15

**Representatives from the Claire Trevor School of Arts** (4 Reps)
Bruce Yonemoto, ‘15- Faculty Chair
Lonnie Alcaraz, ‘15
Haroutune Bedelian, ‘16
Lisa Naugle, ‘16

**Representatives from the School of Biological Sciences** (4 Reps)
Melanie Cocco, ‘15- Faculty Chair
Matthew Blurton-Jones, ‘16
Aimee Edinger, ‘16
Rahul Warrior, ‘16

**Representatives from the Paul Merage School of Business** (2 Reps)
Vijay Gurbaxani, ‘15- Faculty Chair
Joanna Ho, ‘15

**Representative from the School of Education** (3 Reps)
Stephanie Reich, ‘15- Faculty Chair
Greg Duncan, ‘15
Jacquelynn Eeles, ‘16

**Representatives from the Henry Samueli School of Engineering** (4 Reps)
Frithjof Kruggel, ‘16- Faculty Chair
Manuel Gamero- Castaño, ‘17
Chenyang (Sunny) Jiang, ‘17
Athina Markopoulou, ‘16

**Representatives from the College of Health Sciences** (12 Reps)
Michael Demetriou- Faculty Chair, ‘15
Alan Barbour, ‘15
Anjan Batra, ‘15
Anne Calof, ‘15
Brian Cummings, ‘15
Mark Fisher, ‘15
Anand Ganesan, ‘15
David Imagawa, ‘15
Christine McLaren, ‘16
Timothy Morgan, ‘15
Hamid Said, ‘15
Steven Schreiber, ‘15

**Representatives from the School of Humanities** (7 Reps)
Jacobo Sefami, ‘15 – Faculty Chair
Margaret Gilbert, ‘15
Rachel O’ Toole, ‘16
James Porter, ‘15
Victoria Silver, ‘15
Jennifer Terry, ‘15
Tiffany Willoughby-Herard, ‘15

**Representatives from the Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Science** (2 Reps)
Alfred Kobsa, ‘15- Faculty Chair
Jim A. Jones, ‘15

**Representative from the School of Law** (1 Rep)
Shauhin Talesh, ‘15 – Faculty Chair

**Representatives from the School of Physical Sciences** (5 Reps)
Claudia I. Czimeczik (Green), ‘15 – Faculty Chair
Kevork N. Abazajian, ‘16
Anton Gorodetski ‘15
Elizabeth Jarvo, ‘15
TBD

**Representatives from the School of Social Ecology** (2 Reps)
Elliott Currie, ‘15 – Faculty Chair
Bryan Sykes, 16

**Representatives from the School of Social Sciences** (5 Reps)
Linda Cohen (Jennings), ‘15 – Faculty Chair
Leo Chavez, ‘15
Don Hoffman, ‘16
Charles (Tony) Smith, ‘16
Ted Wright, ‘15

Term of membership ends on August 31 of the year listed after each name.
If you have questions about your membership, please contact Wendy Chamorro, wchamorr@uci.edu.
DIVISIONAL SENATE ASSEMBLY

RE: Proposal to Revise School of Education Bylaws

At its meeting on May 19, 2015, the Senate Cabinet voted and endorsed the proposal to revise the School of Education (SoE) bylaws, as presented by its Executive Committee. As part of the review process, the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (CRJ) thoroughly reviewed the proposal.

SoE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: May 4, 2014
COMMITTEE ON RULES & JURISDICTION: May 12, 2015
SENATE CABINET (Review and approval): May 19, 2015

The complete proposal and relevant correspondence is attached to this memo.

Sincerely,

William Molzon
Academic Senate Chair
RE: Revision of the School of Education Bylaws

The Executive Committee of the School of Education (SoE) formally requests a change to its Bylaws, under The Senate Manual of The Irvine Division of the Academic Senate/Part III – Appendices of the Irvine Division / Appendix I Bylaws of the Faculties / Chapter IV: Department of Education (Am 6 Nov. 2001) (Am 11 June 2008). Specifically, SoE requests the following:

Statement of Rationale
The existing bylaws are for the Department of Education. We are now a School of Education with a different organizational structure. As such, revisions are needed for each area of our bylaws.

Attached are the detailed changes of the bylaws using red for additions and strike-through text for deletions.

If the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction requires additional information to review the proposed changes, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Thank you,
Stephanie Reich

Enclosure(s): 1

c. Deborah Vandell, Dean of School
   Mark Warschauer, Assoc. Dean of School
   William Molzon, Chair, Academic Senate
   Natalie Schonfeld, Executive Director, Academic Senate
   Wendy Chamorro, Senate Analyst
Appendix I Bylaws of the Faculties

Chapter IV: School of Education (Am 6 Nov. 2001) (Am May 2014)
It is the intention of the School members in adopting these bylaws that the School operate on
democratic principles and in a humane manner.

I. Voting Membership

Academic Senate Action is defined by the rules and responsibilities of the Academic Senate of
the University of California, Irvine Division.

1. Voting membership on all matters involving Academic Senate action shall consist of those
who hold professorial or acting professorial rank and those who hold the titles of senior lecturer
with security of employment and lecturer with security of employment.

   1. New appointments that confer membership in the Academic Senate will be voted on by all
      Academic Senate members.

   2. Personnel actions involving Merits and Promotions will be voted on by all Academic
      Senate members.

II. Senate Faculty Executive Committee and Faculty Representatives

1. The Senate Faculty Executive Committee consists of the Faculty Chair, Vice-Chair, and an
   additional elected Senate Faculty.

2. The Senate Faculty Executive Committee represents the Senate Faculty in all aspects of the
   academic administration of the School of Education; prepares recommendations for Senate
   Faculty vote; serves as the School Research Committee for allocation of research funds from the
   Council of Research on Computing and Libraries; and makes decisions for the faculty if needed
   between faculty meetings.
3. The term of office for elected Senate Faculty Executive Committee members, including the Faculty Chair and Vice Chair, shall be two years.

4. At about the time of the Irvine Division's spring elections or as soon as possible thereafter, the Senate Faculty Executive Committee shall be elected by the Academic Senate members of the School. The newly elected members shall take office on July 1 following their election.

5. The Faculty Chair shall serve as School representative to the Representative Assembly of the Irvine Division and Chair of the School’s Senate Faculty Executive Committee. If the Faculty Chair is unavailable to attend the Assembly meeting, the Vice Chair of the Executive Committee shall serve as a voting representative to the meeting.

6. The election for Faculty Chair and the Senate Faculty Executive Committee membership shall be governed by the following procedure:

   1. Election of Faculty Chair, Vice Chair and Additional Member: All Academic Senate members of the School shall be placed on the ballot, except the Associate Dean and Dean who are ineligible to serve on the Executive Committee.

   2. A separate election will be held for each of the Executive Committee positions; Faculty Chair, Vice Chair and additional member. In each election, the candidate with the largest number of votes totaling more than half the votes cast is elected. In the event that no candidate receives more than half the votes cast on the first ballot, a second ballot will be prepared with the names of the two individuals receiving the largest number of votes.

   4. Votes shall be conducted by secret ballot online, with results made available online to Senate Faculty members.

III. School Meetings

1. School meetings shall be held at least once each quarter at the call of the Dean, Associate
Dean or Faculty Chair. Members of the Academic Senate may choose to meet separately for discussion and voting on Academic Senate matters.

2. Quorum
   1. A quorum on matters requiring Academic Senate action shall consist of one half of the Academic Senate voting membership in residence for that academic period.

   2. Voting on all personnel matters shall be by secret ballot. On all other matters, upon the call of any voting member, the School shall vote by secret ballot.

