

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
APRIL 14, 2011
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, April 14, 2011 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Evan Heit presiding. Chair Heit welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Evan Heit

The Senate Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and introduced the systemwide Senate Chair, Daniel Simmons, Chancellor Steve Kang and Vice Chancellor Mary Miller. One of the purposes of this meeting is to provide information on what the Senate is doing on the behalf of the membership; this is a meeting about accountability. The following is a summary of general topics addressed by the Senate; more specifics will be discussed in the committee reports.

- **Chancellor Search**- The Chancellor search is one of the most important tasks for the University this year. UC Merced faculty on the search committee include Evan Heit, Martha Conklin and Mike Colvin; Daniel Simmons is another faculty member on the committee. The outcome will be formally announced at the May Regents meeting. The most interesting part of being on the search committee and being Chair of the Division over the past year has been learning how much support there is for UC Merced from the Office of the President and from the Regents. It has been clear in the way that they are approaching the chancellor search and the high standards they are setting for the position; specifically, that they will not compromise or settle. The single best highlight of the year was the two-day interviews of the semi-finalists for the chancellor position. During those two days, President Yudof and Board of Regents Vice Chair Sherry Lansing noted how much they support UC Merced, how they want us to be a fully fledged UC campus and how they want us to thrive as a research university. They also reiterated they want to make it financially possible to attain these goals.
- **Budget Information/Funding** - The Office of the President is committed to the UC Merced budget. UC Merced was not affected by the \$500 million cut from the UC system and there is intention to protect the campus if there are more cuts in the near future. It is remarkable how the campus is being supported by the system considering what is happening in the State. Merced has had several great meetings with the Office of the President and it is clear they appreciate what the campus is doing; our accomplishments on a shoe-string budget in terms of our operating budget and in terms of space per faculty member and per student.
The State budget has not been passed. UC Merced is in a republican state senatorial district and our Senator does not want to sign a budget that extends taxes. There are rumors that UC should shut down a campus or turn some campuses into liberal arts colleges; however, those are just rumors. The UC Office of the President and the Regents are behind the campus. Senate Chair Heit asked President Yudof about the rumors and it took him a nanosecond to respond that the rumors are not true.

- **Senate Work-** Divisional Council has accomplished several things and there is still work that is being addressed by the current Divisional Council. Some business will continue to be pursued next year.

Accomplishments

Accreditation-

The campus is on track for WASC accreditation which reflects the work of everyone in the room and all faculty. Undergraduate program review has been underway which is necessary to be a fully established university. This reflects hard work by the faculty and Senate office, particularly Fatima Paul. Most of the people in the room have been involved in assessment at some point. When the WASC team was here, the committee commended the campus profusely; the faculty, the Senate and the way the Senate works with the Administration. The campus is expecting a positive result from the visit.

Graduate Groups-

Three new Graduate Groups have been approved by CCGA which is very important in establishing ourselves as a research university. The three approved programs include Cognitive and Information Sciences (CIS), Qualitative Systems Biology (QSB) and Psychological Sciences.

Bylaw 55 Units

The Senate reviewed faculty-written Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals to split the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) into four (4) personnel units; these were approved by the Administration. The Senate is now reviewing similar proposals for the School of Natural Sciences (SNS).

Untenured Faculty Support-

The Senate has shined a spotlight on the success of untenured faculty at Divisional Council and with the Administration. The campus is in a special circumstance with a high percentage of assistant professors. The campus is focusing on creating a good foundation for success for assistant professors.

Shared Governance-

Shared governance has been successful this year. The Divisional Council and Senate have worked cooperatively with the Administration on this campus and have had several visits from administrators from the Office of the President. A lot of common ground was found with built trust and sense of common purpose. It is also important to foster shared governance at the School level. How is shared governance working in each School; are faculty in charge of all academic decisions and are the administration and faculty consulting each other on decisions made by the administration?

Topics in process

Academic Personnel Processes-

The Senate is concerned about the AP processes. Top issues include:

Not all policies are in writing but are based on oral history. The campus would work more efficiently if all policies were written.

