

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
NOVEMBER 14, 2014
MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Friday, November 14, 2014 in Room 232 of the Kolligan Library. Senate Chair Jian-Qiao Sun presiding.

II. Announcements

A. Senate Chair Jian-Qiao Sun

Senate Chair Sun called the meeting to order and welcomed participants and guest.

The first order of business was announcing of Senate items currently under review:

- APM 133 17 g-j Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles; 210- Instructions to Review Committees Which Advise on Actions Concerning Appointees in the Professor and Corresponding Series; 220 18B- Normal Periods of Service & 760 Stopping the Clock for Child Care
- APM 080 Medical Separation and 330 Specialist Series
- Doctoral Student Support
- Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 682 specifying the interval between the filing of advancement to candidacy for a Master's degree and the conferral of the degree
- Open Access Policy extension to all non-Senate members of the University community who author scholarly articles

The next announcement referred to items opined on by the Division:

- The Joint Senate-Administration IT Advisory Council Suspension of Appraisal Form which accompanies the Course Evaluation Form
- Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom Committee split
- General Education Chair Compensation
- Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation Space Principles
- Parking Committee memo from FWDAF to VPF Camfield requesting

Lastly Chair Sun announced issues of importance identified by the Division Council:

- Strategic Planning
- Program Review
- Admissions/Enrollment Management
- General Education
- Faculty Salary Equity and Diversity
- Reprioritization and Management of Space
- Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Student Needs

Chair Sun then welcomed and introduced Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Thomas W. Peterson and thanked him for attending the meeting.

B. Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Thomas W. Peterson

Provost/EVC Peterson thanked Senate Chair Sun, and advised attendees of his planned report on the Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI) and Workforce Planning Survey. Provost/EVC Peterson explained how he held an open forum to discuss the status of SAFI providing a summary of the submitted proposals and analysis' with respect to the campuses current situation (teaching loads, research activities, etc.). The SAFI working group continues to assess the initiative and it plans to provide a one-page descriptor for each of the proposed campus themes. To support the effort, the Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF), Gregg Camfield agreed to help facilitate faculty conversations and provided a memo discussing the goals associated with that dialogue. The campus has been involved in the initiative for fourteen months and there continue to be issues outside of the academic realm in need of academic input. The goal is to provide a draft strategic plan in early 2015 with a focus on academics, facilities, and workforce planning. Members were then invited to ask questions and provide comments.

VPF Camfield added his memo was intended to be a vehicle to stimulate conversations, clarify what has been done to date, present potential elements we are considering, and explain how this culminating moment is a way to clarify for external and internal constituents what we have accomplished.

A faculty member stated the faculty has participated in this initiative for fourteen months and he believes there is enough information already provided to make a decision. He also stated that many have currently participated in two rounds of proposals and if other groups did not participate we should not continue to push to define a theme for those specific groups. The current proposals are good and he believes the campus should move forward with them.

Provost/EVC responded that is a possible position to take but this would be more exclusive than inclusive. The SAFI working group agreed to offer facilitated conversations and he believes we need to provide these forums for the good of the campus. He did not feel it necessary to continue to re-work the themes, but perhaps faculty can help determine if we should continue to engage or move forward with the proposals and themes we already have.

A faculty member supported providing a paragraph or two that explains the themes because there are a large number of faculty who currently do not identify with any of them. She then asked, in terms of facilitated discussions, will decisions be made based on those discussions or the work that has been done to support the proposals? She questioned the possibility the discussions would lead the campus in a different direction.

Provost/EVC Peterson replied the defined areas are based on the submitted proposals so he does not believe the discussions will lead the campus in a different direction.

A SAFI member added that the first round of proposals were narrowly focused. She continued by saying the working group is now working to establish a structure and coordination so we do not have competing faculty hires. The themes and facilitated discussions will help groups determine where they can collaborate.

Chair Sun then addressed Provost/EVC Peterson stating that the Division Council expressed strong sentiments that there is enough information for the working group to make recommendations. He then asked the Provost/EVC if he thought the information is sufficient for the working group to now make decisions?

The Provost/EVC responded he personally believed we could move forward with the information we have. He is, however, seeking input from the majority representation of faculty.

Provost/EVC Peterson then began to discuss the campus Workforce Planning Initiative, whose goal is to address administrative support across the campus. The majority of campuses regards workforce planning implies workforce reduction, so naturally there are some concerns that have been expressed with this effort. On our campus we are not engaging in this exercise to reduce staff, instead we are working to determine how to most efficiently expand staff.

