

**Undergraduate Council
Minutes of Meeting
Wednesday, October 9, 2013**

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council (UGC) met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, October 9, 2013 in the Willow Room, Chair Jay Sharping presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Sharping welcomed members and guests and reported on the following:

- Visit by President Napolitano took place last week. The President seemed tuned in right away to the campus' challenges and handled the questions with tact.
- The GenEd committee convened on 9/23 to discuss the General Education program review scheduled for AY13-14. This year, UGC and the Merced Senate will need to ponder on GenEd program review at a higher level. The approach will be different from reviews of standard programs that are driven by disciplines. A lot of work has been done on campus to first create a GenEd model that was compelling and then to sustain it. It is difficult for us to sustain our GenEd structure partially because the motivation for it has been lost as the campus grew. We will redefine and clarify what we hope to accomplish and get some external input on how to accomplish it.
- DivCo convened yesterday. Discussion items included:
 - The CCGA process for review of PhD proposals.
 - Senate Administration Council on Assessment and Planning Revised Charge and Membership – UGC chair reiterated that it would be useful to have a balanced representation from faculty and administration.
 - November 19 Meeting of the Division – Chair encouraged members to send discussion topics to the Senate Chair.
 - The Administration sent a copy of the draft MOU to DivCo. The MOU will be sent to UGC when appropriate.

III. Consent Calendar

The agenda was approved as presented.

IV. Systemwide Committee Reports

A. BOARS – Vice Chair Vevea

The meeting was very interesting. BOARS Chair Johnson reported on the main task ahead for the committee, which is to identify major issues this year, specifically:

- Revisiting transfer issues. SB 1440. Background: In September of 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law two pieces of legislation on the California Community College (CCC) transfer function in California: Senate Bill 1440 (Padilla) and Assembly Bill 2302 (Fong). The first bill applied to California State University (CSU) and the second bill requested UC to design a similar path. Together they signal

a strong interest by the state in using major-based associate's degrees as a means to simplify the transfer process in California.

Senate Bill 1440 requires CSU and CCC to develop Associates Degrees for Transfer guaranteeing junior status at CSU. The numbers of applications from Community Colleges have decreased and this is politically charged because the State sees the transfer path to UC as a very important pathway. The UC system has been under some pressure to have a similar guaranteed path and is probably losing students to the CSUs. The State wants us to have a transfer route into the UC system and questions why UC has not implemented a similar guarantee. There is an expectation that there will be legislation this year that will put some pressure on us.

- Referral Pool – Referral is an administrative process by which UC-eligible California applicants who are not selected at any of the campuses where they apply are offered admission to an alternate campus. This process represents an implementation of the University's commitment to provide all eligible California freshman and transfer applicants the opportunity to enroll on a UC campus. Referral occurs in the fall term only and Merced is the last campus that is still taking students from the referral pool. BOARS discussed whether Merced will no longer be able to offer guaranteed referral admission. There were 10,000 students in the referral pool in 2013, 836 students opted-in to consider admission to UCM and only 188 SIREd in the referral pool last year. In [Regents policy 2103](#) there is a disclaimer that makes the whole prospect of guaranteed admission to UC contingent on availability of space so we may be backing off from that guaranteed eligibility. This will be a very difficult task politically. The Governor has made it very clear that we can expect no more funding increases from the State.
- There was some extensive discussion of the ELC-only pathway to admission to the UCs. UC bases ELC eligibility on GPA only and some are concerned that some students in the ELC-only pool are not well prepared to succeed at UC. Students who are eligible based on the index are eligible in the local context. If we focus on the student population who are ELC eligible and not eligible based on the index, those students' high school GPA has no relationship to their performance in the UC system, whereas their test scores are very good predictors. This presents a dilemma because it implies that for ELC-only students, we should probably be looking more closely at the test scores rather than GPA. This is intellectually conflicting with the idea of holistic review.
- BOARS discussed changes in the UC student success as a result of the new admissions policies. BOARS reviewed 2010-2012 GPA data that showed students' success admitted in 2012 compared to students admitted in 2010 and 2011, prior to the implementation of the new admission policies. Students who entered as freshman in 2012 had a higher overall GPA than those in 2010 and 2011. The changes in policies do seem to be accomplishing some of their purpose.
- BOARS also discussed the "compare favorably" [policy](#) under which non-residents admitted to a campus must compare favorably to the CA residents who were admitted to that campus. Most of the UCs are meeting the standards and UCM's data

looks very good. Campuses will soon be receiving a request for an analysis of 2013 outcomes.