Academic Personnel needs to be a cooperative process between faculty and different academic units, faculty on the Committee for Academic Personnel and with various

administrative offices such as the Senate Office, School Dean's offices and the Academic Personnel Office. There needs to be more collaboration between these constituencies. Divisional Council is pursuing ways to work more efficiently and more collaboratively.

Graduate Student Appointment Processes-

Divisional Council has met with graduate students, who help define us as a research university. The students have valid complaints about late appointments and late or last minute notification of support for the year; sometimes not hearing until after the beginning of the term. These issues are related to unwritten policies and different administrative units on campus not working together or as well as they can. The campus is making progress and has invited experts from other UC campuses to help tune up the appointment processes.

Classroom scheduling-

Clearly the campus is challenged for space and will not be getting much more space in the near future. It is important to use the existing space as wisely and efficiently as possible. Ultimately the scheduling of the classrooms falls within the purview of the Registrar. This is an example where there must be a shared governance process and the Administration must consult the Senate about how to do this in a pedagogically sound way. There was a bit of an unraveling of this process where the Registrar issued a well-intentioned scheduling system but had failed to consult with teaching faculty. The Senate has since been in communication with the Registrar's Office. The new scheduling system treated graduate teaching as an exception. Faculty would have to request a waiver if the course deviated from the block scheduling program which was built around teaching undergraduates. This is not appropriate for a research university.

UCM San Joaquin Valley PRIME Program-

The UC Merced San Joaquin Valley Program in Medical Education (PRIME) is a well-intentioned program where six students per year will be taught medicine at UC Davis. The students will be given opportunity to research or field clinical work in the Merced area. The program has been launched in the name of UC Merced without prior Senate consultation. The Senate should be leading the way in terms of curriculum and admissions. One of the Senate goals is to have a written document that is agreed upon by all parties involved with PRIME by this summer.

University Relations-

The Senate has met with University Relations which includes Communications, Development and Governmental Relations more often this year than in previous years. It is appreciated that University Relations has made an effort to work together by inquiring about Senate interests. Yet at the same time, University Relations still tends to be disconnected from academic and budget issues on campus. The University Relations Office needs to have more information on the campus budgetary priorities and academic priorities. The Senate will continue to facilitate discussions with the University Relations Office as there has been improvement this year. It is hoped that emphasizing these issues is a goal for the incoming Chancellor. The campus needs to build strong relations with the state government and the campus needs to do a substantial amount of fundraising; which needs to be aligned with the campus academic mission and budgetary needs.

Chair Heit thanked the faculty who served on Senate committees this year. Nominating petitions are available for anyone who would like to run for a position on the Committee on Committees or as an At-Large Member of the Divisional Council. Nominations are due by the end of business tomorrow. Being the Division Chair has been a great experience and has showed me how to appreciate the people we work with. This Divisional Council has been a great team and has been very collegial and likewise the Senate Office has been fantastic.

Vice Chancellor Mary Miller

I was asked to speak about budget and capital and am happy to address questions on any other topic. I know you are all aware of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Office of the President; it is still in effect where UC Merced will receive \$6 million per year for three (3) years beginning in the year that we are in, 2010-2011. This will allow us to have funding for a net of 600 new students per year for three (3) years. This year the State actually provided the \$6 million in enrollment growth. Therefore, the campus has asked UCOP to extend the MOU agreement for another year. UCOP seems amenable to this request and the EVC is working on modifying the MOU to add another year. If the State provides enrollment growth funding for another year, the campus intends to request another extension of the MOU which would provide a guarantee of five (5) years of revenue for UC Merced growth. A pro forma budget has been created. If the campus receives the guarantee from UCOP and continues on track with enrollment, the campus will be able to balance its budget when the student population reaches 7500 which is projected to be in AY2015-2016 or AY2016-2017. Then the campus will not have to worry as much about requesting funding however; the pro forma is still a bare bones budget. With the current economic climate, the campus does not expect to have a budget that enables us to do everything we need. Faculty hires are planned at a rate of approximately seventeen (17) faculty per year; which the campus knows is not enough to attain the ratios we want.