Provost/EVC Peterson continued saying what is clear is that a proportional expansion based on current configurations and current ratios may not be sustainable. If we try to grow without efficiency we may have to hire fewer faculty in order to hire additional staff. At this stage we are reviewing functions. He's met with all of his departments and discussed support structure and administrative activities (travel, purchasing, payroll, etc.). The next step will include Human Resources working with Academic Personnel to discuss the similarities and differences between faculty and administrative hiring and the distinctions that need to remain a part of academic functions. There are, however, activities that will have common elements across the campus.

A faculty member responded the academic units believe that the structure we currently have is not working. We continue to discuss a departmental model that other UC campuses moved away from during the economic downturn. Have we looked at what is happening on other campus?

Provost/EVC Peterson responded in the affirmative, there are academic examples we have examined and one of those models is UC Berkeley. He explained we also have increased flexibility compared to other campuses and they provide valuable academic examples we can reference.

A faculty member expressed structurally for the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts the major concern is that there is no assigned staff at the disposal of the faculty. Staff are responsible to administrators up to the Deans office but there is also an enormous amount of work that is academic faculty directed and there needs to be staff members that are accountable to faculty.

Provost/EVC Peterson answered there are several elements that require personnel evaluations and service orientation and whatever we do needs a service component.

A faculty member informed attendees aligning structures was one of the reasons the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council proposed a new program review system where the same committee reviewing the administrative structure is reviewing the academic goals. She relayed that she personally noticed the administrative structure was not always aligned with the academic goals and believes this new structure will address that concern.

Another faculty member asked Provost/EVC Peterson if he anticipated feedback from the faculty on workforce planning?

Provost/EVC Peterson responded it is a topic that is being discussed, however, he is not aware to what extent the faculty have been engaged. He encourages faculty to speak with their Dean.

III. Consent Calendar:

- A. The May 1, 2014 minutes approved as presented.
- B. The following 2013-2014 Annual Committee Reports were approved as presented:
 - Division Council
 - Committee on Academic Personnel
 - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
 - Faculty, Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom
 - Committee on Rules and Elections
 - Committee on Research
 - Graduate Council

IV. Proposed Division Regulation Changes

The Committee on Rules and Elections Chair Vanderschraaf provided an overview and rationale for the proposed Division Regulation changes. He stated that at the May 1, 2014 Meeting of the Division, the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) presented proposed changes to the Merced Division Regulations. The proposed changes are meant to codify Graduate Council approved policies for graduate education per the recommendation of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). The main proposed substantive changes to existing Regulations include:

- Added distinction between undergraduate/graduate and specified credit toward degree requirements.
- Specification of resolution of incomplete for graduate students.
- Suggested language that P/NP are not counted towards degree requirements.
- Added Section 2. Graduation

After consultation with the standing committees and Office of the Registrar, CRE has finalized the revisions for final consideration.

A faculty member asked what is the rationale for distinguishing between pass or no pass and satisfactory or unsatisfactory?

CRE Chair Vanderschraaf replied a distinction could be that undergraduates are allowed to take classes for a grade of pass or no pass while graduate students are not allowed to request this distinction that must be determined by the instructor.

VPF Camfield added and CRE Chair Vanderschraaf agreed that he understood the difference to be at the undergraduate level you can pass a class with a C or better but at the graduate level you must pass a class with a B or better.

A faculty member then asked are there any discussions occurring in preparation for undergraduate majors restricting pass or no pass options?

CRE Chair Vanderschraaf replied that is up to the discretion of the degree program itself.

Faculty members added that it counts toward the major and is articulated in the syllabus when the course is approved.

CRE Chair Vanderschraaf then announced that a ballot will be issued for approval of the Regulation changes before the end of the semester.

V. General Education (GE)

General Education Subcommittee (GESG) Chair Anne Zanzucchi and Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Elizabeth Whitt provided some historical background on the General Education program GE at UC Merced consists of courses that meet university, campus, and school requirements. Writing 10 for example is a UC requirement and Core 1 is a first year course. Of the 500 GE courses offered, 70% of the GE requirements are fulfilled through twenty –three courses.

VPDUE Whitt report: in AY 2005-2006, the campus established Eight Guiding Principles of General Education that state” UC Merced is planning educational experiences designed to prepare well-educated people of the 21st century for the workplace, for advanced education and for a leadership role within their communities. UC Merced graduates will be exceptionally well prepared to navigate and succeed in a complex world. The principles guiding the design and implementation of our academic program are envisioned within a continuum that ranges from preparatory and advanced curricula in general education and in the majors, through a variety of educational activities inside and outside the classroom.”

