



FALL MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2016
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
Chancellor's Conference Room
232 Kolligian Library

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------|
| I. | ANNOUNCEMENTS – Divisional Chair Susan Amussen | 10 min |
| | A. General Education | |
| | B. Working Groups on Budget | |
| | C. William Shadish Memorial Graduate Student Fellowship Fund | |
|
 | | |
| II. | CONSENT CALENDAR¹ | 5 min |
| | A. Approval of the Agenda | |
| | B. Approval of Draft Minutes of the May 9, 2016 Meeting of the Division (Pg. 4-12) | |
| | C. Annual Committee Reports AY 15-16 ² | |
| | Division Council (forthcoming) | |
| | Committee on Academic Personnel (Pg. 13-19) | |
| | Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (Pg. 20-29) | |
| | Committee on Research (Pg. 30-32) | |
| | Committee on Rules and Elections (Pg. 33-34) | |
| | Diversity and Equity (Pg. 35-40) | |
| | Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (Pg. 41-48) | |
| | Graduate Council (Pg. 49-55) | |
| | Undergraduate Council (Pg. 56-62) | |
|
 | | |
| III. | CAMPUS UPDATE – Chancellor Leland | 10 min |
|
 | | |
| IV. | INFORMATION ITEM: MODELING INSTRUCTIONAL DEMAND AT 10,000 STUDENTS –
CAPRA Member Mike Colvin | 5 min |
|
 | | |
| V. | PROPOSED REVISED FACULTY HIRING PLAN (Pg. 63-66) – Divisional Chair Amussen | 30 min |
| | A. Model(s) Presentation ³ – CAPRA Chair Mukesh Singhal | |
| | B. Facilitated Discussion with Faculty and Administration Leadership – Divisional Chair Susan Amussen | |

¹ Agenda items deemed non-controversial by the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Division, in consultation with the Divisional Council, may be placed on a Consent Calendar under Special Orders. Should the meeting not attain a quorum, the Consent Calendar would be taken as approved. (Quorum = the lesser of 40% or 50 members of the Division.) At the request of any Divisional member, any Consent Calendar item is extracted for consideration under "New Business" later in the agenda. Lin Tian, Secretary/Parliamentarian

² Committee on Committees will generate an annual report beginning in 2016-17.

³ Model(s) will be revised and circulated based on campus feedback.

VI. ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DIVISION BYLAWS (Pg. 67-69) – CRE Chair Lin Tian 5 min

Due to increasing workload, the Committee for Diversity and Equity has requested that the Bylaw language related to its membership (Part II. Title III. 6) be changed from “three members” to “at least four members,” and the preference of one member from each school to “at least one” member from each school. This proposal was approved by CRE at its September 16, 2016 meeting, circulated for comment to all Standing Committees and the School Executive Committees (no comments were received), discussed at the October 6, 2016 meeting of Divisional Council, and endorsed by Divisional Council on November 18, 2016.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Merced Division votes to endorse the proposed revision to Bylaw II.III.6. If approved, changes are effective 1/7/2017.

VII. STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS 15 min

[Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#), Chair Mukesh Singhal (oral)
[Committee on Academic Personnel](#), Chair Ignacio López-Calvo (oral)
[Committee on Committees](#), Chair Rick Dale (oral)
[Committee on Diversity and Equity](#), Chair Tanya Golash-Boza (oral)
[Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom](#), Chair Jayson Beaster-Jones (oral)
[Committee on Research](#), Chair David Noelle (oral)
[Committee on Rules and Elections](#), Chair Lin Tian (oral)
[Graduate Council](#), Chair Ramesh Balasubramaniam (oral)
[Undergraduate Council](#), Chair Anne Zanzucchi (oral)
[General Education](#)
[Admissions and Financial Aid](#)

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (None) 5 min

IX. NEW BUSINESS 5 min

Glossary of [UC Merced](#) and [Systemwide](#) Academic Senate Committee Acronyms

CAP - Committee on Academic Personnel

CAPRA - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

CoC - Committee on Committees

COR - Committee on Research

CRE - Committee on Rules and Elections

D&E - Diversity and Equity

DivCo - Division (al) Council

FWAF - Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom

GC - Graduate Council

L (A) SC - Library and Scholarly Communication

P&T - Privilege and Tenure

UGC - Undergraduate Council

GESC - General Education Subcommittee

AFAS - Admissions and Financial Aid

BOARS - Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

CCGA - Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

COUNCIL - Academic Council

UCAF - University Committee on Academic Freedom

UCAP - University Committee on Academic Personnel

UCAADE - University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity

UCCC - University Committee on Computing and Communications

UCEP - University Committee on Educational Policy

UCOC - University Committee on Committees

UCFW - University Committee on Faculty Welfare

UCIE - University Committee on International Education

UCOLASC - University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

UCPB - University Committee on Planning and Budget

UCOPE - University Committee on Preparatory Education

UCORP - University Committee on Research Policy

UCPT - University Committee on Privilege and Tenure

UCRJ - University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

**Meeting of the Merced Division
Minutes of Meeting
May 9, 2016**

Pursuant to call, the members of the Senate met at 3:30pm on May 9, 2016 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Cristián Ricci presiding.

I. Chair's Report and Announcements

Division Council Chair Cristián Ricci updated Division Council members on the following:

- a. With regard to the issues around the Chancellor of UC Davis, Chair Ricci recommends those interested in learning more to visit the [Davis Senate website](#). Chair Ricci will update Vice Chair Viers with any additional information.
- b. Chair Ricci will be leaving to South America in the summer, and thanked Vice Chair Viers for his assistance during the transition.
- c. Chair Ricci voiced his thanks to the Senate staff, in particular to Senate Interim Director Fatima Paul for her dedication and hard work.

II. Consent Calendar

- a. Today's agenda and the December 2, 2015 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. Consultation with Provost/EVC Peterson

Provost/EVC Peterson provided the following updates:

- a. Shared Governance
 - i. The Provost addressed the potential perception that the proper emphasis is not being placed on shared governance. This is not the position he holds, and he shared some frustrations he has.
 1. Consultation with the faculty: The Provost follows a process in interacting with Faculty, this year attending every CAPRA meeting possible and feeling that there has been a good exchange. He understands that CAPRA is not the only group of faculty, and he is open to participating in other communication structures, such as a "Provost's Cabinet".
 2. Faculty hiring/SAFI process: The Provost reminded the members that this is an "experiment" that has barely begun. If a complete cycle of every pillar was done, 30 out of 140 faculty would be hired. The Provost stated that if there was a problem with the process, it should be analyzed and discussed, but in light of this process being new.
- b. Strategic Academic Focusing and Status of Foundational FTEs
 - i. There is one cluster that has offers out right now. Social Justice and Sustainability clusters will revise and submit their proposals next year.

Regarding foundational hires, the Provost is looking at the recommendations from faculty, from the Deans, and from CAPRA and has found very little correlation between prioritizations between the different groups, and will need time to analyze the recommendations.

- ii. School Reorganization: Almost a year ago, the AP Chairs presented the Deans with a proposal of issues to consider with respect to school reorganization. A meeting was held at the end of last September with the Deans to digest this information and put together a proposal. The Provost stated that an in-person meeting later this week or early next week will be planned to discuss this topic and clear up any misconceptions.
- c. Updates on Project 2020 Planning
 - i. The Provost is unable to provide an update at this time, but is very excited about the prospects, and hopes to have more information by graduation or soon after.

A faculty member thanked the Provost for his remarks about shared governance, and added that, though CAPRA is the primary committee used for communication, that DivCo, the school executive committees, and other senate bodies be utilized as well. The Provost stated that if he is invited, he would attend.