V. Amendment of the Bylaws

The bylaws of the School may be amended with the approval of at least two-thirds of the Academic Senate members of the School. Motions to amend the bylaws must be made at least thirty days before a vote is taken. In the interim, the Faculty Chair shall send a copy of the motion, together with a summary the arguments for and against it, to all Academic Senate members of the School not in residence. Voting on bylaw revisions shall be conducted by secret ballot online, with results made available online to Senate Faculty members.
DIVISIONAL SENATE ASSEMBLY

RE: Proposal to Revise The Henry Samueli School of Engineering Bylaws

At its meeting on May 19, 2015, the Senate Cabinet voted and endorsed the proposal to revise The Henry Samueli School of Engineering (HSSoE) bylaws, as presented by its Executive Committee. As part of the review process, the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (CRJ) thoroughly reviewed the proposal.

HSSoE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: January 21, 2015
COMMITTEE ON RULES & JURISDICTION: May 18, 2015
SENATE CABINET (Review and approval): May 19, 2015

The complete proposal and relevant correspondence is attached to this memo.

Sincerely,

William Molzon
Academic Senate Chair
April 27, 2015

Dr. William Molzon
Chair, Irvine Division Academic Senate

Dr. James Steintrager
Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

cc. Natalie Schonfeld
Executive Director, Academic Senate

cc. Dr. Greg Washington
Dean, The Henry Samueli School of Engineering

Re: Amendment of the HSSoE’s Bylaws

Dear Drs. Molzon and Steintrager:

Faculty of the Henri Samueli School of Engineering (HSSoE) have revised and amended the Bylaws of the School. We would like to ask the Academic Senate to approve the new text that is attached to this letter. Our amendments include:

- repeated text in all sections was combined;
- contradicting statements were removed/resolved;
- the role of the "Research and Travel Committee" shifted to a "Research Committee".

Due to the number and extent of changes, we decided not provide a text with annotated differences. However, changes to the content are rather minor.

The attached text was endorsed by our Executive Committee on January 21, 2015 and published for review by all Engineering Faculty on February 20, 2015. All feedback received by April 1, 2015 was included in this document.

An electronic ballot was held from April 2 to 17, 2015. Out of 114 voting members, 36 voted (32%) participated. Twenty-seven votes were in favor (75%), three against (8%), and six abstentions (17%).

Please, do not hesitate to contact me if you need any further information.

Best regards,

Prof. Frithjof Kruggel
Faculty Chair, HSSoE
Dept. of Biomedical Engineering
The Henry Samueli School of Engineering

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
PART III – APPENDICES OF THE IRVINE DIVISION
Appendix I Bylaws of the Faculties
Chapter V: The Henry Samueli School of Engineering

Section 1: General Provisions

(A) Membership and Duties
The membership and duties of the Faculty of the School of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering are consistent with those specified in Bylaws 45, 50 and 51 of the Academic Senate of the University of California.

All members of the Academic Senate holding a faculty appointment in The Henry Samueli School of Engineering shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at Faculty meetings, but only those regular-rank faculty whose FTE is partially or fully within the School may make or second motions, or vote at meetings of the Faculty or its Standing Committees. Exceptions may be granted by the School’s Executive Committee on an annual basis to Emeritus Faculty on recall, on the basis of their active participation in the academic affairs of the School.

The members of the Faculty initiate, develop, and implement the educational, research, and service programs of the Faculty as a part of the program of the whole University. Within the framework of the policies of the Board of Regents, Academic Senate provisions and other relevant guidelines, the members of the Faculty consider, transact, or delegate business initiated by themselves or presented by the Senate, the Dean, or by other officers or bodies of administration. They determine the requirements for admission of students to educational programs of the School and for granting degrees. They also review, approve, and propose degree program through appropriately established channels. Whenever appropriate, members of the Faculty shall seek the advice of representatives of the students in the above described activities.

(B) Officers
(1) The Chair and Secretary of the Faculty shall be elected from the voting members of the Faculty. Elections shall be held before the 8th week of the Spring Quarter. The Executive Committee and all voting members of the Faculty may make nominations which shall be received by the Chair one week before the election. Results are determined by plurality vote. The terms of office of the Chair and Secretary will be two years and begin on September 1. The Chair and Secretary may not serve more than two consecutive terms.

(2) The Chair shall preside at all meetings of the Faculty and shall function as liaison officer of the Faculty to the Office of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate.

(3) The Secretary shall (a) prepare the call and the minutes for each Faculty meeting and each Executive Committee meeting, (b) prepare and distribute mail ballots when required, (c) keep permanent records of the proceedings of all Faculty meetings and distribute the minutes of each meeting to each member of the Faculty.

(C) Meetings
(1) The faculty meets at the call of the Executive Committee, or at the written request of a quorum of the voting members of the Faculty.

(2) At least three days of instruction before each meeting of the Faculty, the Secretary shall mail one copy of the call for the meeting together with any pertinent documents to every member of the Faculty and to student representatives.
(3) Within 10 days of instruction after each meeting, the minutes shall be mailed to every member of the Faculty of the School and to student representatives.

(4) The Secretary serves as Chair in the absence of the Chair.

(5) A quorum shall consist of at least 20 percent of the voting members of the Faculty.

(6) Questions of order not covered by legislation are governed by Robert’s Rules of Order.

(7) Meetings of the Faculty are normally open to the press and to students and staff of the University. Others may attend at the invitation of any members and with the prior knowledge of the Chair. Meetings may be closed only for purposes of discussion on personnel cases.

Section 2: Committees

(A) General Provisions

(1) Besides the Executive Committee, the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Graduate Studies Committee, and the Research Committee are the Standing Committees of the Faculty. Additional standing committees may be established by majority vote of the Faculty. Standing Committees are responsible to the Executive Committee for the performance of duties specified by it.

(2) Each department and/or program selects its own representatives to the Executive Committee and the Standing Committees. The selection procedures should provide for additional nominations and a secret ballot upon the request of any voting faculty member. The names of the persons selected must be reported to the Executive Committee by the end of the 8th week of the Spring quarter. Faculty members of the Executive Committee shall serve for one year. Faculty members of the Standing Committees shall serve for three years. Vacancies shall be filled promptly and reported to the Executive Committee.

(3) Standing Committees elect a Chair from their members. Elected Chairs are approved by the Executive Committee in consultation with the Faculty Chair and Secretary. Chairs shall serve for one year.

(4) Committees shall meet at the call of its Chair, but at least once each quarter. Special meetings may be called at the request of two members of a committee. Minutes shall be kept of all its meetings.

(B) Executive Committee

(1) This committee consists of the Chair of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, one member from each department within the School and, serving ex officio, the Dean, the Chair of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Chair of the Graduate Studies Committee, the Chair of the Research Committee, voting School faculty serving on each of the Council on Educational Policy, Graduate Council, Council on Planning and Budget, Council on Research, Computing & Library Resources, and the School representatives to the Senate Assembly.

(2) The Chair and Secretary of the Faculty shall serve as Chair and Secretary of the Executive Committee.

(3) The Executive Committee shall: (a) represent the Faculty in all aspects of the government and academic administration of the School of Engineering; (b) authorize the Dean, at the Committee’s discretion, to administer Divisional and Senate regulations; (c) appoint all committees of the Faculty not otherwise provided for.

(C) Undergraduate Studies Committee

(1) This committee consists of the Undergraduate Student Advisor for each academic undergraduate degree program selected by the Faculty associated with that program, an undergraduate student selected by the undergraduate student body of the School, and the Dean or the Dean’s designated representative, ex officio. The student member of the Committee shall serve for a one year term.

