

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION  
APRIL 22, 2010  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, April 22, 2010 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presiding. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

***Senate Chair Martha Conklin***

The Senate Chair thanked the faculty members for their service on Senate committees, thanked systemwide Senate Chair Henry "Harry" Powell and systemwide Vice Chair Dan Simmons for attending, introduced the new Senate Director Susan Sims, thanked Senate Analysts Fatima Paul and Simrin Takhar for their work, and announced that Senate Vice Chair Heit will be next year's Senate Chair. Chair Conklin then reported on the following topics:

A. 2010-2011 Budget. UC President Yudof announced he is terminating the furloughs in August 2010. Any budget shortfalls will be distributed to the individual campuses. UCM has been shielded up to this point but the same cannot be promised for AY 2010-2011.

B. UC Retirement Program (UCRP). Chair Powell announced that the UCRP task force will provide information in late June 2010, and then a proposal will be presented to the Senate. Chair Conklin encouraged faculty to respond to any surveys or requests for information that may be distributed this summer. Academic Council has been asked to be available for a possible teleconference meeting on the UCRP in August.

C. UCM funding. The Senate and Administration have been in negotiations with OP for a more feasible funding model for the campus for the next three years. OP proposed giving UCM \$6 million next year for student growth, \$12 million the year after, and \$18 million in the third year. OP initially offered to provide UCM with \$20 million for a new academic building. They later suggested that we wait one year and they work with the State to provide \$40 million to construct a bigger, more permanent building. Funding for the larger building depends on whether the State will issue lease revenue bonds. The new building will contain classrooms (90-100 seats), faculty and staff offices, and research/graduate student space.

D. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with OP. UCM is working on this document that will be an agreement between UCM and OP on how we are going to grow over the next three years in terms of faculty hiring, space, and types of majors. The MOU deadline is May 15, 2010. The Senate is working with the Administration on budget projections. Our ladder rank faculty-to-student ratio is 1: 30, which is among the highest in the system and that is a major concern for the Senate. Chair Conklin announced she will not sign the MOU without a faculty vote. In the next month, information will be distributed to Senate members and she encouraged faculty to review it.

E. UC Commission on the Future/Gould Commission. Preliminary recommendations have been released about how the UC should grow. Each Division has been requested to

provide comments on each of the recommendations. Response templates have been distributed to each Senate standing committee as well as the Schools. Chair Conklin encouraged faculty to read the recommendations and respond with comments.

F. Program Review. UCM initiated its first ever program review (Applied Math) this year. The Senate and Administration created the Senate Administrative Committee on Assessment (SACA) co-chaired by Senate Vice Chair Heit and Dean of Natural Sciences, Maria Pallavicini. SACA evaluates what resources are needed for the assessment process. SACA is working on a set of recommendations to be finalized by May 15, 2010. These recommendations will be placed in the budget request to EVC/Provost Alley for next year. The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) is also due this summer.

G. Miscellaneous. The Senate is revising the UCM Bylaws (Committee on Rules and Elections Chair Peggy O'Day will discuss this later in the meeting), working to launch the new Senate website this summer, and is continuing to engage in shared governance. Chair Conklin announced that she looks forward to the Budget Committee meeting next week and hopes that budget transparency will continue to improve. The Senate was informed by the Administration that the tracking of research grant expenditures will be a high priority next year. The Senate also plans to continue its process of formal consultation with the EVC/Provost on all issues via memos.

#### ***EVC/Provost Keith Alley***

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

A. School of Engineering Dean Search. Preliminary review of candidates took place in San Francisco last week. Four candidates will visit the campus within the next two weeks.

B. WASC Accreditation. The EER is underway and is due to WASC on December 14, 2010. The WASC site team will visit the campus the second week of March 2011. UCM did very well on the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR). We will keep pursuing the idea of fast track despite WASC's original rejection of the suggestion.

C. Admissions for AY 2010-2011. We will have approximately 800 new students, which is 200 over where we were this time last year. Graduate admissions are down, which is a concern. This year, the Chancellor and I allocated \$500,000 for graduate student funding and the funding will continue for the next three years. GRC was given jurisdiction over the distribution of the funds.

D. S&E 2. It will become Engineering 1 with the exception of spaces for organic chemistry. The Bioengineering space in S&E 1 will remain there. The architects reported that the design meetings last week went well. A planning meeting with the faculty will be held in May. A discussion followed about whether the decision to devote the new building to Engineering was widely discussed amongst the Natural Sciences faculty. There was concern over the lack of communication to faculty.

