

**Undergraduate Council  
Minutes of Meeting  
September 24, 2014**

**I. Meeting**

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council (UGC) met at 3:00pm on Wednesday, September 24, 2014 in KL 362, Chair Jack Vevea presiding.

**II. Chair's Report**

Chair Vevea attended the Leadership Council meeting today. Discussions included equity issues. At the meeting, Professors O'Day and Beman, who are collaborating with Professor Paul Maglio on an online Merced course, gave a presentation on online course delivery. A question was raised about online delivery of lectures and students' understanding of the content of the lectures.

**III. Consent Calendar**

Agenda and September 10 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

**IV. GE Subcommittee Report – Chair Zanzucchi**

Chair Zanzucchi thanked UGC members for their support regarding the request for compensation of GE Chairmanship, and for their approval of the expansion of the GE subcommittee in light of this year's GE program review activities.

The GE Subcommittee is currently drafting the program review self-study and will convene tomorrow to review the first two sections of the self-study. The subcommittee will review another set of sections in two weeks. The plan is to have a complete report by the end of October. The subcommittee is also working on a summary of recommendations that emerged from the May Retreat. Feedback will be solicited from participants.

Short-term goal:

- Upon consulting with the Senate Assistant Director, the subcommittee agreed that it would be worthwhile to have a liaison to accompany the review team and answer questions about the campus during the GE site visit. This liaison could be a member of the GE subcommittee or UGC and would provide a constant presence during the campus visit, scheduled to take place the week of February 9.

Long-term goals:

- It has become clear that we need to discuss and explore the GE eight guiding principles. Things to consider include: what are the essential guiding principles? Guiding principles are outcomes, rather than general statements, so how should they

read? What purposes should they serve? The subcommittee met with various Bylaw groups and School Curriculum Committees in April and solicited their feedback on the current guiding principles and whether they are representatives of the campus' expectations about GE.

- Last year, UGC discussed the need for criteria for submissions of GE courses and clarification of expectations of what a GE course will/should help accomplish. This year, the subcommittee will develop guidelines for GE courses.

**Action:** Analyst will compile UC campuses' guidelines for GE courses.

#### **V. CRS Minor – Effective Fall 2015**

Chair Vevea gave an overview of the overall context of the review of the minor: UGC is expected to write a recommendation for the approval of the minor with some analysis of the recommendation. There appears to have been some mixed enthusiasm on CAPRA about the minor. GC partly addressed some of the staffing issues and there is evidence in the proposal of fairly successful external funding. UGC will need to take all committees concerns into account.

#### Consultation with Robin DeLugan and Steve Roussos:

Robin DeLugan gave a brief overview of the proposal: the proposal was partly motivated by the Blum Center and can be a vehicle to transform poverty by doing research with undergraduates. The minor has the potential to address community interests or concerns. Using the existing resources (undergraduate lower division core 1), the proposers have added a few elements to promote community engaged research. During the preparation of the minor, the proposers surveyed faculty across the three schools to get their approval for including some of their classes as components of the Methods requirement of the minor. One of the signature classes is the opportunity to participate in research that has a connection with the community. There is some support staff dedicated to this minor but additional structure would benefit students.

Roussos reported that they consulted with several faculty and students to explore possible topics such as innovation contribution. Proposers were asked to think more broadly, thus, with the community research *and* service components, the students would be able to participate in ways to serve the community through the concepts of research methods.

The minor's following three themes will be explored through the lower division Core 1:

- Analytics of Prosperity
- Sustainability
- Community-engaged innovation

Students will be able to develop an understanding of these themes through the completion of Core 1 and CSE 195.

Comments/Questions:

A concern was raised about potential problems starting the minor with a course that is already required. For example, at the graduate level, courses cannot count both towards a Masters and a PhD. Associate Dean Ortez reported that the school has a mechanism to avoid “double dipping”.

What would happen to students who take this minor but did not take Core 1 when they entered UCM?

DeLugan reported that there is a provision for that. Core can fulfill a large component of the research requirement and transfer students can take this minor by filing an exception.

Concerns were also raised about having a large number of juniors taking Core and the impact on Core.

DeLugan responded that the faculty who proposed the minor were keen not to negatively impact Core 1 but rather, work with Core 1 and enhance classroom topics.