(2) The Undergraduate Studies Committee shall: (a) be the body of the Faculty which gives expression to its undergraduate educational philosophy and provides broad guidance for the formulation of its academic plans, for the establishment of its curricula, and for its other educational activities; (b) concern itself with the general and specific aspects of undergraduate educational programs; (c) be notified of proposals both for the creation of new courses and programs of study or for changes in existing courses and programs; (d) at appropriate intervals conduct reviews of the officially published rules and regulations established by the Faculty regarding undergraduate curricular requirements, admission and dismissal of students, graduation
requirements, and make recommendations to the Faculty concerning any necessary adjustments, corrections or revisions; (e) at appropriate intervals conduct reviews of the engineering courses and programs of study offered by the School and make recommendations to the Faculty concerning any necessary adjustments or changes; (f) recommend scholastic standards and recommend candidates for degrees; (g) act for the Faculty on matters related to undergraduate affairs when necessary during the interim between Faculty meetings, any and all actions taken shall be subject to review by the Faculty; (h) receive, consider, and take appropriate action in response to requests and petitions by undergraduate students for exceptions to established rules, in those cases where the power to permit exceptions is not specifically delegated to other committees or officers.

(D) Graduate Studies Committee
(1) This committee consists of the Graduate Advisor for each academic graduate degree program selected by the Faculty associated with that department or program, a graduate student selected by the graduate student body of the School, and the Dean or the Dean’s designated representative, ex officio. The student member of the Committee shall serve for a one year term.
(2) The Graduate Studies Committee shall be the body of the Faculty which gives expression to its graduate educational philosophy and provides broad guidance for the formulation of its academic plans, for the establishing of its curricula, and for other educational activities. The Committee shall concern itself with the general and educational concepts which permit the crossing of boundaries within the University’s educational programs.

(E) Research Committee
(1) This committee consists of one representative of each department selected by the Faculty associated with that department.
(2) The Research Committee shall:
(a) consult and advise the Associate Dean of Research on new research initiatives and programs;
(b) notify the Faculty of travel and research funds made available to the School by the Division of Research and Graduate Study and other sources whose funds may be distributed by this committee;
(c) publicize procedures for applications and award selection;
(d) make awards to faculty applicants and settle procedural matters;
(e) report to the Faculty and to the UCI Division of Research and Graduate Studies on the distribution of funds.

Section 3: The School of Engineering Delegation to the Representative Assembly of the Academic Senate, Irvine Division
The Executive Committee shall apportion the number of representatives allotted the Henry Samueli School of Engineering among the School’s departments and/or programs proportional to the size of the Faculties associated with the departments or programs. Allotments may be related if necessary to avoid fractional numbers. Nominations for School representatives to the Senate Assembly must be received by the Executive Committee by the end of the 4th week of the Spring quarter. In the case of a vacancy, the Executive Committee of the School shall accept nominations from the department which has lost its representative and appoint a new representative to serve for the remainder of the academic year.

Section 4: Modification of Bylaws
The Bylaws may be amended by a simple majority of the Faculty. No amendment may be considered without ten days’ prior notice, in writing, to all of the members of the Faculty.
May 18, 2015

WILLIAM MOLZON, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC SENATE, IRVINE DIVISION

RE: Proposal to Amend the HSSoE Bylaws

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (CRJ) received a request on April 27, 2015 to review the proposal presented by the Executive Committee of the Henry Samueli School of Engineering (HSSoE) to amend its bylaws.

CRJ noted that the quorum in the HSSoE is set at a modest 20% of eligible faculty. Per the voting interpretation presented, the majority was indeed met. After thorough review of the proposal to ensure that it is consistent with the Code of the Senate, CRJ approves and recommends this proposal for consideration by the Irvine Divisional Senate Assembly.

We do suggest that the revised HSSoE Bylaws include start dates for committee service in Section 2 (in the current document, only start dates for Officers are stipulated, in Section 1) and that the final section on procedures for modifying the Bylaws (section 4) indicate quorum requirements in addition to stating that a simple majority of the Faculty is required for passage of modifications.

Sincerely,

James Steintrager, Chair  
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Enclosures: (2)

C: Dr. Greg Washington, The Henry Samueli School of Engineering  
Frithjof Kruggel Faculty Chair, HSSoE Executive Committee  
Natalie Schonfeld, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Wendy Chamorro, Analyst
May 20, 2015

DIVISIONAL SENATE ASSEMBLY

RE: Proposal to Revise Chapter II. Section I. General Requirements (IB 505-530)

At its meeting on May 19, 2015, the Senate Cabinet voted and endorsed the proposal to revise Chapter II. Section I. General Requirements (IB 505-530), as reviewed by the Academic Advising group. As part of the review process, the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (CRJ) thoroughly reviewed the proposal.

Academic Advising Directors: April 20, 2015
COMMITTEE ON RULES & JURISDICTION: April 29, 2015
SENEATE CABINET: May 19, 2015

The complete proposal and relevant correspondence is attached to this memo.

Sincerely,

William Molzon
Academic Senate Chair
Chapter II. Section 1. General Requirements (Regulations 505-530)

MANUAL OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE IRVINE DIVISION

PART II. REGULATIONS OF THE IRVINE DIVISION

CHAPTER II: BACCALAUREATE DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

Section 1. General Requirements

Regulation 505. Entry Level Writing Subject A Requirement
Regulation 510. American History and Institutions
Regulation 515. Residence Requirement
Regulation 520. General Education Requirement
Regulation A525. Unit and GPA Requirement
Regulation 530. Publication of Requirements

**************************************************************
Regulation 600. The Claire Trevor School of the Arts

(A) Majors

The Claire Trevor School of the Arts offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in Art, Arts and Humanities, Dance, Drama, and Music, and Studio Art; a Bachelor of Music degree, and a Bachelor of Fine Arts in Dance and Musical Theatre. (AM 6 June 96) (CC 20 Oct 2006)

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

Regulation 605. Francisco J. Ayala School of Biological Sciences

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
PART II – REGULATIONS OF THE IRVINE DIVISION
Chapter II: Baccalaureate Degree Requirements
Section 2: Academic Unit Baccalaureate Degree Requirements
Regulation 605. School of Biological Sciences (CC 27 Jan 11)

(A) Majors

The School of Biological Sciences offers the Bachelor of Science degree in the Biological Sciences, with opportunities to specialize in Biology/Education, Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Developmental and Cell Biology, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Exercise Sciences, Genetics, Human Biology, Microbiology and Immunology, and Neurobiology. and Plant
Biology. The School also offers a Bachelor of Science in Applied Ecology, a joint program with the School of Social Ecology. (CC 20 Oct 2006) (CC 27 Jan 2011)

(B) Study List Requirements

Undergraduate students in the School of Biological Sciences are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Subject to the restrictions of IR 415, undergraduate honors at graduation in the School of Biological Sciences are awarded on the basis of a student’s performance in research and cumulative grade point average.

last revised April 8, 2011

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

THIS IS AN ADDITION

Regulation ??? The School of Education

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

PART II – REGULATIONS OF THE IRVINE DIVISION

Chapter II: Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

Section 2: Academic Unit Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

Regulation 645. The School of Education

(CC 28 Jan 2015)

(A) Major

The School of Education offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in Education Sciences.

(B) Study List Requirements

Every student in the School of Education is responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Campus criteria for honors at graduation are described in the Catalogue. See Division of Undergraduate Education, under Honors Recognition. In addition to campus criteria, the School of Education uses cumulative GPA as the criterion for the awarding of Honors at Graduation. The official designation of Honors on the diploma and transcript will be based upon the candidate’s cumulative GPA and total units completed at the end of the final quarter.
Regulation 615. The Henry Samuei School of Engineering

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

PART II – REGULATIONS OF THE IRVINE DIVISION

Chapter II: Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

Section 2: Academic Unit Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

Regulation 615. The Henry Samuei School of Engineering

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation Subject to the restrictions of IR 415, undergraduate honors at graduation in the Henry Samuei School of Engineering are awarded on the basis of a minimum upper division grade point average of 3.5 for work completed at UCI while demonstrating the highest ethical standards, service to the School, service to the University and/or the community, and achievement in research projects.