A Division Council member asked if the Provost had heard everything the Chancellor announced regarding a forthcoming plan about workforce development, at a recent meeting between the Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom committee, the Chancellor, and the Provost. SNS Dean Meza, who attended the meeting, confirmed that the multiple plans will not be addressed until the end of the semester, at which time the Chancellor will direct efforts of the Vice Chancellors to work on this topic. The Provost added that workforce planning is an integral first piece to the issue of school reorganization, and nothing will be acceptable until this aspect is finalized. Shared services are being analyzed across schools. The Division Council member asked about the impact of Project 2020 if the plans were not completed, and the Provost replied that the key issue is placement of people that are part of the workforce. Providing for the workforce, for the faculty, and for the infrastructure all requires money, and these categories need to be balanced. The Chancellor is absolutely committed to faculty hiring, so workforce planning must be done in the most efficient way.

A Division Council member brought up the numbers of SAFI hires for this year and next being greater than originally expected, and the Provost responded that positions that went directly into Bylaw Units are far higher. He reiterated that allowing the process to run for a full cycle (allowing every pillar to go through the process once), we would have invested 30 positions out of 140 in academic focusing, and everything is speculative because a full cycle has not been completed.

A faculty member brought up his perception that UC Merced is not on a trajectory for being a research university in the next 10 years, and asked about what the higher administration has as a vision for what a research university looks like. The Provost provided his operational definition: “An institution that is as much involved in the creation of new knowledge as it is in the dissemination of new knowledge.” This distinguishes a research university from a four-year institution that focuses primarily on dissemination, and sees UC Merced as on an incredibly good trajectory. He recognizes that there are areas to improve, but the primary distinguishing feature of a University of California campus is the ability to create new knowledge.

A faculty member asked about undergraduate programs going through reviews and graduate proposals moving forward, all happening in what is perceived to be a resource-constrained environment. How can we show trajectories of growth that would yield capacities to teach graduate and undergraduate programs when we reach 10,000 students? The Provost stated by doing the same as we have in justifying proposals throughout the growth of the campus, by making projections and commitments by the administration that the program will be supported as it goes forward. There will be annual negotiation for how positions are allocated, but that commitment will not change due to the SAFI process.

A faculty member asked about the idea of running an experiment on a system that was already working, and expressed concerns about the design of the experiment, including no external reviews of the proposals, and no metrics to evaluate proposal strength. According to an all-faculty survey conducted in 2015, 65% of the faculty did not support the design, and the faculty member thought there needs to be consideration of the design being able to work up front, before asking if it did in hindsight. The Provost replied that he is more than willing to address all questions, using the most effective method – survey, referendum, in-person meeting, or other structures. Vice Chair Viers added that the survey itself was very basic, with only 1/3 of respondents being in favor, and stated that it was a poor survey, but there will be a new survey this semester that is written with more nuance that will yield better information. A faculty member added that the SAFI process wanted to start big, without previous knowledge of how the process might progress. The Provost reiterated that he is happy to have a conversation about how the process needs to be changed, if a survey is decided on, he would like to be involved in how the survey is presented, to make sure that useful information is gathered. His preference is to have an in-person meeting. A faculty member stated that using the survey is the best way to gather systematic information about faculty views on the SAFI, with groups more likely to present their bias, where a survey would provide unbiased input.

IV. Standing Committee Reports:

- a. Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
 - i. In 2015, CAPRA met with the steering committee representatives of three SAFI pillars: Sustainability, Computational Science & Data Analytics

(CSDA), and Inequality, Power, & Social Justice (IPJS) to hear about their plans for hiring.

- ii. In 2016, CAPRA met with the search committee chair of CSDA for his input on the cluster hiring process.
 - iii. In February, CAPRA submitted suggested criteria for foundational requests to the Provost, and in April, CAPRA reviewed and ranked foundational FTE requests and submitted its recommendations to the Provost.
 - iv. The Provost attended almost all CAPRA meetings.
 - v. CAPRA consulted with Project 2020 representative VC Feitelberg throughout the year to discuss the 2020 planning and financing.
 - vi. CAPRA attended the monthly systemwide meetings for planning and budget, with discussion topics such as the controversial changes to the UC retirement plan and deficits on some campuses.
 - vii. For the next year, CAPRA will make recommendations on foundational FTE allocation requests and on SAFI hiring plans.
- b. Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
- i. Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP) was revised this year to include a modification suggested by CAP, where assistant professors must submit their tenure materials at the end of their sixth year.
 - ii. CAP opined on various proposed revisions to the APM.
 - iii. CAP has deliberated on 119 cases: 8 promotions to associate, 8 promotions to full professor, 1 promotion to above-scale, 1 advancement to Professor VI, 17 mid-career assessments with advancements, 22 appointments including 1 endowed chair appointment, 56 advancements, and 6 merit increases for LPSOEs/LSOEs.
 - iv. CAP is scheduled to conclude its business in the first week of June.
- c. Committee on Committees (COC)
- i. CoC has filled the following committee leadership seats:
 1. CAPRA Chair – Mukesh Singhal
 2. UGC Chair – Anne Zanzucchi
 3. GC Chair – Ramesh Balasubramaniam
 4. COR Chair – Ajay Gopinathan
 5. FWAF Chair – Jayson Beaster-Jones
 6. D&E Chair – Tanya Golash-Boza
 7. LASC Chair – Karl Ryavec
 8. P&T Chair – Pending
 9. CAP Chair– Pending
 10. GEN ED Subcommittee Chair - Pending
 - ii. COC Chair reported that feedback is being received about the numerous requests for faculty to volunteers on committees across campus, and there have been issues raised about teaching relief for doing this work. Chair

Ricci added that some faculty have had to purchase their own course relief due to inconsistencies across the schools.

- d. Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E)
 - i. AY 15-16 was the inaugural year for this new committee.
 - ii. D&E drafted a proposal to introduce Faculty Equity Advisors (FEA), and DivCo has approved this proposal.
 - iii. D&E also proposed revisions to (MAPP) 6001 regarding the selection and reappointment of Endowed Chairs, which DivCo also approved.
 - iv. D&E hosted an inaugural faculty diversity event that was well attended and well received.
 - v. D&E incorporated guidelines related to diversity and equity in program review, when program review and D&E meets, D&E issues are fully incorporated into the program review.

A Division Council member asked about the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, and the plan to hire within the campuses. The Chair replied that the UCAADE committee has made recommendations with regard to the appointment of President's Postdocs, and at the same time, the UC Provost Aimee Dore issued a memo on search waivers. UCAADE met with Provost Dore and Vice Provost Susan Carlton about proposals for clarification of the appointment of fellows in general and search waivers in particular. Provost Dore did not completely agree with the points made by UCAADE and will be getting back to the committee.

- e. Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF)
 - i. A proposal, drafted by UCFW representative Shawn Malloy, was proposed for a Campus Police Advisory Board, which has received endorsement from the Chancellor and the Provost and will be revisited in the next academic year.
 - ii. FWAF submitted a recommendation for modification to the Active Service/Modified Duty (ASMD) policy, providing care for immediate and close family members, and those that fall under provision of legal guardianship, to provide them with relief in the event of a family crisis. This recommended modification will also benefit tenured faculty, given that APM 133's "stop the tenure clock" provisions do not apply to them.
 - iii. The FWAF chair has worked very closely with VPF Camfield on improving faculty morale, including the introduction of a routine faculty celebration of achievement event. This will be implemented in AY16-17.
 - iv. FWAF awarded their second Excellence in Faculty Mentorship award and continues to support the faculty professional development program, which includes a seminar series.
 - v. FWAF has worked closely with the Director of Campus Climate and Campus Ombuds to review and access resources and policies to recognize signs of distress among colleagues.