The eight guiding principles are:

- Scientific Literacy
- Decision Making
- Communication
- Self and Society

- Ethics and Responsibility
- Leadership and Teamwork
- Aesthetic Understanding and Creativity
- Development of Personal Potential

VPDUE Whitt invited GE Chair Zanzucchi to report on GE program review activities. General Education's program review relates to the institution broadly. The GE program review is similar to traditional academic program reviews of majors and the GE subcommittee is functioning similar to a unit. There are novelties to GE in the sense that it is fairly representative of many different disciplines and everyone is responsible in some way for GE. It has been a major undertaking to determine how to engage the campus in a discussion about GE. In early February an external review team is composed of scholars from another UC, a non-UC campus and from the American Association of Universities and Colleges.

A GE retreat was held in May for the purpose of "engaging faculty and staff in redefining and reimagining UC Merced's General Education program in light of the institution's mission." Attendees were asked "What is the meaning of a baccalaureate degree at UC Merced?" and were encouraged to "identify goals, aims, aspirations, expectations and hallmarks of our baccalaureate graduates in the context of our institutional mission."

GE Chair Zanzucchi invited attendees to ask questions and share comments related to General Education.

A faculty member asked if there has been an opportunity to evaluate Core 1 and whether or not the program will change or remain the same?

GE Chair Zanzucchi responded that GESC conducted a mini study with the Core 1 and WRI 10 leads and based on those responses we have institutional data (enrollment, grades, course evaluations, etc.) for review. Additionally, the subcommittee is working to determine the future of Core 1 including external and internal evaluations to determine what we want all students to experience regardless of their major.

A faculty member asked whether the early philosophy of GE that involved common elements specific to each of the schools was revisited and if it is a direction that we want to continue?

VPDUE Whitt replied that the self-study, the program review, and the Retreat are all on parallel tracks. Therefore, the campus does not have to wait until spring 2015, after the conclusion of the review team site visit, to consider the future of GE while reviewing the past. The GE Subcommittee wanted to capitalize on the current momentum from the program review and the Retreat. Everything at this time can be considered and that is why it is important to have as many stakeholders involved in GE participating in the conversations. Possible outcomes of this review include a revision of the Guiding Principles and name change for GE. Retreat participants also considered GE not as a course but as a set of experiences including undergraduate research.

A faculty member added that he participated in the May GE retreat and witnessed a strong interest on how to make General Education a genuine experience and research was suggested as a way to accomplish this.

UGC Chair Vevea noted that the GE program review could be used as a catalyst to act on the conversations that have been taking place for years.

An attendee commented as we work with our campus populations to clarify general education we also need to bring awareness of program components.

Chair Sun relayed that he is an Engineering Professor and students are taught technical skills like most scientist, but he believes GE is important because it shapes the soul of the student. A solid GE program leads to a successful student capable of dealing with a variety of people. He then asked if there were plans to expand the course offerings?

VPDUE Whitt answered the campus currently offers 500 courses but the students are not choosing to participate in a majority of them.

GE Chair Zanzucchi added we have a lot of potential with GE courses and we are now exploring how they have been defined and if they are connected. We have 23 heavily enrolled courses and we need to provide breadth of experience. How do we logically accomplish that goal?

VPDUE Whitt continued that the campus also needs to determine why students are enrolling in the 23 classes; whether the enrollments are based on what students need or what fits their schedule.

VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) Member Tsoulouhas

Last year CAP membership included two internal and five external members and this year an additional internal member was added to the committee. CAP has deliberated on routine merit cases, mid-career appraisals, and promotion cases. The committee held its bi-annual meeting with faculty on October 23, 2014 and attendees included APO staff, CAP members, the Provost/EVC, AP Chairs, Senate staff, and faculty. CAP answered several questions including evaluation of non-traditional types of research and securing non-traditional funds. CAP is the lead reviewer of proposed APM revisions including one proposed revision that would extend the reasons for stopping the tenure clock. CAP is currently working with the APO and the VPF on a list of frequently asked questions pertaining to the academic review process. Finally, this semester the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) has met once on November 7, 2014.

Member Tsoulouhas thanked Simrin Takhar for her work in supporting the committee.

B. Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) Chair Kelley

CAPRA has been mainly concerned with its role with the FTE allocation process this academic year. The committee has met twice once over the summer and once this semester with Provost/EVC Peterson for updates and deliverables and they met with two SAFI members for input. The committee remains unclear how the SAFI process will move forward and they have discussed ways to provide support. CAPRA also discussed space allocation and while they do not believe it is their role to manage space they do believe they can be helpful by providing general principles. In terms of systemwide, the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) has met twice this semester and they are discussing the new budget plan presented by President Napolitano.

The Provost/EVC responded he welcomed parameters around space allocation from faculty with the understanding that there will be different criteria for different disciplines. He suggest providing space considerations broken down by post doc, graduate student, school, wet lab intensive, dry lab intensive, or no lab intensive space requirements.

Chair Kelley wished to thank Simrin Takhar for her work in supporting the committee.

C. Committee on Committees (CoC) Chair LiWang

CoC has appointed 14 members to committees, subcommittees and working groups. They continue to work to fill several remaining committees most important of which is the need for an external Humanist member on CAP, an additional SOE member for GC, the systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare, the Medical Education Task Force, Information, Privacy and Security committee and faculty facilitators for SAFI discussions.

VPF Camfield asked if CoC has reached out to the Emeritus Society for potential members?

CoC Chair LiWang advised we currently have a list of potential members we are working through in order to seek participation and will consider contacting the Emeritus Society.

Chair LiWang wished to thank Dejeuné Shelton for her work in supporting the committee.

D. Committee on Research (COR) Chair Noelle

COR has opined on a variety of campus and systemwide proposals, for example the committee is in the process of submitting a statement of support for a systemwide initiative to limit non-resident tuition for first year doctoral students. Last year, COR produced a document defining the establishment and periodic review process for Organized Research Units, Centralized Research Units, Core Facilities and Multi-Campus Research Units and the committee is now monitoring the first implementation of these processes focusing on the upcoming review of the Sierra Nevada Research Institute. For the sake of procedural transparency, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development (VC ORED) Sam Traina is working on a document detailing how competitions between proposals for limited submission extramural funding opportunities are resolved. At the request of the VC ORED, this information will be made broadly available to the faculty in the form of a constructive critique of the process by COR. COR has met with representatives from the Research Development Services, the Sponsored Projects Office and Research Accounting Services in order to gather information about on-going efforts to integrate the activities associated with

grant proposal generation, proposal submissions and grant management. Specifically, the committee has been introduced to a new suite of online tools designed to facilitate the intramural funding efforts of both faculty and staff. All of these tools are scheduled to be incrementally deployed starting this spring and COR intends to provide input on their design from a faculty perspective.

Despite recognition of tight resource constraints, COR is continuing to advocate for the establishment of a UCM Academic Senate committee on Library and Scholarly Communications as recommended by last year's ad-hoc Senate-Administration Library Working Group. Currently it is the charge of COR to monitor Library issues but it is clear that supporting research is only part of the library's mission. Library issues involving campus resources should also include guidance provided by the faculty.

COR is monitoring ongoing efforts by the administration to establish internal financial support for faculty research activities. These policies are meant to address the issues surrounding start up funds, availability of emergency or bridge funds, indirect cost return issues and other funds. The committee has met with the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Finance and the Campus Controller and are monitoring the development of these policies and preparing to provide feedback as they form.

Finally, COR is preparing a proposal to expand the Academic Senate Faculty Research Grants Program. The funding for internal research grants has remained constant since the inception of this program despite the growth in faculty numbers. COR is also working on modifications to the research grants program attempting to optimize the impact of the limited funds. At least some of the modifications will appear in the Call for Proposals issued in the spring.

Chair Noelle thanked Simrin Takhar for her work in supporting the committee.

E. Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) Chair Vanderschraaf

CRE opined on several issues including CCGA proposal, membership expansion for the General Education Subcommittee of UGC, and the proposed split of FWDAF. The committee has provided recommendations on mostly procedural questions related to faculty voting. A call for the annual review of school bylaws was issued and will be due by November 17, 2014. The committee is working on a guiding document on Bylaw 55 and will issue a Senate COI policy. This policy will allow the Division to maintain our current model of allowing committees to issue their own COI policies and address the number of request for guideline recommendations. Finally, next term there will be revisions to the Division Bylaws at the Spring Division Meeting and they will work with FWDAF in helping to establish two committees.

Chair Vanderschraaf thanked Mayra Chavez-Franco for her work in supporting the committee.

F. Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom (FWDAF) Vice Chair Tanya Golash-Boza

The Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom Committee set several goals including encouraging diversity in the faculty recruiting process with the hope of proposing revisions to the APM that emphasize the contributions of diversity. Chair Ortiz is working with VPF Camfield to gain an understanding of the extent of which we have an acceptable retention rate and how we compare to other institutions. Members recently completed the Faculty Salary Equity Study working with staff members from Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS) and the report will be submitted in January per UCOP's directive. The committee also opined on CAPRA's Space Principles, and the FWDAF committee split. The committee is working on a parking pass renewal policy based on a request from the Senate Chair and working with the Campus Ombuds to understand various issues that affect faculty on campus. In terms of systemwide the committee opined on APM revisions and at the last systemwide University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) meeting members discussed the Total Remuneration Study.

Vice Chair Golash-Boza thanked Simrin Takhar for her work in supporting the committee.

G. Graduate Council (GC) Chair Hull

The Graduate Council is handling eight CCGA proposals and based on the increased workload made a request to CoC and received two additional members. Chair Hull stressed the need for internal CCGA proposal reviewers and encouraged members to accept an invitation to review if called upon. The Council created a template for Graduate Group Policies and Procedures, mentoring guidelines, and plans to approve minor changes to the Graduate Council Policy on new graduate programs due to revisions to the CCGA policy. The Council is working with the Graduate Division on revisions to the Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook partly in response to minimize request for exceptions, revisions to the policies and procedures for Graduate Concentrations and Designated Emphasis, and a policy on Non-Ladder Rank Faculty Teaching Graduate Courses. They are currently addressing the minimum standard for the English Language Requirements for Graduate Students and are considering developing recommendations for the use of conjoined courses.

The Council reviewed a dozen CRF request for spring approval and are awaiting the new CRF system to come on line. The awards subcommittee reviewed and approved language for various fellowships, approved a new system of rolling deadlines and started reviewing fellowship applications.

Chair Hull welcomed Vice Provost and Graduate Dean Marjorie Zatz and thanked Mayra Chavez-Franco for her work in supporting the committee.

H. Undergraduate Council (UGC) Chair Vevea

UGC set several goals for the year including the General Education Program Review, clarifying guidelines for submissions of courses that will satisfy GE, and expanding dialogue between UGC and the Admissions Office on campus and systemwide admissions policies. In the past, admissions had been handled by a small admissions subcommittee of UGC that met periodically with the Admissions Director. The Council expanded the size of the

subcommittee and plans to invite Admissions representatives to participate in UGC meetings to provide additional details.

Members are working on revisions to Undergraduate Policies and one relates to the language on the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) that was placed in the catalog without UGC review. Members are considering the implications of the language and will provide their findings in time for the catalog deadline. A UGC subcommittee is working on developing a clearer process for grade appeals and the policy subcommittee is addressing ways to clarify the process for the submittal of CRFs. There are also plans to develop more definitive guidelines and a checklist that clarify the roles of responsible parties and expectations.

The Council has opined on several items and received opinions from other committees on the Community Research and Service Minor. Similarly, UGC is also reviewing the School of Natural Sciences Honors Proposal. The Spanish Minor review is underway and the Computer Science and Engineering Major program review was closed. The latter will now enter the program response phase.

The committees that correspond to UGC at the systemwide level include BOARS (Board of Admissions and Relations w/Schools) Committee and UCEP (University Committee on Educational Policy). One of BOARS's main discussion item is a change of the 9/9 eligibility rule to 7/7. The change could result in unfortunate consequences in the diversity of the eligibility pool. UCEP discussed a hybrid program where students completed three years at UCSC and an additional two years at Hastings. Members realized that UCEP does not have a formal mechanism for opining on these types of courses and to address the need, the committee is drafting a memo seeking clarification. Additionally, UCEP was asked to approve a systemwide course for field work in the UC Natural Research System and approved it on an interim basis with a request for the course to go through the proper procedures for receiving certification. UCEP acted on a proposal to separate the UCLA Herb Alpert School of Arts and planned to address the meaning of a UC degree until it was asked by the President to postpone a formal statement. Additionally, UCEP has spent a great deal of time discussing financing undergraduate students by admitting international students that pay a much higher tuition.

Finally, the Academic Integrity Task Force, which includes UGC representatives, will convene soon to discuss and work on revisions to the academic integrity policy.

Chair Vevea thanked Fatima Paul for her work in supporting the committee.

V. Petitions of Students-None

VI. Unfinished Business-None

VII. New Business-None

Chair Sun closed the meeting by addressing the increased workload of the Senate office and the need for additional resources. He thanked the hard work of the staff and for their patience.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Attest: Jian-Qiao Sun, Senate Chair