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

Regulation 607. Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

PART II – REGULATIONS OF THE IRVINE DIVISION

Chapter II: Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

Section 2: Academic Unit Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

Regulation 607. Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences (En 19 Feb 04) (CC Jun 04)

(A) Major (CC 8 Apr 04) (CC 20 Oct 2006) (CC 15 Dec 2011)

The Donald Bren School of Information and Computer Sciences offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Game Science, Computer Science, Informatics, Information and Computer Science, and Software Engineering. The School also offers a Bachelor of Science in Computer Science and Engineering, a joint program with the Henry Samuei School of Engineering and a Bachelor of Science in Business Information Management, a joint program with the Paul Merage School of Business.
This is an addition

Regulation ____. Program in Nursing Science

(A) Majors

The Program in Nursing Science offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Nursing Science.

(B) Study List Requirements

Undergraduate students in the Program in Nursing Science are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Campus criteria for honors at graduation are described in the Catalogue. See Information for Admitted Students, under Honors Recognition. In addition to campus criteria, the Program in Nursing Science uses cumulative GPA as the criterion for the awarding of Honors at Graduation.

Regulation 625. The School of Humanities

The School of Humanities offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in African American Studies, Art History, Asian American Studies, Chinese Studies, Classics, Comparative Literature, East Asian Cultures, English, European Studies, Film and Media Studies, French, Gender and Sexuality Studies, German Studies, Global Cultures, History, Humanities and Art, Japanese Language and Literature, Korean Literature and Culture, Literary Journalism, Philosophy, Religious Studies, and Spanish, and Gender and Sexuality Studies.
Regulation 630. School of Physical Sciences

(A) Majors (CC 20 Oct 2006 DATE) The School of Physical Sciences offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Chemistry, Earth and Environmental Sciences, Earth System Science, Mathematics, and Physics. The School also offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in Environmental Science.

(B) Study List Requirements

Undergraduate students in the School of Physical Sciences are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Subject to the restrictions of IR 415, undergraduate honors at graduation in the School of Physical Sciences are awarded on the basis of a student’s performance in research, contributions to school/departmental governance, and cumulative grade point average based on six quarters or a minimum of 75 units at UCI. Final selection of recipients of honors at graduation will be made by the Faculty of the School of Physical Sciences.

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

THIS IS AN ADDITION

Regulation XXX. Program in Pharmaceutical Sciences

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
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Chapter II: Baccalaureate Degree Requirements
Section 2: Academic Unit Baccalaureate Degree Requirements
Regulation XXX. Program in Pharmaceutical Sciences

(A) Majors

The Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences offers a program leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in Pharmaceutical Sciences.

(B) Study List Requirements
Undergraduate students in the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

THIS IS AN ADDITION

Regulation XXX. Program in Public Health

THE MANUAL OF THE IRVINE DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
PART II – REGULATIONS OF THE IRVINE DIVISION
Chapter II: Baccalaureate Degree Requirements
Section 2: Academic Unit Baccalaureate Degree Requirements
Regulation XXX. Program in Public Health

(A) Majors

The Program in Public Health offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in Public Health Policy. The Program also offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Public Health Sciences.

(B) Study List Requirements

Undergraduate students in the Program in Public Health are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Campus criteria for honors at graduation are described in the Catalogue. See Division of Undergraduate Education, under Honors Recognition. Subject to the restrictions of IR 415, undergraduate honors at graduation in Public Health are awarded on the basis of a student’s performance in research and cumulative grade point average.

******************************************************************************
Regulation 635. School of Social Ecology

The School of Social Ecology offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminology, Law and Society; Psychology and Social Behavior; Environmental Analysis and Design; Urban Studies; Psychology and Social Behavior; Public Health Policy; Public Health Science; and Social Ecology. The School also offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Applied Ecology, a joint program with the School of Biological Sciences.

(B) Study List Requirements

Undergraduate students in the School of Social Ecology are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Subject to the restrictions of IR 415, undergraduate honors at graduation in Social Ecology are awarded on the basis of grade point average. Among those qualifying, the awards shall be determined by a committee that considers, in addition to grade point average, scholarship as displayed in day-to-day work, contributions to the community of social ecologists, performance in field assignments, and a paper defining a community problem and demonstrating insight into its causes, its bases of continuance, and the potential paths toward solution.

last revised October 20, 2006

Regulation 640. School of Social Sciences

The School of Social Sciences offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in Criminology, Law and Society; Psychology and Social Behavior; Environmental Analysis and Design; Urban Studies; Psychology and Social Behavior; Public Health Policy; Public Health Science; and Social Ecology. The School also offers the Bachelor of Science degree in Applied Ecology, a joint program with the School of Biological Sciences.
Regulation 640. School of Social Sciences

(A) Majors (CC 20 Oct 2006)

The School of Social Sciences offers the Bachelor of Arts degree in Anthropology, Business Economics, Chicano/Latino Studies, Economics, International Studies, Political Science, Psychology, Quantitative Economics, Social Sciences: Social Policy and Public Service, and Sociology; and a Bachelor of Science in Cognitive Sciences.

(B) Study List Requirements

Undergraduate students in the School of Social Sciences are responsible for selecting, with the assistance of a faculty advisor, a program of study consistent with the scholarship and degree.

(C) Criteria for Honors at Graduation

Subject to the restrictions of IR 415, undergraduate honors at graduation in the School of Social Sciences are awarded on the basis of a student’s cumulative grade point average.

last revised October 20, 2006
Mary Gilly, Chair
Academic Senate

Aimee Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of California, Office of the President

Re: UCI comments on distribution of 3% salary adjustment for 2015-16

UC Irvine Senate representatives (four members) and Administration leaders and staff (seven members) met to consider options to implement a faculty salary adjustment equivalent to 3% of the salary pool (with the exact definition of that pool to be determined). This proposed salary increase was seen by the group largely as an effort to prevent further erosion of UC Faculty average salary with respect to that of our peer institutions and not as a mechanism to close the 12% gap in total remuneration with respect to that group. Following a robust discussion, three options for making that adjustment were considered in detail. A plurality of the group preferred option 1; there was also significant support for the other options.

For all options, the group discussed whether or not the across-the-board portion should be restricted to productive faculty: those who had recently received a merit increase or successful five-year review. Most felt that this principle was important, but some felt that the administrative burden needed to identify and track the few (<5%) faculty who would not be eligible by that criterion might not justify the effort.

1. Two-thirds of the pool would be put towards an across-the-board increase and one-third would be put towards addressing salary inequities.

   • The group did not arrive at a consensus on whether the across-the-board portion should be on the base or total salary. If on the base, it would minimize perceived inequities associated with larger absolute increases for faculty with large off-scale salaries. Others supported the idea that this is a mechanism to restore eroded salary for all, and all should benefit with the same percentage increase.

   • Salary inequities include the “loyalty penalty” for faculty who have not sought or received external offers and have been at UCI long enough that their salary might not reflect market salaries. A procedure for implementing a plan for addressing salary inequities would be developed jointly by the Administration and Senate in a way to be determined.
2. All of the pool would be put towards an equal percentage increase in the total (on-scale plus off-scale) salary of all faculty.
   - Opinion of those favoring this option was split on whether this should be for all faculty or only for productive faculty as defined above.

3. All of the pool would be put towards an equal percentage increase in the base, on-scale salary of all faculty; the off-scale salary component would not increase.
   - This option would modestly address the loyalty penalty (as discussed in option 1) and it respects the UC step system that has a goal of tying compensation to merit, as defined by the personnel review process.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Clark  
Interim Provost and  
Executive Vice Chancellor

William Molzon  
Chair, Irvine Division Academic Senate  
Professor, Department of Physics and Astronomy
This is a reference document to an external location.