- vi. Systemwide discussion at the meetings of the UCFW has included modifications to the UC Retirement program, UC health plans, issues regarding the cybersecurity changes, and the Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance.
 - vii. FWAF is discussing issues around the Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) after-school/break options.
 - viii. Additionally, FWAF is working with the Committee on Research regarding issues surrounding start-up funds, particularly for junior faculty.
 - ix. Finally, the FWAF Chair stated that the local Post Office is no longer renewing passports, which can impact faculty that participate in international travel for research purposes.
- f. Committee on Research (COR)
- i. COR undertook a review of UCMEXUS, provided input on the structure of the lab-fee program, and provided input on what the University should do with grant money that has national security connections.
 - ii. COR has developed a policy for funding calls with limited submissions.
 - iii. COR expressed concern about the scaling back of services provided by Research Development Services, (RDS), and the lack of information about that decrease. A memo from the Deans and the VCORED was received, detailing plans for increasing staffing across schools and centrally, to support faculty grant writing efforts.
 - iv. Regarding Senate faculty grants, COR was successful in requesting and receiving an increase in the total amount of funds for this program to \$175,000, and this year, in an effort to reduce disparities between schools and remove ambiguities, the committee trialed a new structure with two categories of grants: "seed" grants for new projects, and "research acceleration" grants, intended for specific, critical needs to finish a research project. The committee was able to fund 29 out of the 33 proposals received.
 - v. In Summer and Fall, COR will be reviewing the Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI), and developing a more coherent ORU policy that addresses the use of "Centers", except for non-research-based centers.
 - vi. COR is researching policies for establishing and running core facilities.
 - vii. Finally, COR looks forward to working with the administration on indirect cost return, with the hope of using them to promote the university's research mission.
- g. Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)
- i. The primary long-term project for CRE this year has been to determine a policy for voting rights and eligibility specific to UC Merced. The committee has developed the basics of the policy, but will wait until Fall 2016 to propose, as there has been difficulty in receiving nominations for elected offices to the Senate.
- h. Graduate Council (GC)

- i. GC fielded many inquiries over the year regarding topics such as composition of graduate masters committees, graduate group memberships, grade appeals process, graduate student appointments proposed for use in non-academic environments, joint program review with Undergraduate Council, catalog copy, Course Request Form (CRF) process and software, course evaluations, and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) admissions requirements.
- ii. GC reviewed 25 CRFs, approving 11, with 14 pending.
- iii. GC handled hundreds of applications for graduate student fellowships and awards, with 20 compositions, and made dozens of awards with Graduate Division for incoming and continuing graduate students.
- iv. GC has been working on improving this review process by inviting faculty from graduate groups as well as LPSOEs and LSOEs.
- v. GC will be working on a new graduate student fellowship award for excellence in overall scholarship, to be developed with the Graduate Division in the Fall.
- vi. GC sought to initiate a regular dialogue with various stakeholders around campus on both the administrative and academic sides, having meetings with graduate group chairs, with the Registrar, Student Affairs, and with multiple AVCs.
- vii. Regarding PhD proposals, Mechanical Engineering advanced to CCGA, and should be approved by CCGA soon.
- viii. The Public Health CCGA proposal will be advanced to DivCo and the VPDGE shortly.
- ix. Economics should be approved by CCGA soon, leaving EECS and BEST as the remaining Interim Individual Graduate program.
- x. GC will be working to finalize reviews for the Graduate Group Policies and Procedures, and the Graduate Advisor's Handbook, hopefully by June.
- xi. GC plans to draft white papers on "teaching as research", to integrate the teaching and research missions of the University.
- xii. GC will also review the graduate fellowship awards landscape to look at where funding is coming from and going to for greatest effect at the graduate level.

A Division Council member asked about the possibility of funding not being available for graduate group seminars or recruiting for next year. The Chair did not know, but welcomed additional dialogue, and the topic could be added to a future GC agenda

- i. Undergraduate Council (UGC)
 - i. UGC has placed the Admissions subcommittee on firm footing, improving the interface with the rest of the university and with BOARS. This has also improved the enrollment management committee, redefining the planning and resourcing for new students.

- ii. At the systemwide level, BOARS has not supported the proposal by the central administration to add a question to the application form for students to state whether their parents were UC alums. The President has placed this issue on hold for a year while further discussion continues.
- iii. The “compare favorably” status will be better understood with more regular faculty discussion into the topic.
- iv. UGC has reviewed, discussed, and made recommendations on several items this year, including a revised proposal for a Bylaw Unit in Public Health. The committee liked the proposal and encouraged the relevant SOE faculty to reinforce the multidisciplinary foundation of that unit and the committee encourages the future Senate leadership to formally require letters from Deans when Bylaw Unit proposals are submitted.
- v. UGC looked at the Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology (MIST) proposal, and looks forward to learning more about that plan.
- vi. UGC approved a proposal for a World Heritage minor, effective Fall 2016. The committee provided comments to VPF Camfield on Chapter 5 of the MAPP.
- vii. UGC has developed a way to deal with “orphaned” programs, such as the UCM Chorale. There is now a procedure in place for faculty to explain why they wish to discontinue a program to the Dean, and a letter is sent to the Undergraduate Council so that all stakeholders are informed.
- viii. UGC has reviewed some policy revisions, such as the Academic Degree Programs Policy (ADPP) proposed by the joint Senate-Administration Academic Programs working group. The committee has a similar working group that will carry over into next year to reach completion.
- ix. The UGC Policy/CRF subcommittee has proposed revisions to the policy for reviewing and approving new and revised courses, and will also carry over into next year. 72 CRFs were handled this year.
- x. Finally, a policy for TOEFL score appeals will be developed, and the committee will work with the Graduate Council on CRF software recommendations.

V. Division Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary/Parliamentarian

CoC Chair Patti LiWang made the following announcements:

- Lin Tian will be the next Secretary/Parliamentarian.
- Susan Amussen will be the next Senate Chair.
- The Vice Chair position remains open.

VI. Tribute to Professor William Shadish

Professor Jan Wallander and Professor Emeritus Gregg Herken provided a historical background on the career and accomplishments of Professor Shadish.

VII. Senate Awards

Chair Ricci announced the winners of the 2016 Senate Awards.

VIII. Petitions of Students

None.

IX. New Business

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:21pm.

Attest:

Cristián Ricci, Senate Chair

DRAFT

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2015-2016.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included two members from UCM and six external members. The UCM members were Theofanis “Fanis” Tsoulouhas, Vice Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Michael Modest (Engineering). The external members were Raymond Gibbs, CAP Chair (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science); John Leslie Redpath (UCI, Biology); Rajiv Singh (UCD, Physics), Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages), and Mark Wrathall (UCR, Philosophy).

The CAP analyst this year was Simrin Takhar.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

CAP is charged with making recommendations on all Senate faculty appointments and academic advancements, including merit actions, promotions to tenure, promotions to Professor, and advancements across the barrier steps Professor V to VI and Professor IX to Above Scale.

Policies and Procedures

UCM CAP adheres to systemwide policies and procedures as described in the UC Academic Personnel Manual ([APM](#)). Policies and procedures not outlined in the APM, but practiced at other UC campuses, were generally observed at Merced.

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and Academic Personnel (AP) Chairs. As the MAPP is an evolving resource, CAP presented this Spring’s suggestions for revisions of the document to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Division Council (DivCo).