Next year, student fees are increasing by eight percent (8%) in Fall 2011. There is no mention of raising fees more than that. Currently the UC knows it has a \$500 million cut in State funding, none of which is being passed on to UC Merced. UCLA is being cut by approximately \$100 million. President Yudof has said that if the State is unable to extend taxes and the cut is more than \$500 million, then the UC will look at significant additional increases for student fees. Additional fee increases will be problematic for the campus because a high percentage of Merced students are from low-income families and the amount of financial aid needed will rise.

Next year, with a combination of the \$6 million from the State, student fees from additional students and the increase in fees; the campus will have approximately \$13 million to \$14 million in new funding. That is a little less than this year because last year between the Fall and the mid-year increases student fees went up by thirty-two percent (32%) which provided a considerable increase in campus funding.

This year off the top of the additional funding the campus has to pay for seventeen (17) to nineteen (19) new faculty salaries and start-ups, additional lecturers to accommodate the increase in students, the university portion of the retirement increase at seven percent (7%) up from four percent (4%) last year, increases in benefits, mandatory salary

increases for faculty and all represented employees, perhaps an increase for unrepresented employees (it has been four (4) years since they have had an increase), support of research centers, Office of Technology Transfer charges from UCOP because the campus has not yet realized any royalties for technology transfer increases (although royalties are expected next year) however the legal fees are increasing in order to set the infrastructure, General Counsel charges costs to the campuses, start-up costs for a new Chancellor, traffic mitigation to improve roads in the community, new Dean in the School of Natural Sciences, graduate student financial aid. The Social Sciences and Management (SSM) building is opening this summer and for the foreseeable future the campus will have no new funding for operations and maintenance of plant for new facilities. The funding from the State stopped in AY 2010-2011. Funding for utilities, custodial services, other maintenance costs associated with any new buildings will have to come from the existing campus budget. All of the above expenses must be taken care of before any departmental requests for new funds such as staffing or new non-academic programs are considered.

Budgets will be confirmed prior to July 1, 2011. Budget presentations will be in mid-April and decisions will be made in May based on the agreed funding with UCOP.

Capital and space continues to be the biggest issue for the campus. The Social Sciences and Management (SSM) building will open in the fall. There is an issue with the building funding as all of it is dependence on the State's sale of bonds and the State is not selling bonds. If State bonds are not sold, UCOP has agreed to try to sell bonds using the UC bonding capacity which is better than the State's. Some of the campus' capital projects are at the very top of the systemwide priority list. Approximately \$4 million is needed to furnish the SSM building. The campus has an agreement with Steelecase to begin ordering furniture even though purchase orders cannot be issued until July 1, 2011 because of fiscal year restrictions. This will help ensure delivery dates in August prior to the Fall semester. If Steelecase is the only company the campus can make special arrangements with then the following will be open in the Fall: the sixty (60) seat classroom, two (2) class labs, one (1) seminar/video-conference room, forty-one (41) faculty offices, furnishings in the scholarly activity spaces. Areas that may not open in the fall include: the faculty labs, the audio-visual fit-outs in the conference rooms, three (3) computer labs, computers for the computer labs and the second seminar/video-conference room.

The Science and Engineering II building is on track to open in 2014. The process used for furnishing SE II will be similar to the one for the SSM building, UCOP will sell bonds if it has to. It is essential that S&E II open in 2014.

The Classroom and Academic Office Building (CAOB) is problematic. About one year ago the UCOP Finance Office found \$20 million and suggested the campus use the funds to build a classroom and office building. The UCOP Budget Office stated the campus should not use money to build something that the State is supposed to fund, save the \$20 million for something else, and ask for a \$40 million building funded by the State. The plan for the \$20 million building included a modular unit that could be erected quickly. The plan for the \$40 million building was for a permanent structure. The \$40 million was not included in the State budget; which was part of the bonds that were supposed to be sold in fall 2010 and spring 2011 but were not sold. The latest approach to constructing

the CAOB includes using the system fund for a \$20 million modular building that can be built quickly. The campus would continue to lobby the State for the \$40 million building. It is still undecided how the campus will proceed. If the campus builds the smaller building, it will include classrooms and some tutoring space.