Types of Graduate Programs at UCI
Dear Colleagues:

CCGA has had several in-depth discussions of the issues associated with self-supporting graduate professional degree programs (SSGPDP). The attached document summarizes our analysis of the situation and our recommendations. SSGPDPs raise important issues for each of our campuses and the UC system. They need close attention and in-depth discussion between the Senate and administration on each campus. This will hopefully result in joint action guided by strategic academic planning.

We ask you, as chair of your campus Graduate Council, to bring this issue to discussion in your council, and then – informed by this discussion – start a conversation with the administration (provost’s office and planning and budget leaders) on your campus. In this process, it likely will be useful to also involve the Council on Planning and Budget on your campus.

All the best and please keep us posted (via your CCGA representative) on how things progress!

Jutta Heckhausen

cc: Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair
    Daniel Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair
    Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director
    Todd Greenspan, Director of Academic Planning
    Kimberly Peterson, Academic Planning Analysis Manager

Enclosures (1)
CCGA Recommendations Regarding Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs

Current planning on different campuses in the UC system indicates that three campuses (UCI, UCLA, UCSD) anticipate starting a relatively large number of new self-supporting graduate professional degree programs, whereas the other campuses have plans for few or no such programs. Given the potentially substantial impact - for better or worse - of these programs on our campuses’ instruction and research, CCGA has developed the following statements and recommendations for consideration by the divisional Graduate Councils. We hope you find these helpful in the immediate and intermediate future to guide your judgment and initiatives as well as joint academic planning with the administration on your campus.

Self-supporting graduate professional degree programs differ from traditional academic programs.

The complementary missions of a Research One university are research and instruction. What distinguishes UC from the Cal State system is its dedication to research, both pure and applied. Professional programs do not typically focus, as do our doctoral programs, on the generation of new discovery. They exist, in large part, to train and to certify working professionals. Apart from our well-established state-supported professional schools of law, medicine, public health, social work, and business, these programs supplement our core mission in research and instruction. In the aftermath of large budget cuts to the University of California system, the development of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs promises new streams of revenue for our campuses. At the same time, these professional programs help address the needs of the State’s working professionals for high quality graduate education. Of course, all educational programs need the robust involvement of the faculty in the relevant academic unit. Faculty engagement is a prerequisite for creating any educational programs, whether traditional academic or professional.

A distinguishing feature of self-supporting graduate professional degree programs is that they have a predominantly applied focus, as seen in reviews of recent proposals for new self-supporting programs. This is often reflected in the capstone requirement and its focus on applied research and not on generating new discovery. Students in professional programs are typically working full-time or are looking to pursue a specific career.
CCGA recommends that Graduate Council and Provost’s Offices on the individual campuses should jointly engage in strategic planning for self-supporting professional graduate programs. For the already very active campuses in this regard, the conversation probably needs to focus on prioritizing and sequencing new proposals and their start-up funding. For the less active campuses, Senate-administration discussions might focus on exploring opportunities and identifying and overcoming possible obstacles (e.g., regional constraints may be overcome with online formats). CCGA would like to see in the introduction section of every proposal for a new self-supporting program answers to the following questions: How does this program fit into the campus’ priority planning for self-supporting programs and into its overall strategic academic plan?

We recommend that campuses conduct rigorous marketing analyses to identify the professional graduate programs that will attract robust cohorts of applicants over the next decade. Launching a self-supporting program takes a significant investment of faculty and administrative time as well as start-up funds. To assess the market for some self-supporting programs, campuses may look at the professional education needs in their local or regional community, whereas for evaluating the potential for other programs, particularly those that promise the on-line delivery of courses, campuses may want to evaluate national or international demand. Estimates of market need for a given professional program should be based on high-quality and specifically targeted analyses, which may require seeking the input from a consulting company for higher education institutions or for economic modeling.

We recommend that campuses invest in these programs with sufficient start-up packages for developing new courses and advertising, additional faculty where needed, and support services necessary to ensure not just self-supporting status, but sufficient growth to yield revenue beyond mere cost-coverage.

CCGA believes strongly that self-supporting professional master programs must adhere to UC’s commitment to affordability and accessibility and should have solid financial aid components. This implies that a significant part of the revenue from a new program should be reinvested in financial aid, particularly in programs that are targeting applicants with limited financial means.

Our campuses and their respective Senate Graduate Councils and Offices for Planning and Budget should assess at regular intervals (possibly every three years) whether these programs are thriving, whether the funds they generate are supporting the core mission of the university, and whether they are draining faculty time from teaching in traditional academic programs or from research.

If programs do not thrive, there needs to be a process in place, administered by the respective Graduate Councils, to sunset them. With the judicious choice of particular programs to develop, self-supporting programs should be generating strong revenue by year five.

We strongly recommend that campuses think ahead about the proper distribution of “profits” from these programs. We know that some programs will be more financially successful than others, and we fear that serious inequities might result. We strongly recommend, therefore, that campuses think ahead about the proper distribution of “profits” from these programs between the sponsoring department, school, and general campus. We realize the need for incentives, but we also fear a situation in which some parts of a given campus may enjoy the lion share of revenue generated by professional programs, while other parts of that campus, where entrepreneurial efforts are less promising, languish with far less support for their research and doctoral programs.

In sum, CCGA recommends that the Graduate Councils on all campuses engage in serious strategic academic and budgetary planning efforts regarding SSGPDPs with the cooperation of their campus’ Provost and key leaders in budget and planning.
Guidelines for the Development and Review of New Self-Supporting and Senate-Regulated Graduate Degree Proposals at the University of California, Irvine

Policy Statement: All Self-Supporting Program (SSP) proposals must comply with all aspects of the September 2011 University of California Office of the President (UCOP) Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs, Implementation Guidelines for the Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) Guidelines for Senate Review of New Self-Supporting Programs (2011).

1. SELF-SUPPORTING PROGRAM CRITERIA: Per the documents referenced above, a self-supporting program should meet one or more of the following criteria ("although meeting a single criterion is not necessarily sufficient justification for self-supporting status"): 1) primarily serve a non-traditional population, such as full-time employees, mid-career professionals, international students and/or students supported by their employers; 2) be offered through an alternative mode of delivery, such as online instruction or a hybrid model; 3) be alternatively scheduled, such as during evening, weekends, and summers; and/or 4) be offered in an alternative location (e.g., off-campus centers).

2. LADDER FACULTY INVOLVEMENT: Self-supporting graduate degree programs should be held to the same standards of quality as regular programs, and accordingly, proposals for new, self-supporting, Senate-regulated graduate degree programs must provide a detailed explanation of the measures taken in designing the self-supporting program to ensure that faculty members will continue to provide at least the current level of support to existing academic graduate and undergraduate programs. Ladder rank faculty must be involved in the conception, review, approval, teaching, and ongoing evaluation of all proposed self-supporting programs; a description of ladder faculty's role with the proposed self-supporting program is expected in the proposal.

3. PROGRAM INTENT AND CONGRUENCE WITH UNIVERSITY MISSION: New proposals should explain the intent for creating the self-supporting program and how congruent it is with the mission of the university and the department’s educational programs; proposals should elaborate on how the program will contribute to meeting campus strategic goals and priorities. Additionally, the proposal should state how the proposed program will enhance the reputation of the department, school and/or university.

4. TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS: New proposals must provide a detailed explanation of how teaching assignments will be managed, as well as an explicit discussion of teaching assignments in relation to the usual workload of faculty members; the proposal must indicate whether the involved faculty members are teaching on an on-load or off-load basis. A description of the department, division and/or campus policies that deal with teaching load must be included in the proposal. Proposers are reminded that no more 20% (one-fifth rule) of the curriculum for the new graduate program can be transferred into the new program, including XI courses taught through UNEX.