Review Process

CAP’s review process begins when the committee receives files from APO, where they have been analyzed, vetted, and classified to facilitate further, efficient processing. The cases, as well as reviewer assignments, are distributed to the committee one week prior to CAP’s meeting and ensuing discussion of the files. CAP typically reviews fewer cases in the Fall (two to five) and many more in the Spring (five to eleven). One lead reviewer and one or two secondary reviewers, depending upon the proposed personnel action, are assigned to report on each case; however, all members are expected to read and become familiar with the files. Reviewer assignments are made according to members’ areas of expertise. Reviewers serve not as advocates of their areas, but as representatives who act in the best long-term interests of the

campus. Committee members who participate in a prior level of review for a file are recused from CAP's respective review of the file.

CAP convenes for two-hour meetings on Friday mornings; non-UCM members participate by teleconference. Reports from the primary and secondary readers on each case are followed by a thorough committee discussion, as well as a vote on the proposed action. CAP's quorum for all personnel actions is half plus one of its membership. On rare occasions, a vote on a case is deferred, and the file is returned for further information or clarification. After the meeting the CAP Chair prepares draft reports on the dossiers. These are then distributed to the committee for review, consultation, and approval. The final version of the report is sent as a letter to the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC). If the Provost/EVC determines that no further deliberation is necessary, the substance of CAP's report and those of other levels of review are summarized by Academic Personnel in a letter that is transmitted to the dean of the candidate's school.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. The Provost/EVC communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Throughout the UC system, certain categories of academic personnel cases, for example, appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, sometimes require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. In most cases, CAP makes the request for this *ad hoc* review, especially in instances where CAP lacks sufficient expertise in the faculty member's research area or when there are ambiguities in the case file. The *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate and its report is included in the materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate. These *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit.

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2015-2016 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 148 cases during the year, compared to 92 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 138 (93%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). In addition, CAP agreed with the School recommendations but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step) for another 4 cases (3%). For 6 other cases (4%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case. There were 12 cases this year in which a school dean and his/her school/bylaw unit faculty disagreed with each other and therefore presented different recommendations. Of these, CAP agreed with the faculty/bylaw unit 6 times and agreed with the dean 5 times. With regard to the remaining case, CAP agreed with the dean on the mid-career appraisal (MCA) rating and with the faculty/bylaw unit on the advancement recommendation.

Tables 1A – 1D detail caseloads and their respective outcomes according to the proposed personnel actions. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendations by the academic units.

CAP recommendations are transmitted to the Provost/EVC for a final level of review. The

Provost/EVC is deeply involved in the academic personnel process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels. This final level of review gives significant weight to CAP's recommendations. On rare occasions, the Provost/EVC goes against CAP's recommendation, whereupon, per procedures, he is required to meet with CAP to discuss his decision to overturn. This year, the Provost/EVC disagreed with CAP twice.

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

In keeping with tradition, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review during the academic year. Along with the other Senate standing committees, CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process. This year's proposed revisions to the MAPP involved the LPSOE/LSOE titles, number of external letters, proposed new ratings for mid-career appraisals, clarification on denial of tenure in assistant professors' seventh year, and various other modifications related to the review process.

CAP discussed at length the present set of adjectives that may be given to faculty for the MCA in regard to their prospects for tenure. We have always had difficulty in deciding whether to recommend "Good" or "Fair" for some cases and have informally heard that some faculty are disturbed when they receive only a "Fair" assessment. CAP's recommendation, therefore, was to change the set of adjectives to include a four-tier system (which is employed at some other UC campuses such as UCSD). They are: (a) Favorable: Promotion is likely, contingent on maintaining the current trajectory of excellence and on appropriate external evaluation; (b) Favorable with reservations: Promotion is likely if the candidate addresses identified weaknesses, deficiencies, or imbalances in the record; (c) Problematic: Promotion is uncertain given significant weaknesses in the record, but possible if these may be adequately addressed, and (d) Unfavorable: Promotion is unlikely given major weaknesses in the record.

Under this system, certain faculty members who have in the past received "Fair" may now be given the more positive "Favorable with reservations," while other cases of "Fair" may now be termed as "Problematic," depending, of course, on the specific challenges each faculty member faces at the time of the MCA. CAP finds the above system to be more comfortable because it may better serve the faculty being given feedback.

CAP also requested clarification regarding denial of tenure and terminal year. The way the MAPP is currently worded implies that if a faculty member makes an unsuccessful bid for tenure at any time (e.g., earlier than at the end of the 6th year), then he/she will receive notification of a terminal year, with no other chances for tenure being possible. CAP suggested that that the statement be modified to state that if a faculty member is again denied in the seventh year, then there are no more opportunities to go up for tenure again, if that is what is intended. As a more general comment regarding the language in MAPP regarding dates, CAP noted that it is unclear as to the exact time frame intended when mentioning "seventh year." This really means, in this case, at the end of the sixth year, but not at the end of the seventh year. CAP therefore suggested that this general concern be addressed by explicitly.

IV. Counsel to Provost/EVC

The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendation, with the Provost/EVC and the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF). These discussions mostly

focus on individual cases, but there were other general discussions regarding the preparation of academic personnel files, differences between the Academic Divisions in their recommendations, and CAP procedures. For example, we had several discussions this past year with the Provost/EVC and VPF regarding the MAPP and when best to make change to this document.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at UCM, the Provost/EVC and the VPF requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, held on October 12, 2015, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Raymond Gibbs, Vice Chair Fanis Tsoulouhas, and an additional external member. The committee participated in three discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. A second meeting was held involving CAP members, Provost/EVC, VPF, AP Chairs, and UCM faculty. This was followed by an afternoon session and was open to all faculty members, School AP Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Brief minutes from both sessions are available in the Senate office. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for promotion, the evaluation of teaching, and extramural funding success.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The committee was named as the lead reviewer for proposed revisions to the following APM sections: 278, 210-6, 279, 112, and new section 350 (Clinical series) as well as 360 and 210-4 (Librarian series). We endorsed both sets of revisions. CAP also, as mentioned above, gave feedback on the MAPP.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with Gregg Camfield in his role as VPF. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the Deans, the AP Chairs, and the AP staff in each school for their dedication to excellence in the personnel review process at UC Merced, and the Senate Analyst assigned to CAP this past year.

Respectfully,

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., Chair (UCSC)
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (UCM)
Michael Modest (UCM)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
John Leslie Redpath (UCI)
Rajiv Singh (UCD)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)
Mark Wrathall (UCR)

APPENDIX A

**2015-2016 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	138	4	6*	0	148

*Includes 1 split vote and 1 postponed vote

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (includes Adjuncts & Acting)	30	0	0	0	30
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts)	2	0	0	0	2
Professor (1 with Endowed Chair)	2	1	0	0	3
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	2
Endowed Chairs	1	0	0	0	1
Total	37	1	0	0	38
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					97
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	7	0	1*	0	8
Professor	10	0	0	0	10
Professor VI	2	0	0	0	2
Above Scale	1	0	0	0	1
LSOE	0	0	1	0	1
Total	20	0	2	0	22
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					91
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					91

*Postponed vote

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	6	1	0	0	7
Assistant (1 Adjunct)	45	1	1	0	47
Associate Professor (1 Adjunct)	24	0	3*	0	27
Professor	5	1	0	0	6
Total	80	3	4	0	87
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					92
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					95

*Includes 1 split vote

CAP Recommendation

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	TOTAL
Assistant	1	0	0	0	1
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	1
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2015-2016**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering	29	23	1	0	5	0	79	83
(MCA)	3							
Natural Sciences	54	54	0	0	0	0	100	100
(MCA)	6							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	65	61	0	3	1	0	94	98
(MCA)	7							
TOTALS	148	138	1	3	6	0	93	96
(MCA)	16							

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2016**

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Total Cases	61	56	82	61
Total Appointments	43	32	45	22
Total Promotions	3	2	2	3
Total Merit Increases	14	22	35	33
Total Other	1	0	0	3

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Total Cases	63	96	90	98
Total Appointments	13	34	33	30
Total Promotions	10	17	18	13
Total Merit Increases	40	39	38	47
Total Other	0	6	1	0

	2013-2104	2014-2015	2015-2016
Total Cases	128*	92	148
Total Appointments	50	16	38
Total Promotions	16	16	22
Total Merit Increases	58	57	87
Total Other	4 1 MCA only 3 reappointments *1 case pending	3 reappointments	1 reappointment

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2015-2016

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) held a total of 14 regularly scheduled in-person meetings, 1 specially-convened meeting in June 2016 with the Provost/EVC, and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.IV.1](#).