CAPRA Chair Shawn Kantor reported that recently at UCPB it has been expressed that the \$40 million request will be back in the queue after the May Budget Revise.

Systemwide CAOB is a very high priority but is just delayed. VC Miller responded that the original desire was to open the \$20 million building in fall 2013 as a “surge” building with continual use while other buildings come on line. Because of the \$40 million building size, it will take longer to construct with an opening date pushed back from 2014 to 2015. The VC has been working with the campus architect and Physical Planning, Design and Construction to expedite construction once the funding is available.

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons

Chair Heit invited me to talk to you about issues discussed at the Assembly meeting yesterday. But first regarding rumors of closing campuses or changing some to liberal arts institutions, at his cabinet meeting President Yudof used one word to describe the rumors, “nonsense”. President Yudof is highly supportive of the Merced campus. Regarding the Chancellor’s search, the group of candidates interviewed was highly enthusiastic about the future of Merced. Evan Heit did a fabulous job chairing the faculty steering committee and produced superb candidates for interviews.

The State budget news is not good. The Governor is visiting districts in California, particularly Republican districts, to discuss his hopes for tax extensions and the damage of the so called “all cuts” budget where the full \$24 billion problem would be solved by budget cuts only. The Democratic caucus in the Assembly says they will not approve additional cuts and the Senate is discussing more cuts. The minority party’s stance is to not approve tax extensions. This creates a stalemate situation that will likely last quite a while. The next discussions will be about the May Revise of the budget and subsequent negotiations. Part of the budget has been passed and the bill and trailer bills are awaiting the Governor’s signature. President Yudof is talking about a five year plan for stability based on the fluctuations of State funding for the University. As VC Miller pointed out, the University is moving toward an 8% increase in fees for next year. The five year scenario starts with a \$2.5 billion base budget as proposed by the State and contemplates State funding increases of 8% per year for the next five years, which will start in 2012-2013. President Yudof has stated that the campuses have done well dealing with the \$500 million cut in AY 2011-2012. The President is looking to the 8% increase in State funds in conjunction with the 8% student fee increase to solve a \$1.5 billion shortfall in the University’s budget over five years, which contemplates a lot of internal savings. If the State support drops below this model, the President has said the only solution is to raise fees and possibly move up the five year plan to begin in 2011-2012. There has been a change in rhetoric where the President is starting with this five year plan but UCOP also has a table that projects what is needed with less State support. This table is available on the systemwide Academic Senate website. There is a recognition that as State support decreases the only alternative is to increase student fees. There is talk about changing the financial aid model to possibly expand the Blue and Gold plan to help those in the \$90k-\$120k family income range. This will be based on the Federal need assessment.

UCOP will present additional plans for funding options at the next Regents meeting. Reducing enrollment seems off the table. In the work that the Senate is doing, Merced is in a different situation than all other campuses. The steps that the University takes to solve its problem will have to be independent of goals for UC Merced. Overall strategy can't be built around building and protecting UC Merced and the campus' budgetary issues are those of UCOP rather than issues of how UCOP allocates state money amongst the other campuses. UCOP is reducing its budget by approximately \$80 million and shifting funds back to the campuses as relief from the \$500 million cut. \$30 million comes from reductions in programs funded by the State through UCOP. AIDS research will be eliminated, a \$10 million item. Yet overall there is \$270 million in the university in research. The \$10 million goes back to the early 80's when nobody was funding this research and it was important for the University to take a lead in AIDS research. However, the \$10 million doesn't influence the direction of research programs. California Labor Institutes will also be reduced. There is \$50 million in the funding streams. Funding streams is a new paradigm for operating the office of the President. UCOP will determine its budget and central funds, approximately \$500 million; the campuses will be taxed on an amount necessary to fund the office. The campuses will have a transparent budget from the Office of the President and will be taxed between 1.4% and 1.6% of the campus operating expenses to fund the budget. UC Merced's \$6 million is part of the funding streams money that will be retained by UCOP and given to the campuses from a general pot. \$50 million will be cut out of funding streams money, most of which is academic affairs and some are for efficiencies and an 8% reduction in UCOP operations.