5. RECRUITMENT AND RELATION TO EXISTING PROGRAMS: New proposals must describe the intended audience and academic goals of the program, including how the proposed curriculum offers students an opportunity to achieve these goals. The proposal should include a comparison to existing departmental degree programs and a description of how the proposed program does or does not overlap in the goals, missions and target audience of these programs. A detailed marketing plan is required, that includes a description of the student recruitment process, any marketing channels and media that will be deployed.
to promote the program should be included in the proposal, as well. In such cases where a contractual agreement is being contemplated between the program proposers and University Extension to support selected components (e.g., on-line instructional development and infrastructure) of the self-supporting program, the proposed arrangement and draft contract should be submitted with the proposal.

6. RESOURCE ANALYSIS AND DISPOSITION OF PROGRAM REVENUE: There are several aspects of resource analysis required for these proposals:

A. The proposing faculty / department must provide preliminary market research that supports the feasibility/viability of a self-supporting program before investing resources in the extensive development of a full proposal. As per the memo issued by the EVC on June 20, 2012, faculty should contact the Graduate Division for coordination assistance with this market research process and campus decision-making prior to proposal development [see Appendix A - EVC Memo]. This market research phase must yield a positive outcome for the viability of the proposed program in order to justify final development of the comprehensive proposal and further review by the campus administration and academic senate committees.

B. New proposals must use the SSP cost analysis template from the UCOP in preparation of their proposal budgets [provide link to template here]. This analysis should demonstrate that student tuition and fees will cover all direct and indirect costs of the program, supplemented only by non-state fund sources, and that the program will become fully self-supporting within three years. The recovery cost of the market analysis (paid initially by the campus administration) must be included in this cost analysis.

C. The proposal must have a detailed resource analysis from the Office of Planning and Budget (OPB), which ensures that the disposition of the proposed program’s projected revenues will be transparent and implemented to assure that secondary support services receive a return of the support (campus tax applied) needed to maintain excellence in the campus infrastructure. This review from OPB must be completed before submission to the Academic Senate.

D. Upon receipt of the proposal in the Academic Senate office, the proposal will be forwarded both to the Graduate Council (GC) and the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) for further review, analysis and comment. A CPB statement of endorsement will be required before the GC acts to recommend approval of the proposal to the Senate Cabinet. CPB requirements include:

i. The CPB is specifically asked to assess whether the proposal has provided a thorough analysis of and justification for the proposed fees and enrollments that underlie revenue projections. This should be done in relation to the strengths and limitations of local, regional and national competing programs.

ii. Proposals must identify the nature, source and extent of any set-up, seed or temporary funding, and gifts and contributions-in-kind that affect program revenues, costs or operations, whether from campus or external entities. The nature of any formal or informal obligations incurred in relation to any of these contributions must be identified. A plan must be provided for the repayment and/or fulfillment of all financial and other obligations to campus or external entities, including the possibility that the program is a financial failure.

iii. A specific non-state funding source must be identified for the potential repayments in (ii), as well as to cover any program deficits.

iv. A plan should be presented for how any net revenues will be shared amongst the entities involved (department, school, campus) and how they will be used to support academic programs on campus.
v. The trade-offs and impacts of ladder rank faculty being involved in the administration and/or teaching in the program should be identified. In particular, the proposal should state how the unit would mitigate any adverse impact on the core teaching mission of the unit.

vi. The proposal should identify all academic units that might be affected in the event that a program fails and goes into deficit. The potential financial and programmatic impacts on each such unit should be discussed.

vii. Proposers must comply with University policy regarding Conflict of Interest for all program participants, administrators and staff, and should identify any known conflicts and their proposed resolution.

E. Interdisciplinary programs (IDP) ideally report to the Dean of the Graduate Division, as proposed by the Graduate Council. For those that are proposed to be self-supporting, the Office of Planning and Budget will assist with the determination of appropriate indirect costs to be shared proportionally across the various disciplines involved. For IDPs, commitment of faculty FTEs dedicated to the IDP must be included in the proposal, with documented support from the school Dean. This is necessary to assure viability/stability of the program that could be jeopardized by resignations or other economic changes in any of the participating departments/schools. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is required between the participating disciplines to provide assurance about this ongoing support.

7. PROGRAM GOVERNANCE: New proposals require a set of bylaws that detail the governance of the proposed program, including the levels of engagement by ladder and adjunct faculty in the administration and execution of the program (i.e., committee structures) and assurances of financial transparency (i.e., annual reporting requirements).

8. DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION: Proposals for new self-supporting programs that rely heavily on digital technologies in the delivery of instruction should explain in the proposal how those technologies will enhance learning and provide access to a larger and more diverse student population. An assessment of whether the proposed program will create a “substantive change” as outlined by the Western Association of Schools and College (http://www.wascsenior.org/subchange) must be conducted to ensure compliance with WASC regulations.

9. EXPEDITED REVIEWS: CCGA generally requires up to two years to review new degree program proposals. On an exceptional basis, the CCGA may grant an expedited review. It is our goal to achieve an expedited review process through CCGA on these SSP proposals. In such cases, the proposal must meet the following criteria:
   a) The proposal must have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny at UCI;
   b) The GC must solicit both internal (to UC) and external (outside UC) reviews from appropriate UC faculty from other university campuses (whose reviews must address criteria as detailed in the CCGA Handbook, found at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/ccga/reports.html). Accordingly, proposers are requested to submit a recommended list of internal and external reviewers, as part of their proposal package.
   c) Proposers must address issues raised by the solicited reviews and make appropriate adjustments to the final proposal, before final approval is considered by the GC. These reviews and responses from the proposers will be included in the CCGA submission package.
   d) It is important to remember that all SSP proposals are additionally reviewed by the UC Council on Planning Budget (UCPB).
10. PROGRAM EVALUATION: Following approval of the proposal the self-supporting program will be required to submit an annual progress report to the GC and **three years after the admission of the program’s first cohort**, the GC will conduct an independent review of the self-supporting program. Such a review will involve the collection of a written progress report from the program’s department chair. In the precedent years, the self-supporting program will be reviewed annually by the Office of Planning and Budget; the resultant annual reports should be made available to the program’s department chair and appended to the year-three progress report to enable the Council to consider the financial feasibility of the program, in addition to the academic merits of the program. If necessary, the GC may request assistance from the CPB to conduct a more thorough assessment of the program’s financial feasibility. Following a successful year-three review by the GC, the self-supporting program should then be incorporated into the Academic Senate’s regular, eight-year program review process. Should immediate concerns arise as a product of the year-three review the GC will address them directly with the department chair and monitor the program’s progress with addressing the concerns. Should the concerns not be satisfactorily addressed within a reasonable specified period of time, the GC will move to suspend admissions to and/or discontinue the self-supporting degree program as afforded under the Academic Senate’s Appendix V procedures and as recommended by the CCGA guidelines. Any voluntary suspension or termination of a self-supporting program by the faculty/department/school involved requires prompt reporting to Graduate Council via submission of the" Request for Approval to Modify Graduate Degree Program" form.

11. LOAN PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY: All SSPs that are successfully reviewed by the Academic Senate are eligible to apply for the loan program, established through the Office of Planning and Budget.