This was the inaugural year for the implementation of the Provost/EVC's Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI) for faculty hiring (see annual reports from [2012-2013](#), [2013-2014](#), and [2014-2015](#) for background). The six research pillars that were intended to guide the investment of resources and ladder-rank faculty hiring for the next six years are: Towards a Sustainable Planet ("Sustainability"), Computational Science and Data Analytics (CSDA), Chemical and Biological Materials and Matter, Entrepreneurship and Management, Human Health Science, and Inequality, Power and Social Justice (IPSJ).

The three pillars that were previously selected to receive FTE lines this year were Sustainability, CSDA, and IPSJ.

While CAPRA conducted normal Senate business, much of the academic year was focused on CAPRA's role in the SAFI process as well as preparing for the review of requests for "foundational" (traditional, disciplinary, non-SAFI) FTE lines.

CAPRA also benefited from regular consultation with the Provost/EVC who attended nearly all the meetings this academic year.

SAFI and Pillars

In fall 2015, CAPRA met with the steering committee chairs or representatives of the Sustainability, CSDA, and IPSJ pillars to hear their hiring plans and provide input. While CAPRA looked forward to seeing the widest range of cogent, proposed hiring plans, it shared the faculty's deep concern over the late timeline of the SAFI process and hoped that the Provost/EVC would agree that faculty hiring should begin earlier in the

“season”. Several disciplines that begin recruiting in August and September were greatly disadvantaged as it was already too late for them to fill positions for next year.

The Provost/EVC requested to meet with each of the three pillars to discuss which areas within each pillar theme they propose to target this year. The pillars were also required to submit to the Provost/EVC a short description of the specific sub themes within each pillar and to include a list of questions the Provost/EVC suggested they address.

After meeting with the representatives from the three pillars, CAPRA found that all three had the same concerns, namely, the late timeline and the fear that several disciplines are already disadvantaged, the various unknowns surrounding the formation and role of search committees, and the role and level of authority of the Council of Deans in the selection of candidates. Another source of confusion was the rank of faculty. Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Camfield informed CAPRA that all pillars have the option of hiring assistant professors and tenured professors from one pool and that the Provost/EVC will clarify this with the pillars’ leadership.

In the beginning of spring semester 2016, CAPRA agreed that it should conduct a review of the SAFI process thus far in order to provide guidance to the three pillars that are scheduled to hire faculty next year. Possible dimensions or evaluative criteria that CAPRA considered when evaluating the SAFI process were timing, inclusiveness, and efficiency. While CAPRA recognized that this is the first time the campus has undergone a SAFI process and the first full cycle is not yet complete, the committee nevertheless wanted to make suggestions to the Provost/EVC on how to improve the process next year.

In January, it became evident that the CSDA pillar was the farthest along in the process and by this time had formulated search committees, posted faculty position advertisements, and already received numerous applications. The IPSJ pillar, upon receiving negative feedback from the Provost/EVC on its proposed hiring process and sub-themes, elected to re-start its process again next year. The Sustainability pillar was still in the process of populating its steering committee in anticipation of posting job advertisements.

As part of its evaluation of the SAFI process, CAPRA invited the CSDA and Sustainability steering committee chairs and search committee chairs to meet with CAPRA to hear their input about the timelines of key events of the SAFI process and

their opinions of the efficiency of the overall process. The CSDA representatives reported the following challenges and input: 1) candidates wished to know which bylaw unit they would be assigned to and some faculty members in the pillar felt that the cluster's sub advertisements should have been clearer in this regard. 2) the Academic Personnel office ran the diversity statistics for the search, and while CSDA was not informed of the numerical value assigned to the diversity benchmarks, they were told they reached them. The Council of Deans, with the pillar's permission, provided input on the diversity of CSDA's candidates, and, helped narrow down the long list to create a short list of candidates. CSDA leadership stated that they will recommend to the Provost/EVC that 1) the search committee should draft the job advertisements next time, not the steering committee; 2) once the steering committee defines the cluster, the search committee should form immediately and then take over with the drafting of the language of the job advertisements, and 3) the decision on the hiring of the four faculty members under this pillar should be made by the search committee after consulting with the relevant AP units. The hiring decision should not be made by the Council of Deans.

SAFI Survey

As a result of negative feedback and concern from faculty colleagues, CAPRA members discussed the possibility of conducting a second survey of faculty for the purposes of data collection on the process of the cluster hiring (the committee conducted a survey last year on SAFI). It was too early to determine whether these future hires, if made, are as successful or more successful had they occurred under a traditional, non-cluster hiring process. However, CAPRA reasoned that a survey conducted at the end of this semester could be used to provide guidance to the pillars that are scheduled to conduct faculty searches next year.

In May 2016, CAPRA sought input from campus faculty members who have expertise in surveys to help draft a more nuanced and cohesive survey. The survey was also shared with Division Council for input. The final version of the survey, in conjunction with the Provost/EVC, was then issued to all Senate faculty members and included multiple choice questions and text boxes for comments. Sixty-seven percent of eligible members voted and the macro-level conclusions from CAPRA were 1) a majority do not support SAFI in its current form, 2) there is support for SAFI in a modified form, but the faculty consensus is that 20% or fewer FTE lines should be allocated to it, 3) a majority

of the faculty see a benefit to the cluster hiring process but there is no consensus on which elements are superior, and 4) there seems to be faculty support for cluster hiring, however at a much more limited scale.

The results of the survey with comments (respondents' identities were kept confidential) were submitted to all Senate faculty, the Provost/EVC, and the Chancellor. The raw data results that did not include the comments, as well as CAPRA's macro and micro-level analyses of the results, were submitted to the Provost/EVC.

On June 23, CAPRA and the Provost/EVC met to discuss the survey results and the analysis. The Provost/EVC acknowledged the majority of respondents were not in favor of the SAFI process or allocating such a high percentage of FTE lines to pillars. However, he also stated that he is unwilling to completely eliminate the SAFI process as this would disadvantage the pillars that are currently hiring faculty or are in advanced stages of preparation for forming searches. The Provost/EVC agreed that he will issue an all-faculty communication that indicates 1) his desire to hold conversations with faculty members in fall 2016 to prepare for the following year's hires, 2) his willingness to reduce the number of FTE lines he intended to go to pillars as well as his approval for faculty members to disband their current collaborations and form new ones, and 3) a re-articulation of how many FTE lines will go to foundational areas and how many will be allocated to the pillars.