Rebenching is a discussion about resourcing and/or reallocating all of the State money that flows through UCOP to the campuses. In referring to the Choices report put out last year by UCPB, there is a wide variation on a per student basis on how much money goes to each campus, which is historic. The Senate has an implementation task force based on a report written by some of the faculty involved in the Commission on the Future. They are focusing on reallocation based on undergraduate enrollment.

A member of the Senate asked: based on conversations about the budget, is the idea of differential fees by campus absolutely off the table for discussion?

Chair Simmons responded: Differential fees are on and off the table. At the last Regents meeting, UC Berkeley Chancellor Birgeneau stated they need absolute flexibility in fees, salaries and enrollment. Chancellor Drake from UC Irvine and Chancellor Blumenthal from UC Santa Cruz did not mention this. The Chair of the Board of Regents is opposed to differential fees, and President Yudof is not in favor of the idea but doesn't say it is impossible. The President has said the University should set one fee level and allow the campuses to vary by discounting fees.

Another member of the Senate asked: Is the administration aware that by increasing fees they are jeopardizing the diversity of the University of California especially when it comes to low income families which tend to be minorities?

Chair Simmons responded: The administration is very sensitive to this problem. But when the University raises fees the University covers low income families. However, there is still a sticker shock.

A second Senate member stated: You bring up an important point. The University tries to accommodate the increase in cost but there will be an increase in loans. What will we do for our campus when we are absorbing the largest percentage of low income first generation students? 56% of applicants this year are first generation low income. This is who is coming to this campus today. If that is eliminated as the campus is still maturing and becoming more popular it could have challenges for the campus.

Chair Simmons responded: There are three real priorities at the University of California: access, affordability and quality. We are keeping access in terms of numbers because we are addicted to fees. Affordability; if the State wakes up to the need to provide low cost public higher education it can be fixed even if the University is at a high fee model today. If people and the State want low fee education, it is a switch that can be turned on. However, if the University loses the quality in the faculty because of decisions that we are making in the next year or two, we will never get it back. The priority of the Senate needs to be to maintain the research excellence of the University of California across the system at all campuses. The goal has to remain nine AAU campuses in the University. We cannot do anything that jeopardizes the excellence at UC Berkeley, UCLA and UC San Diego. The only way we may be able to protect that for a period of time is high fees until the State realizes the absolute critical need to fund access.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

The December 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

IV. APPROVAL OF UC MERCED REGULATIONS

CRE Chair Van Dyke is removing this item from the agenda. The committees are not done reviewing the Regulations. This topic will be discussed next fall.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A) Support for Success of Untenured Faculty- UGC Chair Amussen

There is a memo in your packet from the Divisional Council to the Provost that was led by Susan Amussen.

This year the issue of support for untenured faculty came up repeatedly in conversations between DivCo and the EVC and the Chancellor and the Senate Administration Council. There is concern that the campus does everything possible to make sure untenured faculty have the opportunity to do the work that will give them tenure. As you know, approximately 80% of tenure candidates receive tenure across the system. During candidate interviews the campus states we hire to tenure, our expectation is for the candidate to reach tenure. There are two kinds of support that the campus has reviewed and is developing: those within Schools and Bylaw Units and those on a campus-wide basis.

Mentoring support: The campus is looking at different kinds of support as each individual will need different support such as professional development or teacher/scholar development. Part of the consideration is the importance of making it possible for faculty to have a mentor that is not making judgments about their tenure. If a new faculty member needs to discuss a difficult situation, they would not be talking to someone voting on their tenure. The only minimal cost will be to provide support from a mentor that is off campus from somewhere else in the system. Natural Sciences has a

mentor policy and the Senate hopes SSHA and SOE will develop one in the next year as a way of helping junior colleagues grow into their role as faculty members.

A member stated that SSHA used to have a mentoring program approximately four or five years ago.