12. PROCESS STEPS FOR REVIEW OF SSPs UNDER THIS GUIDELINE:
   A. Faculty who are proposing a self-supporting program must meet with the Graduate Division to initiate discussions and internal decisions about preliminary market research needed prior to program development. At the discretion of the Graduate Dean, this initial meeting will include the faculty proposers, the school Dean, the Dean of the Graduate Division, and the Dean of University Extension (if the market analysis is conducted by UNEX). If determined to be justified, this process will be completed prior to final proposal preparation and submission to campus administration and the Academic Senate.
   B. Proposal preparation and submission (in compliance with these guidelines) to the OPB. Simultaneous with the OPB review, the proposal should be submitted to the Graduate Division and Senate analyst for GC who complete pre-reviews to assure completeness of the proposal and compliance with graduate program policies as pre-requisite to Senate review.
   C. Once approved by the OPB, the proposal is submitted to the Academic Senate, where initial reviews will be conducted by the GC and by the CPB. Proposers will respond to these review comments from the Councils and make applicable proposal changes.
   D. The GC, in conjunction with the Graduate Division, will seek and oversee critical peer reviews of the proposal (2 from faculty internal to UC, and 2 from faculty external to UC).
   E. The proposers will respond to all reviews received and revise the proposal accordingly to achieve a final proposal document. This may involve an iterative process of response and revision, depending upon the consistency of the review comments received.
   F. The GC will re-review the new degree program proposal in consideration of the peer review comments, the responses from the proposers, and the final proposal document. All of these documents will be shared as information items with the CPB, but additional review by this Council will be requested at the discretion of the GC.
G. Once approved by the GC, the proposal will be reviewed for approval by the Senate Cabinet (and the Divisional Assembly as deemed necessary by the Cabinet).

H. The proposal is then submitted to CCGA, with a specific request for an expedited review procedure. All review documentation from the GC, CPB, and the internal and external reviewers will be attached to demonstrate the adequacy and completeness of the review process. CCGA will additionally request a review for all SSPs by the UCPB.
March 31, 2015: Remarks at Investiture Ceremony

The Differences That Make a Difference

I am overflowing with gratitude:

- to President Janet Napolitano and the Board of Regents, for their faith in me;
- to former Chancellor Michael Drake, whose investiture at OSU is also today, for his countless contributions to UCI and for inviting me to join this community two years ago;
- to our beloved friend, Jack Peltason, who made historic contributions to UCI, to the University of California, and to higher education, while demonstrating that great leadership can be accomplished with good humor, and who stayed engaged with life, and the life of the mind, despite obstacles that would have gotten the better of mere mortals;
- to President Max Nikias, not only for his generous remarks today but more importantly for being a great friend and superb mentor;
- to the many professional colleagues who over the years have made this work so fun and so satisfying;
- to the UCI faculty, staff, students, alumni, and supporters who have offered their support and good guidance;
- to the community and civic leaders in Orange County who have reached out so that we can work together to serve this region;
- to the great Cary Elwes, for his life’s work, for bringing a special glow to this occasion, and for recently writing a wonderful book (a New York Times bestseller);
- to everyone who helped put this event together and participated in the ceremony, too many to thank now, but especially to Ramona Agrela for leading the effort and for keeping me in the dark about it so that I could experience it and enjoy it;
- to our friends and family – people from my childhood and people from our neighborhood;
- to all of you for taking the time to be here today or watch the webcast;
- and especially to my wife, Ellen, and the two people who matter the most to us, our beautiful children, Arielle and Danny, our pride and joy. I could not do this if they were not generous with their love, support, and perspective. Because the responsibilities of this position are borne by them as well as by me, I ask you all to thank them for their service to UCI.

I am also thankful to my parents, Stan and Charlyne Gillman, who never went to college but worked hard to make sure I had that opportunity, who instilled in me simple but enduring values that made everything else possible. Their lives were too short, passing away before they saw their grandchildren come into the world, and before I started my career in earnest. But they had confidence that their only child would be okay.
They would have thought this was very nice – a little over the top, but nice.

Those are some of the people to whom I am thankful. But I am also grateful for the privilege of being part of the Anteater family, a truly inspirational community of scholars, teachers, learners, and supporters, determined to do even more to serve humankind.

In formally accepting the Chancellor’s Medal, I commit to you that I will devote myself to doing justice to your faith in me and to working with you – and with all willing and inspired partners – to advance our indispensable mission. This is an investiture, and make no mistake about it: I am invested in UCI.

High Hopes for Our Future

You can see how one might conclude that investitures are about a person, and you all have made this a day that I will remember for as long as I am capable. But this moment is more fundamentally about the hopes and expectations of everyone who is devoted to UCI and its mission. And I have heard your high hopes for our future.

You have told me that, while there is tremendous pride in what we have done to date, there is also an eagerness, even a fierce determination, to do more: make even stronger contributions in research, education, and service; accelerate our ascendency among globally preeminent research universities; marshal our passions, skills, and ingenuity to further improve people’s lives. There is little appetite for resting on our existing laurels, or imagining merely incremental improvements.

I have heard you say that we must continue to strive to be a sought-after destination for the most talented and ambitious faculty, students, and staff – reflecting all backgrounds and life experiences – who see that UCI is where they can reach their full potential and do their best work. We are especially proud that our vision of excellence is unshakably democratic, an essential component of the still-unfolding promise of America, inclusive of all, including vast numbers of outstanding first-generation college students and students from low-income backgrounds, many of whom represent the real future of California, who are here because of the opportunities we provide and because of their promise, character, ambition, and drive. As an institution created by the people in order to serve the people, we know that the more we resemble the majestic diversity of this republic, the stronger we will be.

And I have heard one more thing on which there is a clear consensus: we have the most feared, revered, and beloved mascot in all of higher education. Trojans and Bruins may be more well-known (for now), but watch out world, Peter the Anteater will not be stopped. Zot zot zot!

Embracing a New Model for Enhancing Our Excellence and Impact

While we have high hopes for making ever-stronger contributions, and for attracting even more world-class talent to our campus and our region, we also understand that the old models of campus expansion no longer apply.

I am confident that we will continue to be supported by the state, in a way that ensures greater access for the next generation of California’s sons and daughters. But the day is past that the state will be our primary supporter. The state will help, but it will also expect us to rely on more self-help and embrace innovation.
For some colleges and universities the current uncertain and rapidly changing landscape of higher education is a reason for caution, a time to put bolder ambitions on hold. But in my judgment this new reality is a strategic advantage for UCI, for three reasons.

First, this landscape rewards institutions such as ours that have an entrepreneurial culture and a pioneering spirit.

Second, we are located in one of the most vibrant and forward-looking parts of the world, where innovation and bold plans are encouraged and rewarded.

And third, the excellence, ambition, and commitment of our faculty, students, and staff make it possible to attract those new partners and supporters who will help us reach our shared goals.

Understanding this, what is our path forward for continuing our maturation as a globally preeminent research university, and for enhancing and expanding the excellence and impact of our work?

It boils down to three interrelated words: innovation, expansion, partnerships.

Let me begin with innovation.

Innovation

From the beginning it has been a core credo of UCI to pursue excellence through innovation. Our extraordinary founding faculty did not come to this place in order to copy their way to the top. They came here to do things that were not possible at more established institutions, and they created a culture that embraced the power of “different”:

- plan the campus around a circle to facilitate interactions across all disciplines;
- build a school of life sciences that dispensed with familiar departments such as botany and physiology and envisioned instead a “new biology” organized around emergent fields such as molecular biology – soon to be a model for the nation;
- become an international center for the new field of critical theory, which would soon become a movement that transformed the study and teaching of literature and culture;
- create the nation’s first Department of Earth System Science well before the country had heard about An Inconvenient Truth;
- establish the first stand-alone School of Information and Computer Sciences in the University of California, foreshadowing the fundamental transformation of the Big Data/Social Networking revolution.

Our academic planning must take ongoing inspiration from this UCI tradition of achieving excellence and impact through innovation.

From the strengths of our existing structures of schools and departments we must continue to explore those areas on the frontiers of knowledge that cut across these structures, where we have unique opportunities to make especially important and impactful contributions, and where we organize our talent so that we are focusing on global grand challenges, regional imperatives, and the evolving interests and passions of a new generation of students and scholars who seek to explore large ideas rather than the traditional boundaries of academic disciplines.
This commitment to innovation will also allow us to elevate the experiences of our students, as we develop new plans for becoming even more of a number-one choice school for our most inspiring applicants, perfect new methods of teaching and learning, and above all to do all we can to ensure that UCI students succeed in their educational goals.