Foundational (Non-SAFI) FTEs

As it does each fall semester, CAPRA reviewed and revised its annual process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests in preparation for FTE request review in spring semester. The committee decided not to include SAFI considerations or guidance for cluster hiring in the document; rather, the criteria would only apply to foundational FTE requests. CAPRA and the Provost/EVC agreed that SAFI/cluster hiring and foundational hiring would proceed in a separate but parallel manner with CAPRA being consulted on both. The revised document for the criteria for evaluation was finalized by CAPRA in September 2015 and shared with the Provost/EVC for input. Receiving no input on the criteria for evaluation document by October 2015, CAPRA requested an update from the Provost/EVC who asked if he should still proceed with the formal call for FTE requests or if CAPRA wished him to expedite the process by asking the deans to submit their foundational FTE priorities to CAPRA immediately. CAPRA agreed that, given the late timeline, it would be more efficient to simply ask the

deans to submit their priorities now for this year's hires and to issue a formal call at a later time for FTE requests for next year's hires.

At the end of October 2015, CAPRA received the foundational FTE priorities from each dean. The committee held a lengthy discussion and while there were only four foundational FTE lines for allocation, CAPRA members decided to recommend six areas that should receive foundational FTE lines. CAPRA members then informed the Provost/EVC of its recommendations along with the rationale for its priority rankings. The committee's recommendations were formally submitted via memo to the Provost/EVC and the Senate Chair.

In early December 2015, the Provost/EVC informed CAPRA that he sent a memo to the deans with his decision on the allocation of foundational FTE lines. Instead of allocating four lines as was originally announced in the Provost/EVC's hiring plan distributed to the campus in spring 2014, he allocated six lines as recommended by CAPRA. Three lines were allocated to SSHA, two to SNS, and one to SOE.

In January 2016, CAPRA again reviewed its criteria for the evaluation of foundational FTE requests and re-submitted it to the Provost/EVC with a request that it be sent to the schools as soon as possible.

In mid-February, the Provost/EVC informed CAPRA that he had no revisions to the document. CAPRA then formally submitted the document to the Provost/EVC via email, with a request that he send to the schools as soon as possible so that CAPRA can review the foundational FTE requests and provide rankings to the Provost/EVC by the end of April. CAPRA suggested the deadline of April 8 for the deans to send their FTE requests, giving the deans a timeline of almost two months.

When the document had not been sent to the deans by mid-March, the Provost/EVC stated that his delay in submitting the document was due to pressing campus issues and strategic planning events. He suggested minor revisions to the document to which CAPRA agreed, and on March 18, the Provost/EVC submitted his FTE letter to the school deans with CAPRA's document appended.

On April 20, CAPRA finalized its review of the foundational FTE requests and shared its recommended rankings with the Provost/EVC at the end of the meeting and later,

formally, via email communication. The Provost/EVC announced that he will issue his final FTE allocation decision to the campus before the end of spring semester.

Space Planning and Allocation

CAPRA's other main function, in addition to advising the Provost/EVC on FTE allocation, is space planning and allocation. The Provost/EVC asked CAPRA for assistance on how he should communicate to the faculty that while the campus is still planning to hire 150 faculty members over the next six years, the campus will have to be very strategic about whom it hires due to the critical space shortage. The campus may have to hire fewer numbers of faculty over the first few years of the six-year plan, and higher numbers in the later years.

The 2020 Project calls for 10,000 undergraduate students and 1,000 graduate students and CAPRA remained concerned about space implications. The Provost/EVC shared this concern and stated that he will consult CAPRA for input once the 2020 project plans are nearing implementation. It is crucial that space be found especially for academic units, new faculty, and incoming graduate students.

Consultation with Provost/EVC

At the January 20 meeting, the Provost/EVC announced that he and the deans were in the midst of drafting a document related to the transition to a new school academic structure. This draft reorganization document would first be shared with the Chancellor for approval and then distributed to the faculty. The goal is to ensure that if the school academic structure does change, it will solve the problems that faculty members have raised with the current state of affairs.

The Provost/EVC asked CAPRA to hold the draft document in confidence which the committee honored. After reviewing the draft, CAPRA responded to the Provost/EVC to state that given the scope and impact of the proposed plan, it requires much broader feedback—even in its initial draft form—than can be provided by CAPRA alone. Soliciting feedback from bylaw unit/AP chairs will insure that perspectives from all faculty will surface and help shape the conversation about reorganization. Secondly, CAPRA noted that the draft this reorganization plan did not address the memo that was written and signed by all bylaw chairs and sent to the Provost/EVC and deans last year. In that memo, the chairs urged the administration to undertake a collaborative

reorganization effort. In sum, CAPRA elected not to provide official feedback on the draft reorganization plan until all faculty have had the opportunity to review it.

CAPRA also opined on the following issues:

2020 Project

Throughout the academic year, CAPRA benefited from consultation with Vice Chancellor of Budget & Planning Dan Feitelberg and AVC of Real Estate Abigail Rider. Given that this year would see the choosing of the design team that would be hired to build the campus for the 2020 Project, CAPRA members were interested in monitoring 2020 Project developments.

CAPRA helped find faculty members to attend the series of design team meetings in fall 2015. The committee made requests during the year to view the technical specification documents and to allow these documents to be shared with faculty members so they can make informed recommendations in their meetings with the design teams. However, the committee appreciated that there were legal impediments to executing this request.

The Regents voted to approve the 2020 Project in December 2015.

Financial proposals were received by the campus in April. Technical expert panels (which included faculty members) were convened to judge the proposals on seven categories. All comments were to be sent to the evaluation committee which included Vice Chancellors (excluding VC Feitelberg and VC for Business & Administrative Services Michael Reese), faculty members from each of the three schools, and a representative from Staff Assembly. CAPRA's main interest was the category related to academic facilities, and in February, VC Feitelberg and AVC Rider attended another committee meeting to explain the rating system for the proposals.

The committee's final consultation of the year with VC Feitelberg occurred in May 2016, when CAPRA members requested clarification on the source of the external funding for the 2020 Project as well as the source and amount of internal funding. CAPRA believed it was important that these questions be addressed so the campus can plan for future faculty FTE lines and ensure it has the appropriate amount of start-up funds for new

faculty members. VC Feitelberg provided an overview of the campus's Long Range Financial Model that was developed to help assess financial capacity and risk for campus operations and capital investments. Expenditures included in the model included instruction, faculty start-up, and academic support. VC Feitelberg confirmed that the 2020 Project's budget forecasting spans a 40-year time period and contains various assumptions, such as 1) the 10,000 undergraduate student enrollment projected in the 2020 Project if successful, 2) an allocation of State general funds with the existing MOU, and 3) gross resident tuition revenue.

VC Feitelberg also provided the fiscal year 2015-2016 all-funds base budget and the 2016-2017 preliminary budget.

Budget

Early in the academic year, CAPRA pointed out to the Provost EVC that CAPRA's charge includes a statement that CAPRA is to meet with the Chancellor's designee for a "briefing on all sources of revenue for the Merced campus, the allocation of revenue to units of the campus, and budgetary planning for the succeeding academic year." CAPRA has not had this opportunity for the past few years. The Provost/EVC acknowledged the last two years were a transition period with regard to the campus budget but agreed that moving forward, CAPRA should receive this information and provide input to him on the subject matter.

In October 2015, AVC of Finance Donna Jones distributed to CAPRA campus budget information that was previously created for the Chancellor's Cabinet and attended a committee meeting to present the information. In May 2016, VC Feitelberg also provided the fiscal year 2015-2016 all-funds base budget and the 2016-2017 preliminary budget.