Communication: Other campus AP websites have a one-page guide to the whole Academic Personnel Process to help faculty understand policy. Currently the APM and the MAPP are not exactly self-explanatory. The Senate is also recommending Academic Personnel provide a central source of information and an area for advice, especially for families.

Paid leave for junior faculty: The final recommendation is to fund junior faculty research leave, preferably in the fourth year rather than the fifth year. The Senate believes the campus can raise money for this purpose which may initially be competitive. There are universities that guarantee junior faculty a year of leave in their fourth year. UC Merced cannot guarantee a year, but leave for a semester would be an important contribution to the success of untenured faculty. Some of this can be done through flexible teaching schedules however this kind of leave should also be formal.

UGC Chair Amussen invited the audience to share ideas or suggestions.

A Senate member stated: it's great to encourage assistant professors to go on sabbatical on the fourth year. Most faculty have taken their leave during the fifth year right before going up for tenure and it doesn't help you at all. Even if you intend to publish three things, those get published after your tenure review. I encourage you to continue to push for the fourth year. In regard to the phrase "we hire to tenure", I am not sure if this is common to other places. Regardless of the 80% rate of faculty becoming tenured in the UC system, I would not use that phrase for incoming assistant professors. It could get us into trouble. The response: The phrase "hire to tenure" is the way it is usually phrased. The UC hires with the expectation that faculty meet the criteria for tenure. We are not saying we will hire you because we know you will get tenure. UC is not interested in having faculty for a few years only to move somewhere else.

Another Senate member stated: As we have more people retiring perhaps we can consider those people as mentors.

A Senate member stated: The fourth year is great but perhaps there can be an option for third or fourth year. In Political Science and Economics, you may have to wait six to nine months to get a review back for an article that has been submitted. Having the time earlier on the clock is valuable because you can lose a year having an article sit at a journal. In particular, top journals can take a really long time and that is where we want our junior people to be sending their work. I recommend you build in some flexibility. The response: One approach discussed for an early sabbatical is to allow faculty to borrow semester credits toward sabbatical. For example; a faculty member could borrow two semester credits so the fifth year sabbatical can be done in the fourth year. The down side is faculty will still have to pay the credits back.

Chair Heit commented that this topic has been introduced as a discussion item to start a campus conversation. The Senate hopes faculty goes back to their Schools and talks with

their colleagues, Executive Committees and Deans. The Divisional Council will continue to talk about this with the Provost but the Provost doesn't set School policies.

B) Building Merced as a Center for Graduate Education- GRC Chair Chris Kello

GRC is in the midst of reviewing ninety (90) proposals for Graduate Summer Fellowships, as well as thirty (30) to forty (40) applications for other graduate fellowships. For UC Merced to become a Center for Graduate Education the campus needs to support the graduate students that are here. We need more good graduate students and more graduate programs. The short answer is we need more faculty as the ratio of graduate students to faculty is not elastic in the same way that it is for undergraduates. The campus needs to state up front that we need more money for more faculty. In the mean time, given the funding and factoring in the faculty, the best approach is to get more support, more students and more programs.

Graduate Programs: The Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is very supportive of helping Merced build graduate programs. While this is a lot of work, and many of the campus programs are not in a position to move forward for CCGA review, this is not an onerous process. It is not something to be afraid of as CCGA is quite supportive and the campus hopes to see more proposals moving forward. There will likely not be any proposals this coming year since we had three groups last year.