- Discussion of implementation of new transfer policies that UCM will need to address. The new transfer admissions policy approved by the Senate in June 2012 will take effect in fall 2014. BOARS Chair requested some reports from the UCs Directors of Admissions on the progress made to implement the policy.
- There was also some discussion on the authority of CUARS (Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools) which is a committee that exists at the other UCs. The Merced equivalent would be the UGC Admissions Subcommittee. The Senate faculty should have authority to make academic decisions and strongly advise on admissions policies. This hasn't been particularly functioning.
- There was some discussion of President Napolitano's visit to the campuses. Napolitano stated that she remains committed to UCM and expects to continue commitment to the MOU.
- Systemwide Chair Jacob reported on and stressed the importance of reading the new [health plans](#), which were recently released.

B. UCEP – Chair Sharping

- SR760 – Discussion of [SR 760](#) which states “The value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent. “ UCM's current [credit hour policy](#) is modeled after UCB. For accreditation purposes, WASC required us to be more transparent with credit hour and student workload during the development phase of online education so UGC drafted a credit hour policy in 2011-2012. Last year, UCEP asked campuses if the committee should propose a systemwide definition or if campuses should develop their own definitions. Given the differences across the various Divisions, decisions should be made at the campus level. Furthermore, WASC reviews campuses individually, not the UC system as a whole.
- Definitions of systemwide and intercampus courses (courses that are offered on multiple campuses). This is related to online education and how credit will be assigned on multiple campuses for an online course created by a campus other than the home campus. It seems that UCEP doesn't want to re-approve courses that are operating on multiple campuses, particularly when those courses had already been approved by the campus' relevant Senate committees. We will need to define what those courses are. UCDC courses are courses created by UC faculty but not necessarily by Senate divisions. Those courses will need to be reviewed for systemwide consistency and there are courses that are offered on multiple campuses (intercampus courses). Per definition, intercampus courses are courses that are approved by the divisions that offer the courses.
- The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative ([ILTI](#)) RFP 2 is open until November 17, 2013.

V. Report from the CRFs Subcommittee

A question was raised about having adequate resources and TAs support for classes with enrollments of 300 (mostly in SSHA). A SSHA staff member stated that the 300 enrollment is only a projection but not the actual enrollment for those courses. SSHA has a formula for assigning TAs to classes, but no policy.

UGC reviewed the SOE and SSHA CRFs and made the following recommendations:

Engineering:

[BIOE 113: Bioinstrumentation](#) – approved contingent on the addition of PHYS 009H as a pre-requisite to avoid holds on qualified students trying to enroll (Completed).

Approved as presented:

Engineering:

[CSE 135: Introduction to Theory of Computation](#)

[ME 144: Introduction to Multi-body Dynamics](#) (conjoined with ME 244)

[CSE 177: Database Systems Implementation](#) (cross-listed with EECS 277)

SSHA:

[PHIL 170: Philosophy, Politics, and Economics](#)

[PH 104: Health and the Media](#)

[PH 103: Health Communication](#)

[PHIL 110: Philosophy of Cognitive Science](#) (cross-listed with COGS 110)

[COGS 110: Philosophy of Cognitive Science](#) (cross-listed with PHIL 110)

[COGS 101: Mind, Brain, and Computation](#)

[HIST 115: Topics in African History](#)

[PHIL 130: Ancient Philosophy](#)

[PH 005: Global and International Public Health](#)

[PH 115: Research Methods for Public Health: GIS Mapping](#)

[PH 102: Health Promotion](#)

[COGS 175: Spatial Cognition](#)

[PHIL 171: Free Will in Philosophy and Cognitive Science](#) (cross-listed with COGS 160)

[COGS 160: Free Will in Philosophy and Cognitive Science](#)

[ARTS 009: Learning to See: Beginning Photography](#)

VI. General Education Revised Charge and Membership

The GenEd Committee revised its membership in a way that would help the committee thrive. The UGC representation was unchanged and the VPDUE and the ALO were added to the membership to reinforce the connection with the Office of Undergraduate Education, and to address WASC and accreditation considerations of GE, particularly the meaning of a degree. The Committee also felt it was important to include a Core 1 Coordinator in the membership. UGC agreed with the idea of enlisting a more complete group of representation, in the absence of College 1.

It was noted that in 2009 the GenEd subcommittee may have functioned as an executive committee as it made recommendations on budget and strategic planning. With the revised

charge, the subcommittee is more specifically charged with curriculum and assessment. The committee may inevitably interface with CAPRA or other entities to address resources. A member raised concerns about removing the authority to make recommendations to CAPRA on resources as it will become unclear who will then have authority to make those recommendations. The language does make it clear that it is a senate role.

Action: Chair Zanzucchi will convey UGC's comments to the GenEd committee and will present a revised charge at the November 6 meeting.

VII. Executive Session

Action: UGC unanimously approved the conflict of interest policy available [here](#).

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30am.

Attest: Jay Sharping, Chair