Assessment

CAPRA benefited from updates from its Vice Chair, who, by virtue of this position, serves on the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC). Major topics of discussion at PROC included the ES graduate program review (the first graduate program to undergo review), the Anthropology review, and discussions on the American Studies minor with regard to its low enrollment and implications for review.

Systemwide Review Items

- UCPB updates. The major topics of discussion this year were the proposed increased undergraduate enrollment across the ten campuses, the retirement options task force report, updates on self-supporting programs, campus budget deficits, and UCOP's proposal for performance-based costing.
- Retirement Options Task Force Report. CAPRA's position was that new retirement benefit rules will substantially reduce the retirement benefits for new hires and will significantly impact UCM's ability to recruit and retain top faculty.
- Guiding Principles for Search Waivers for Academic Appointees. CAPRA supported the principles insofar as they clarify the current search waiver process that provides flexibility in faculty hiring. However, the committee hope that that faculty members' ability to obtain waivers for other academic positions such as postdoctoral scholars, project scientists, and junior specialists is not adversely affected

Campus Review Items

- CAPRA reviewed and endorsed the Honors Task Force report, the MIST PhD proposal (but retained concerns about the program's proposed plan to support graduate students), the revised GASP major proposal (after its concerns about rigor of the curriculum and LPSOE FTE lines were alleviated), and the proposed minor in World Heritage (after it received clarification on the duties of the proposed, full-time lecturer beyond alleviating the teaching workload of current ladder-rank faculty members).
- Revised Academic Degree Policy. CAPRA believed the policy is too restrictive on who can initiate a proposal for a new academic degree unit and suggested the language be clarified to state that the academic unit or graduate group chair initiates the proposal.

Respectfully submitted:

CAPRA members:

Mukesh Singhal, Chair (SOE) – UCPB representative.

Anne Kelley, Vice Chair (SNS)

Josh Viers, Senate Vice Chair (SOE) and CAPRA chair in September 2015.

Marilyn Fogel, (SNS)

Nate Monroe (SSHA)

Kurt Schnier (SSHA) from April 2016. Replaced Will Shadish, dec. March 2016.

Ex officio, non-voting member:

Cristián Ricci, Senate Chair (SSHA)

Student Representatives:

Lauren Edwards, Graduate Student Representative, GSA

Hunter Drobenaire, Undergraduate Student Representative, ASUCM

Senate Staff:

Simrin Takhar

**COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

In academic year 2015-2016, the Committee on Research (COR) met 11 times and conducted business via teleconference, email, and in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw [II.IV.3.B](#). The issues that COR considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

Consultation and Review

Consultation with Provost/EVC Peterson and VCORED Traina

- Throughout the academic year, COR members benefited from updates on various research-related issues from Provost/EVC Peterson and VCORED Traina, an ex-officio committee member. Major topics of consultation between COR and VCORED included the distribution of indirect cost return funds, Senate faculty grant awards. The VCORED also provided updates to COR throughout the year on discussion topics at the Council of Vice Chancellors.

Future Campus Research Infrastructure

- COR members discussed the need for increased transparency from the schools and the Office of Research (OoR) regarding the planning and development for future campus research infrastructure, specifically faculty grant support. COR supported the efforts of OoR in requesting additional staff and funding to facilitate the projected growth as publicized in Project 2020. However, COR recognized a possible gap between the grant functions supported centrally from the Research Development Services (RDS) office and what will be supported by the schools. In light of faculty agitation due to the absence of any announcement of this gap in service, COR requested a more transparent plan be developed in cooperation with the three schools and RDS, ideally to include faculty consultation. COR stated their willingness to provide the required faculty input and requested enhanced interactions with the VCORED to improve communication and planning between the schools and the Research Development Services office.

Senate Faculty Grants

- COR was successful in requesting and receiving an increase in the total amount of funds, to \$175,000, and this year, in an effort to reduce disparities between schools and remove ambiguities, the committee trialed a new structure to categorize grants: “Seed” grants for new projects, and “Research Acceleration” grants, intended for specific, critical needs to finish a research project. COR was able to fund 29 out of the 33 proposals received.

Limited Submission Policy

- COR submitted for review a draft policy on evaluating proposals for limited submission competitions. Committee members reviewed a memo from the SNS Executive Committee which included a suggestion of eliminating school-level input. COR felt strongly that school-level input is necessary for discipline-specific expertise to be employed in the review process. COR also noted that the timeline has been moved forward to accommodate the extra time for school review. The policy was approved by VCORED Traina and adopted by Research Development Services.

Senate Awards

- COR members reviewed nominations for the “Distinction in Research” and the “Early Career Research” awards, selecting one winner per award.

Campus Review Items

- CCGA Proposals.
 - Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology (MIST). COR endorsed the proposal but had several concerns, including a lack of clarity as to what typical avenues for employment for “Ph.D.s in Management” are, lack of clarity about how the listed graduate numbers will be sustained, how standards across the program will be maintained consistently, with such a heavy reliance on graduate offerings from other groups, and a concern about the implication that faculty are “entitled” to a certain number of Teaching Assistants, when this is dependent on enrollment number policies in effect.
 - Public Health. COR approved the CCGA proposal in “Public Health for the Ph.D. and M.S. Degrees”.
- Endorsement of LASC Memo on Library Funding. COR joined the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications (LASC) in requesting increased funding and additional resources for the UC Merced Library, to align with the mission of a research university.
- Faculty Equity Advisor (FEA). The Committee on Diversity & Equity shared a proposal for a new Faculty Equity Advisor to be implemented during faculty hiring. COR recognized the importance of diverse pools of candidates for faculty selections, but had concerns about the proposal, which were shared with DivCo.
- Endowed Chair Proposal. The Committee on Diversity & Equity shared a proposal for the “Selection and Appointment of Endowed Chairs”. COR members has no comments on this proposal.
- Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI). In Fall 2016, COR will be reviewing the Sierra Nevada Research Institute.
- Organized Research Unity (ORU) Policy. COR members reviewed the ORU policy from UC San Diego. COR recommended that, for all other research units that are not ORUs, the Provost’s policy on Centers be adapted for use. Additionally, the Chair recommended that the comprehensive policies on the establishment and review of research units, drafted in AY 13-14 and approved by the Senate, be used as a handbook for the future.
- COR plans to work with the administration on indirect cost return, with the hope of using returns to promote the university’s research mission.

Systemwide Review Items

- APM Revisions. COR did not have any comments regarding several proposed revisions to APM, as requested by the Division Council.
- University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) Updates. UCORP discussed the following major issues this academic year: funding and policy development for Multi-Campus Research Units, the new position of “Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship”, reporting

to President Napolitano, discussions on the openness of research, revision to the “Common Rule for the Protection of Human Subjects” policy.

Respectfully submitted,

COR members

Ajay Gopinathan, Chair and UCORP representative (SNS)

Steve Nicholson, Vice Chair (SSHA)

Miguel Carreira-Perpinan (SOE)

Ramen Saha (SNS)

Michael Scheibner (SNS)

Deborah Wiebe (SSHA) (Fall only)

Ex-Officio

Samuel Traina, VC Research and Economic Development (SOE)

Senate Staff

Simrin Takhar, Senate Principal Analyst

Gregory Fellin, Senate Senior Analyst

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

In academic year 2015-2016, the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) conducted business via teleconference, email, and in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw [II.IV.3.B](#). The issues that CRE considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

GENERAL PROCEDURES

The Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) issues formal Legislative Rulings to resolve disputes or clear up ambiguities regarding Senate authority, procedures, or jurisdiction. Legislative Rulings are binding unless modified by subsequent legislation or action from the Board of Regents. CRE also prepares and reports to the Division, or to any of its Faculties, such changes and additions to their Bylaws and Regulations proposed by other committees or by individuals; edits and publishes the Manual of the Merced Division at such intervals as it deems expedient; and determines whether a person meets the conditions for membership in the Division.