Support for current students: Graduate students are a small group at approximately 5-6% relative to undergraduate students. GRC has received feedback from graduate students. Administratively, graduate students seem to be treated as an exception to the administrative processes since there are so few of them. As the campus grows, this should change. The EVC/Provost has made \$500k per year available for graduate student research and education for the last two years. The rough model used thus far includes approximately half of the funds going directly to graduate programs and divided into need-based measures and numbers of students. That proportion for graduate programs has been for recruiting and covering travel, stipends and various things for students to be distributed by the programs. The other half of the funding is for the Summer Fellowship competition. With one more year of funding and the introduction of a new Chancellor, the current method of distributing funds will be up for discussion. The Graduate Division will hopefully have data on whether the current method of support has been effective. Along these lines, GRC is currently working with the Vice Chancellor for Research and Executive Vice Chancellor to craft a more general funding model for research support on campus. Organized Research Units (ORUs) are helping drive this topic to the top of the list. In consulting with the Administration for a more general funding model, GRC is pushing to keep graduate students needs front and center. It is important that student funding continues while the campus discusses ORUs and individual faculty research programs. To support the graduate students on campus, it takes a lot of work on the part of the faculty. This year GRC is reaching out to help with the current workload and moving forward GRC will need to create better mechanisms to handle the workload rather than take care of business on an ad-hoc basis. The splitting of GRC into two separate committees will help, but there are issues surrounding a split that prevent GRC from splitting now.

A Senate member commented: I am encouraged by the emphasis on graduate education which is long overdue. Yes we need more resources. UC Merced must sustain a campus-wide focus to evolve into a credible research university. How can we help the students become as successful as possible with the budget limitations we have on campus?

Chair Heit responded: When Divisional Council meets with the Communications Office, Communications is told that it can continue to put out press releases that focus on the annual increase in enrollment of undergraduates but that shouldn't be the primary metric by which the campus judges success. The campus needs to focus on our research success and success of graduate groups. The Division has made some progress and will continue to emphasize this point.

Senate Member: In terms of spending the funding that we have we also need better ideas. However, the question is how the campus generates ideas to spend the money as effectively as possible.

GRC Chair Kello responded: GRC has left the distribution of funds up to the individual graduate groups as they are the best judge of how to spend the funding. It is the group's choice to use the funds for a competition or however it sees fit. If the GRC splits into a separate Research Council and Graduate Council, it will facilitate more idea exchange from the groups as GRC is suggesting the Research Council be comprised of the Graduate Group Chairs. This would give the Groups a forum to discuss best practices and exchange ideas.

Chancellor Kang interjected: VCR Traina just sent out a communication soliciting applications for Associate Dean for Graduate Studies.

C) Ad-hoc Committee on Course Evaluations- *Ad-hoc Committee Chair, Nella Van Dyke*

When WASC visited for their Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) they expressed dismay that the three Schools use different course evaluation forms. The committee also asked that the campus evaluate learning outcomes as part of the teaching evaluations. The third WASC driven request is a requirement to evaluate the institution's learning objectives. The ad-hoc committee worked with the three School Curriculum Committees and created a common course evaluation form which is similar to the three forms used by the Schools. The committee also created two optional forms for the Schools to choose from to evaluate the institution's learning objectives through course evaluations.

Each course will not address all of the institution's learning outcomes. The Schools will need to provide instruction for faculty on how to complete the form. Each class will be told to complete the specific questions that pertain to institutional learning outcomes as it relates to the course. It was difficult to create an evaluation that was general, as customizing a form for each individual course would be extremely cumbersome. Therefore, there is one set of questions addressing each of the eight University learning outcomes. These new forms will be used this Spring. If anyone has questions, please contact me after the meeting.

VI. SENATE AWARDS- *Senate Chair Evan Heit*

The Senate Awards are selected by our peers to celebrate faculty successes and teaching, research and service. These awards come with a \$1000 cash award and the recipient's names will be on a perpetual plaque outside the Senate office.

The first award I am pleased to announce is being presented for the first time in recognition of Excellence in Graduate Teaching and Mentoring. I am pleased to announce the winner is Ignacio López-Calvo from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

Recognition of Outstanding Early Career Research is awarded to Ming-Hsuan Yang from the School of Engineering

Recognition of Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and Mentorship is awarded to Sean Malloy from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

Recognition of Research that has had a major impact on the field through a sustained record of contributions is awarded to Will Shadish from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

The Dr. Fred Spiess Award for Distinguished Senate Service is presented to Senate Chair Evan Heit from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

VII. CHAIR, VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE DIVISION FOR 2011-2012

The Bylaws state: *“The Committee on Committees appoints the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Division. The appointments shall be reported for confirmation by the Division at the regular spring meeting of the Division. Unless objection is made and an election called for by a majority vote of those present, the appointments shall stand.”*

This is the first time the campus is going through this process.