E. MOU. The Budget Office is working with the data needed to do the proper modeling for the MOU. The first piece was student enrollment data. We will have 600 new students per year for the next three years and we have to model different growth scenarios for the following three years. We have to model 1) continued growth at 600, 2) growth at 300, and 3) no growth. We are modeling through to the year 2020.

#### ***Systemwide Senate Chair Harry Powell***

The Systemwide Senate Chair reported on the following topics:

A. Vice Chair Simmons and I are here because we are holding meetings with each of the UC campuses on post-employment benefits (PEB). We held a faculty open forum earlier today. We anticipate presenting PEB for formal review this summer.

B. UC Commission on the Future/Gould Commission. The Commission has released its first set of recommendations. An additional set will be released in the summer. Important issues include online education and three-year degrees. A controversial group of proposals on indirect costs is forthcoming. The proposals seek to ensure that every dollar in grant funding is matched by an NIH-equivalent rate in indirect costs. Humanities, social sciences, and health sciences disciplines dislike the proposals because their patterns of funding do not fit the NIH model.

C. UC Advocacy. During the current academic year, UC has been involved in chairing the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS includes the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC. Vice Chair Simmons and I will be in Sacramento next week for UC Legislative Day. April 27<sup>th</sup> is the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Master Plan and we will use the anniversary to emphasize the importance of protecting public higher education.

### **III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

A. Draft Minutes of the December 3, 2009 meeting

**ACTION:** Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

### **IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

#### ***CAPRA – Chair Mike Colvin***

This has been an unusual year in that the committee has devoted a lot of time to commenting on systemwide proposals due to the array of budget issues. We have made UCM's voice heard at OP about many crucial issues. CAPRA is currently reviewing the Schools' strategic plans. Now that the campus is bigger, CAPRA is pushing much of the decision-making to the Schools (CAPRA used to decide what kind of faculty to hire.). Schools now develop three-year plans that CAPRA reviews in consultation with EVC/Provost Alley. Feedback from CAPRA to Alley on the strategic plans will be sent in a few weeks and then to the Schools shortly thereafter.

#### ***CAP – Committee member Jan Wallander***

CAP continues to meet a few times a month. Many personnel cases were delayed this year so CAP has received a heavy workload this spring that will last until summer. There are four external and six internal CAP members. CAP appreciates the service and contributions of the external members as their broad range of experience has proved very useful to the committee. The Chair, Joseph Cerny (UCB), is instrumental. As usual, an Annual Report will be released at the end of the academic year that details the number of cases CAP deliberated on and other metrics such as the extent to which CAP's decisions matched those of the EVC/Provost.

#### ***CoC – Chair Carlos Coimbra***

The committee's main function is to populate the slate of Senate committees. For the next academic year, the leadership positions of the standing committees are filled but we are still filling the positions of the regular members. Due to the scarcity of faculty, we have to recruit

more Assistant Professors than we would like. We try to shield un-tenured faculty from excessive service as much as we can. CoC has received nominations for the elected positions on CoC and DivCo At-Large members. These nominees will be placed on the ballot for the spring election. Due to the large workload at the campus level, CoC is attempting to find faculty to fill the positions on only those systemwide committees that are essential for UCM.

***GRC – Chair Chris Kello***

At this time, GRC has reviewed and approved two graduate proposals: Quantitative and Systems Biology (QSB) and Cognitive and Information Sciences (CIS). Both proposals were submitted to CCGA. GRC completed, in conjunction with CAPRA, the first round of review for two ORU proposals -- Merced Energy Research Institute (MERI) and Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI). Also in conjunction with CAPRA, GRC is reviewing two CRU proposals -- Center for Autonomous and Interactive Systems (CAIS) and Spatial Analysis and Research Center (SpARC). GRC also reviewed 43 faculty research grants and awarded just over half. Many of them are eligible for the Chancellor's Awards and are being reviewed by EVC/Provost Alley and the Chancellor. EVC/Provost Alley made available \$500,000 for graduate student support. In order for the money to have an impact this year, GRC decided to apportion half the funds directly to the nine graduate groups/emphasis areas relative to the number of currently enrolled PhD students in each program. Any unspent funds roll over into the next fiscal year. The other half of the funds was devoted to a new, graduate student summer fellowship competition for conference travel or summer stipend. GRC received 77 applications and is currently reviewing them. Graduate offers and admissions are down this year. Before the semester is over, GRC and VCR Sam Traina, who established a graduate education task force, will gather information to see what can be improved for next year.