In light of resources concerns raised by CAPRA, De Lugan and Roussos were asked to discuss the funding model for the expansion of the program:

The assumption is that the minor will require some staff support and coordination. A proposal was submitted with the Office of Research for one FTE, a PhD level community researcher with experience with undergraduates, who would help launch the minor and in the future, there will be two or three similar positions that would serve as catalysts for community research. Roussos reported that a similar model is used by the SOE Service Learning. At the Blum center, there is the promise for funding to support this minor. There is also some external funding from UCOP. Undergraduate Education is one of the three pillars of the Blum Center so supporting this minor would be a priority, according to Roussos. With regard to engineering courses, DeLugan reported that they consulted with SOE faculty. The goal is to continue to add courses as relevant. Both the SOE and SSHA Deans supported the proposal and SSHA has committed their staff to help with advising.

A member commented that CAPRA was also concerned about teaching credit.

The above concerns will need to be addressed by the faculty proposing the minor.

**Action:** UGC will formulate a recommendation at a future meeting.

**VI. CRF subcommittee Report:**

The Subcommittee reported that grammar and writing styles need to be corrected and made the following recommendations:

**GASP/ARTS 035:**

General Education: Creativity: The sentence is garbled and should be corrected.

**Recommendation:** Approve with corrections.

**GASP 155:**

**Assignments/Evaluation:** No information is provided for how student performance in relation to the learning outcomes will be graded / assessed. This information needs to be included.

**General Education: Decision-making:** This is almost identical to the justification for communication. For GASP 035, the wording was distinct in a way that it isn't for GASP 155. Clarification is needed.

**Class restriction/Pre-requisite:** This course is restricted to juniors and seniors. Would this course be suitable for a non-major having taken no other GASP/ARTS courses? In previous CRF reviews, instructors automatically assumed students within the major or the school to be enrolled. With no information about the assessments of the CLOs, it is difficult to determine if the class level restriction without any pre-requisites is the best designation. Also, CLOs 1 and 4 are identical to those of GASP 35, which could imply an assumption of previous exposure to this topic.

**Recommendation:** Approve with corrections.

**HIST 139:**

**Assignments/Evaluation:** No information is provided for how student performance in relation to the learning outcomes will be graded / assessed. This information needs to be included explicitly although some items are described in the paragraph about the GE components of the course.

**General Education Component:** This paragraph needs editing; it includes incomplete sentences, duplicate sentences, etc. It is not clear how the GE principles will be supported in this class.

**Recommendation:** Approve with corrections

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to approve the above CRFs pending corrections.

**Action:** Senate analyst will collaborate with the School to make sure revisions are made.

**Action:** The CRF subcommittee was charged with making sure that corrections are made. UGC subcommittee will review and vote on these courses electronically.

A request was made to clarify what needs to be included in CRFs, in course outlines etc.

The policy subcommittee will revise the current policy for review and approval of new/revised courses to include more detail and instructions for elements that should be included in course outlines and CRFs.

It was noted that last year, the Senate Analyst, the ALO and the School Assessment Specialists put together a site that provides an overview of the approval process of undergraduate courses: <http://assessment.ucmerced.edu/node/51>

**VII. Suspension of Appraisal Form**

The general consensus was that the form is not serving a useful purpose so members unanimously agreed to approve its suspension.

In the future, and in consultation with standing Senate Committees, School Executive Committees and others as appropriate, UGC will explore ways to develop a strategy to pilot a change to the campus Appraisal Form.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously carried to approve the suspension of the appraisal form.

**Action:** Senate Analyst will draft a memo and circulate for approval via email.

**VIII. Senate Administration IT Council Charge**

Members had no objections to the establishment of this Advisory Council and offered the following comments and recommendations:

- Grammatical errors in sections 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 need to be corrected (“Reviews”, “Tracks”, “Works”, and “Establishes”); without that change, the bulleted list lacks parallel structure.
- The proposal refers to a need for balanced representation but does not define “balanced representation”.
- Expand the membership to four members for both the Senate and the Administration to ensure adequate representation of research and pedagogy concerns.
- Add a staff member to the membership, ideally, a person who provides support to faculty and is cognizant of instructional and research computing issues.

**Action:** Senate Analyst will draft a memo and circulate for approval via email.

**IX. Grade Appeals**

The policy was constructed years ago and may not be appropriate now. As written, the policy provides no criteria or grounds for students to pursue an appeal. Another concern is that the policy is implemented differently across the schools. Additionally, the language is not clear and puts the burden on the faculty member.

Although revisions to the policy falls within the purview of UGC, the Council will consult with General Counsel, FWDAF, the VPDUE, Student Affairs and others as appropriate before changes to the policy are approved.

**Actions:**

- Senate analyst will collect UC policies and circulate.
- The following members of UGC were charged with revising the policy: VPDUE Whitt, Christopher Viney, Carrie Menke, and Anne Zanzucchi.

**X. Executive Session**

No minutes are taken in executive session.