CoC Chair Tom Hansford announced the committee appointments.

- Susan Amussen has been appointed as Chair of the Division
- Peggy O’Day has been appointed as Vice Chair of the Division
- Manuel Martin-Rodriguez has been appointed as Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Division

There being no objections, the Committee on Committee appointments stand.

VIII. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)- *Chair Shawn Kantor*

Thank you VC Mary Miller for reviewing the budget information. The campus does not have any new academic planning given the MOU agreement. The MOU dictates the number of positions open. The committee assigned the Schools the job of prioritizing the number of FTE the Provost has allocated to them. CAPRA cross-checked and inquired where needed but for the most part the Schools are doing the hard work. There is no longer a need to argue with the Administration on the point that growth won’t happen with limited space. The current Administration understands the importance for space in terms of growth. The campus is in a budgetary steady state, not a very good state but steady.

Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)- *Vice Chair Tom Harmon*

This is the busy part of the academic year. CAP will be meeting at least three times per month through July with special meetings for appointments as needed.

Committee on Committees (CoC)- Chair Tom Hansford

Senate Chair Heit introduced Tom Hansford and thanked him for stepping in to the role of CoC Chair.

The committee is making good progress on the complete Senate slate for academic year 2011-2012. The committee is encountering some difficulty in identifying people willing to serve in Senate committees. Please encourage your colleagues to say yes, if they hear from us.

Graduate and Research Council (GRC)- Chair Chris Kello

Senate Chair Heit noted that the earlier discussion about graduate education was good information. He acknowledged Chair Kello for his work as the Chair of GRC for the past two years and contributions to the Senate. Chair Heit stated he always hears great things about Chair Kello when he is in Oakland at UCOP.

Systemwide Chair Simmons stated Chair Kello does a very nice job as the Merced representative on the Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs (CCGA).

The Health Science Research Institute (HSRI) has submitted its proposal to GRC. This will be an important review process for HSRI and more generally establishing support for Centers on campus.

Non-Resident Tuition (NRT) and how to fund graduate students is a perennial issue. With the new funding streams model, the Graduate Deans will be discussing a potential for the campus to no longer have to worry about NRTs at least for TAs. This would be wonderful for many programs across the campus. Essentially the campus is charging itself for NRT. With the funding streams model it may be possible for NRT to automatically come with a TAship.

Undergraduate Council (UGC)- Chair Susan Amussen

Senate Chair Heit thanked Chair Amussen for serving as UGC Chair for the past two years.

It was mentioned earlier that the campus had its first program review last year. This year UGC is conducting three reviews with site visits in the next couple of weeks. As part of being a research university, all academic programs will be reviewed over the course of the next six years. Program Review is another place we ask for campus faculty involvement, not just for external committee members. The internal faculty role is important to help each other build strong academic programs. The campus is currently conducting review at the undergraduate level and has simplified the process for the graduate program review. The intent is to coordinate the undergraduate and graduate program reviews whenever possible. Additionally UGC reviews course requests and admissions policies.

Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)- Chair Nella Van Dyke

The CRE has reviewed and commented on several policies this year. Most significantly, the four SSHA Bylaw 55 Units were reviewed and approved. The committee has just completed its first review of the four SNS Bylaw 55 Unit proposals and will be requesting revisions.

CRE will make a few minor changes to the campus Bylaws such as moving the start dates to new committee chairs from the first day of instruction to the first day of the semester.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS

There were no student petitions.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There is no unfinished business.

XI. NEW BUSINESS

Chancellor Kang thanked Chair Evan Heit for his great leadership and all the committee Chairs for their great dedication and hard work. This academic year has been very successful. Congratulations to the incoming Chairs of DivCo. The work between DivCo and the Cabinet has improved and we look forward to continued success for this campus.

Chair Heit thanked Chancellor Kang for attending the meeting and for his contributions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:08pm.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Kymm Carlson