***UGC – Chair Susan Amussen***

In addition to the usual workload of reviewing and approving courses, programs, and minors, UGC has spent a great deal of time on the recommendations from the UC Commission on the Future/Gould Commission, especially the question of what constitutes UC quality and education. UGC will submit its suggestions to OP. UGC has also opined on online education, particularly the way many of our students would be disadvantaged by this method of delivery. Another major item UGC is working on is UCM's first program review, Applied Math. UGC is setting up the site visit in the next few weeks, and then the committee will re-review our program review procedures and simplify them for the process next year.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEM – PROPOSED REVISIONS TO UCM BYLAWS – CRE Chair Peggy O'Day**

CRE Chair O'Day provided the rationale and background of the process to revise the Bylaws. UCM's Bylaws were written by the UCM task force in AY 2003-04 prior to the arrival of most faculty; the adopted Bylaws were intentionally sparse in order to allow UCM faculty the opportunity to shape the character of their Academic Senate. Although a few amendments have been made to the Bylaws in the intervening years, there are major gaps in the descriptions of the powers, duties, responsibilities, and functions of Senate officers and standing committees. These gaps have resulted in confusion and conflicts regarding Senate authority over academic matters and ambiguity in procedures. Fuller descriptions of the powers, duties, and authority of Senate

standing committees were needed to clarify committee responsibilities and jurisdiction over various Senate and Faculty matters. Several procedural issues required modification or clarification in order to comply with UC Academic Senate Bylaws. Language needed to be clarified and enumeration of Bylaw clauses needed improvement.

The CRE decided that wholesale review and revision of the Bylaws were warranted as the most expedient way to make a consistent set of comprehensive changes. During AY 2008-2009, the CRE solicited input from all Senate standing committees for potential changes to the Bylaws and for comments on existing committee duties, powers, and functions. It also reviewed Bylaws from all other UC campuses to identify important differences and items missing from the UCM current Bylaws. Dan Simmons, CRE member during AY 2008-2009 from UC Davis, provided a set of draft Bylaw revisions in August 2009. CRE reviewed, discussed, and revised the proposed changes, taking into account comments from the Senate standing committees and the Bylaws of the other campuses.

In AY 2009-2010, CRE consulted with the Senate standing committees on its proposed revisions to the Bylaws. CRE submitted the revised Bylaws to University Counsel to ensure the Bylaws were in compliance with systemwide rules. CRE made further revisions based on committees' feedback. CRE then conducted a poll -- accompanied by an explanatory memo to the Schools -- on UCMCROPS to obtain comments from all Senate members. (A summary of all proposed changes, results of the poll, faculty comments from the poll, comments from Senate standing committees, and background material are posted on UCMCROPS.) Input received from faculty was very helpful to CRE, but CRE ultimately decided which to accept and which to reject. CRE's decision and rationale is summarized in the last memo that was distributed to the faculty along with a copy of the proposed revised Bylaws.

CRE Chair O'Day clarified that there will be no vote on the Bylaws at this meeting. A vote of Senate members will be conducted in the spring election on the same ballot as the CoC and DivCo At-Large member nominees. The ballot will be distributed to Senate members tomorrow and is due on May 7. Passage requires a 2/3 approval of those Senate members voting. If the Bylaws are approved, they will be submitted to the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (UCR&J) for review. UCR&J will decide if our revised Bylaws affect anything at the systemwide level. If not, our revised Bylaws will be placed on the Academic Council agenda for approval in fall 2010. If Council approves, the implementation date for the new Bylaws will be January 1, 2011.

A discussion then followed between faculty members and Chair O'Day about several major proposed Bylaw revisions. Controversial issues included the proposed revision that the Vice Chairs of GRC and UGC serve on CAPRA instead of the Chairs. There was also discussion about deleting the proposal that the Vice-Provost for Academic Planning be appointed to CAPRA as an *ex officio* member. A faculty member suggested a clarification of the provision of not having Administration Senate members serve as Senate committee representatives.

**ACTION:** Based on the feedback received at this meeting, CRE Chair O'Day will make final revisions to the Bylaws and distribute to all Senate members along with an explanatory memo. Senate members will receive the revised Bylaws and memo in advance of the election.

**VI. UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW) – UCM**  
***Representative Sean Malloy***

Most of UCFW's work is related to the PEB taskforce. The unfunded liabilities associated with UCRP have potentially catastrophic consequences for the survival of the UC system. There is a sense of urgency to begin fixing the problem. Professor Malloy urged faculty to pay close attention over the next few months to any information associated with UCRP and to direct any questions or comments to him. Malloy also asked faculty to spread the word among their colleagues, especially the junior ones as many of the changes that UCFW is debating now will affect junior faculty in the future. Malloy concluded his comments by pointing out that UCFW also opines on issues such as child care, housing, and salaries.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Attest:

Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:  
Simrin Takhar