This campuswide spirit of innovation and creativity will also be advanced through Illuminations, our Arts and Culture Initiative, which will make arts and creative expression a more pervasive part of the UCI experience.

It is not possible, right now, to know precisely all of the innovative areas of inquiry and discovery that will become matters of strategic focus. However, two areas will have to be on the list.

The first has to do with health and medicine. Any AAU research university with an academic medical center has an obligation to marshal its research and clinical expertise to promote human health, more effectively treat disease, and enhance people’s well-being. UCI will continue to be the place that brings to the region the future of medicine and health promotion.

Some of the most important innovations in human health are being made possible by the convergence of research across the life sciences, physical sciences, engineering, information and computer science, and the social and behavioral sciences. Work across these disciplines is also yielding critical advances in fields such as energy, food, climate, and water.

This brings me to my second example of a necessary area of innovative research and educational focus: ensuring that faculty and students from these converging fields can work together in a more focused and systematic way. While we have exciting pockets on campus where these sorts of collaborations take place, we do not have the kind of facility that will allow big scale research on a broad range of global challenges.

To my mind the absence of such a facility on this campus is the single biggest impediment to transformational innovation in our core missions of research, education, and service.

If we are going to contribute to such vital fields as personalized and precision health, nano-scale manufacturing, and the development of sustainable alternatives to fossil fuels, it is imperative that we be prepared to invest in such a structure.

Accordingly, with leadership from the relevant deans and faculty members, we will create a plan for building a large research and educational building devoted to the Convergence of Science and Engineering, and we will make fundraising for this building a top priority.

A Convergence of Science and Engineering Building will also support the efforts of our Institute for Innovation by dramatically expanding the sort of translational, problem-oriented research that often has real-world applications. It will also allow us to recruit high-impact faculty looking to tackle big questions across disciplinary boundaries.

And this brings me to expansion.
Expansion

On this beautiful campus we have the great advantage of having the physical ability to grow. And this year we have almost 89,000 students who are applying for seats at our table. We should do all we can to give more of them an opportunity to have a UCI education.

Mindful that old models of expansion are no longer available to us, and that we will need to establish the right combination of new state funding, new students, new revenue sources, and new fundraising, I believe we are in a position to set the following initial goals of expansion:

- increase the size of our permanent faculty by 250 or around 20 percent;
- increase our funded research activity from $300 million per year to $500 million per year;
- increase the size of our student body to 40,000 total students, through a combination of new on-campus and online students.

Expanding the size of the faculty will allow us to recruit in areas of strategic importance; increase the overall impact of our research, scholarly, and creative activity; more quickly diversify the ranks of the faculty; and respond to changing patterns of student interest and societal need.

Levels of research funding are a basic measure of the quality and impact of research universities, and despite our impressive accomplishments, by that measure our peers and aspirational peers are at higher levels than we are, which is why we must establish ambitious goals for improvement.

Increasing the size of our student body will, of course, enable us to serve a larger and more diverse set of students, while at the same time establish a foundation for overall expansion. However, given the dramatic increases we have recently seen in the number of student credit hours delivered online, up to half of the total increase in the student body could take the form of new online students. This will allow us to become a national leader on how to do online and distance education right, so that we reach more students, improve learning outcomes, and give our residential students more options for completing their degrees on time.

The three goals I mentioned do not fully capture the nature and scope of how we seek to expand the excellence and impact of our work. Humanistic inquiry, performance art, and arts scholarship are foundational for the work of any great comprehensive university, and we will identify goals that are appropriate for these disciplines. Our professional schools will continue to increase their influence among their national and international peers and increase the contributions they make to our regional professional organizations. And of course we are firmly committed to dramatically expanding the impact of UCI Health throughout the region.

Committing ourselves to expansion will require a lot of hard work, creativity, and coordination. In particular, there will be infrastructure needs that will be met only with the help of our supporters.

I am especially mindful of the need for new spaces that will serve our students. For example, our students deserve a new building for student services. We will also need help creating the kind of twenty-first century learning spaces that our students desire and deserve. And so these, too, will be priority areas for fundraising. That means that a few lucky persons will have a unique opportunity to associate their names with serving our amazing students and ushering in the future of teaching and learning at UCI. I’ll be talking to you.
As you can see, it is not possible for us to accomplish this all on our own. And this brings me to my final topic, partnerships.

**Partnerships**

Consider a few recent examples of partnerships that have made us better and increased the impact of our work.

Our work with Southern California Edison has resulted in one of the country’s largest “smart grid” demonstration projects, which will help our region and our country develop energy infrastructures that are more reliable, secure, economic, efficient, and environmentally friendly – and just last week, scholars and executives from around the world came to UCI for a Microgrid Global Summit.

If you have enjoyed our region’s amazing open spaces you should know that our Center for Environmental Biology collaborates with the Irvine Ranch Conservancy on the maintenance of those open spaces, and also provides expert guidance on how best to restore native plants.

Our partnerships with international universities have facilitated unique student and faculty exchanges and allowed us to make important contributions to global challenges, from sustainability research to water policy.

The Beall Family Foundation gave us the start we needed to establish our Institute for Innovation, devoted to being a regional catalyst for technology transfer and commercialization, and the impact of that institute will be expanded by a whole series of partnerships, including a network of more than 200 local experts who will represent the Orange County Entrepreneurial Advisory Network – or as I like to call it, the Antrepreneurial Advisory Network.

A central feature of our Illuminations initiative is the creation of a UCI Community Arts Council, made up of outstanding community arts leaders, through which we will explore ways to contribute to Orange County’s rich arts and culture landscape.

We are committed to expanding the power of partnerships of all kinds, and toward that end we are taking a number of important steps.

Our new Office of Global Engagement will help us forge strategic international partnerships, especially with prominent Pacific Rim institutions.

An enhanced and reenergized Alumni program will open up new connections in the business and nonprofit communities.

Our Chief Executive Roundtable will make sure there is depth of understanding between the regional business community and UCI activities, in order to advance more mutually beneficial relationships, including corporate support for research and internship opportunities for our students.

An enhanced effort to reach out to national foundations will benefit all our high-impact campus programs.

Our long-standing affiliation with the National Academies, via the Beckman Center, will be reenergized.
New and expanded advisory boards for our schools, centers, and institutes will ensure that enthusiastic and influential supporters will benefit all our faculty and students.

And our fantastic Foundation trustees will be hard at work ensuring that we are in contact with people – in the region, across the country, and around the world – who can make a transformational difference in the development of UCI in the years to come.

Forging Our Brilliant Future

As you can see, innovation, expansion, and partnerships are not separate and distinct components of our planning. They are interactive and mutually reinforcing pieces.

Over the next few months we will take these guiding principles and begin the work of devising the next strategic plan for UCI. Our plan will be true to our pioneering spirit, meet the expectations of the people of California, reflect the interests of the upcoming generation of students and their families, resonate with the priorities of federal funding agencies and influential foundations, attract strategic partners, and inspire people of goodwill who are looking for ways to make a real difference in the world.

The difference we continue to make will be on a scale of global significance. After all, where would we be – and where would the rest of the world be – if our own Nobel Prize winner Sherry Rowland didn’t save the ozone layer?

Still, the people who will benefit most persistently from our work, beyond our students, will be the people of our region. These are our neighbors, our friends, our supporters, our advocates. We are, and will continue to be, an essential part of what ensures the people of this region a good quality of life and a promising future. Their promising future is inextricably tied to UCI’s promising future – which, come to think of it, was exactly why visionary leaders decided, more than 50 years ago, to create a large research university on the rolling hills of the Irvine Ranch.

We are proud of our bright past. Let us begin now to work together to forge our brilliant future.

Fiat Lux. Let there be light.