ELECTIONS

- ***Academic Senate Elections:*** The call for nominations for six positions on the Committee on Committees and two At-large members of the Divisional Council was distributed to the Senate membership on April 11, 2016. All positions for the Committee on Committees were for two-year terms, while one At-Large position would serve for two years, the other position serving for one year. Nominating petitions required five signatures including the signature of the candidate showing willingness to serve. Complete forms were due to the Senate on April 29, 2016. On May 2, 2016, CRE extended the nomination period to allow nominations to be returned to the Senate office on May 6, 2016. On June 6, 2016, CRE extended the nomination period to allow nominations to be returned to the Senate office on June 17, 2016.
- ***Online Voting System:*** CRE continued to use the system developed in collaboration with the Cognitive & Information Sciences Unit and the Office of Information Technology.

FORMAL LEGISLATIVE RULINGS ISSUED

CRE made no formal legislative rulings in AY 2015-2016.

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM DIVCO

- ***03/07/16 Voting Rights Policy:*** In October 2015, CRE discussed the drafting of a policy related to the process for voting rights and eligibility in the Schools. The policy will be formally proposed in Fall 2016.

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM THE SCHOOLS

- ***02/1/2016 Review of Cognitive and Information Sciences Bylaws:*** In November 2015, CRE was asked to review the bylaws for the Cognitive and Information Sciences program, which were unanimously approved by the committee.

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- ***11/30/15 Revision to the MAPP:*** CRE considered revisions to the Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures (MAPP).

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Vanderschraaf, Chair (SSHA)
Lin Tian, Vice Chair (SNS)
Lilian Davila (SOE)

Ex-Officio
Cristián Ricci, Divisional Council Chair (SSHA)
Joshua Viers, Division Council Vice Chair (SOE)

Senate Staff
Fatima Paul, Senate Assistant Director
Gregory Fellin, Senate Senior Analyst

COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUITY (D&E)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2015-2016

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

Academic Year (AY) 2015-2016 was the inaugural year of the Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E). The committee was empaneled as a result of the request made by the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom that diversity and equity issues would be better served if they were placed under the purview of a separate, standing Senate committee such that exists on all other UC campuses. Following an approval vote by the Senate faculty in spring 2015, D&E was officially created as a standing committee.

In AY 2015-2016, D&E held a total of 6 regularly scheduled in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw [II.IV.6](#). Some additional business was completed via electronic mail discussions.

Areas of Focus/Academic Year Goals

In the first meeting of fall semester, D&E members outlined four areas for the committee to pursue throughout the academic year.

1) *Establishment of equity advisors.*

D&E members recognized the need to recruit and retain diverse faculty members in an effort to more fully diversify the faculty as a whole. To that end, the committee conducted research on the practices of other UC campuses in this regard. Four UC campuses have faculty equity advisors (FEA) whose roles include advising faculty search committees on recruitment strategies, reviewing candidate pools, addressing campus climate issues, and assisting in approving the short list before campus visits begin. D&E members acknowledged that such a system at UCM would represent two major challenges: a culture change and an additional service burden on faculty members who volunteer to serve in this role. Therefore, the committee decided that the proposed plan for implementing FEAs at UCM should be introduced in phases. Phase 1 would be to establish diversity statements as a requirement across the schools, phase 2 would be to identify one or two faculty members in each school to act as an equity

advisor, and phase 3 would be to appoint one faculty member to each search committee to serve as an equity advisor for that search.

It was also acknowledged that FEAs would have to agree to undergo training in order to more efficiently advise faculty search committees. In January 2016, Chair Golash-Boza attended a training session on implicit bias at UC Davis and in early spring, D&E members worked on adapting those training materials for UCM's future FEAs.

Phases one and two were both completed in fall semester 2015: in October, ex-officio, non-voting committee member and Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Gregg Camfield informed D&E that school deans have agreed to require statements of contributions to diversity from all faculty candidates and in December 2015, a D&E member announced that she identified one full Professor who was willing to serve as an FEA beginning fall 2016.

In April 2016, the D&E committee submitted a formal proposal to Division Council for the establishment of FEAs at UCM. After an online discussion with Council members, D&E's proposal was slightly revised. Division Council formally endorsed the revised proposal in May and the proposal was then transmitted to the Provost/EVC and VPF for implementation by August 2016. The proposal's main tenets stated that 1) FEAs will work with search committees to help them develop a search plan that includes outreach to relevant disciplinary groups, explains the search process, and includes benchmarks for candidate pool diversity; 2) FEAs will work with search committees in an effort to meet benchmarks in terms of a diverse long list and a set of on-campus interview candidates, and 3) FEAs will be selected by the D&E committee, in consultation with the VPF and the school deans, will serve for a two-year term, will receive \$5,000 in additional annual compensation, and finally, will attend FEA Training at UC Irvine.

At the time of this writing, the proposal (including Division Council's endorsement memo) was under review by the Provost/EVC and VPF.

2) Selection and reappointment of endowed chairs.

In the last academic year, the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom submitted a memo to Division Council, pointing out the lack of gender and ethnic diversity in UCM's endowed chairships. The memo was discussed at a subsequent Division Council meeting. At the fall semester Meeting of the Division,

the Provost/EVC asked for D&E's input on procedures that can be used by each school in the selection and reappointing of endowed chairs.

In fall 2015, D&E members, in consultation with the VPF, reviewed the endowed chairs section (6001) of the Merced Academic Policies & Procedures (MAPP) and recommended revisions that became the committee's proposal for the selection and reappointment of endowed chairs. D&E sought to create a process that is equitable, transparent, and in line with practices at other UC campuses.

The main points of D&E's proposal stated that 1) a search committee, with multi-disciplinary (unit) representation, shall be appointed by the appropriate dean(s) after consultation with the relevant academic personnel chair(s) and should be charged with searching for and recommending an appointment for an endowed chair; 2) an endowed chair may be used either as a recruitment tool during the faculty appointment negotiation process or an endowed chair appointment can be made to existing faculty members; 3) appointments to endowed chairs shall be made in accordance with regularly established procedures for faculty appointments as stated in MAPP 2013, and 4) for reappointment, a review of the accomplishments of the endowed chair holder shall be conducted at the beginning of the final year of the specified period of appointment or in the appointee's fifth year, whichever comes first, and the review dossier should include the results of consultation with the faculty and the vote, which should follow the same procedures used for appointment of the chair holder. The proposal also included a list of suggested criteria for the review of the chair holder.

In April 2016, the D&E committee submitted a formal proposal to Division Council. The Council endorsed it in May and at the time of this writing, the proposal is under review by the Provost/EVC and VPF.

3) Campus diversity event for faculty.

In December 2015, D&E members discussed the idea of holding an event for faculty of color and other allies to address issues such as micro aggression and effectively working with students, administrators, and colleagues.

On March 8, 2016, D&E hosted its first diversity event with the campus visit of Professor Patricia Matthew of Montclair University. Professor Matthew delivered a luncheon talk on the "unwritten rules of tenure" and held meetings with faculty

members, academic leadership, and graduate students. The event was well-attended and well-received and Professor Matthew expressed her admiration for the diversity work being conducted at UCM.

4) Diversity considerations in program review.

In the last academic year, D&E chair Golash-Boza (then serving as vice chair of the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom) suggested to the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) that diversity issues should be required to be taken into consideration in program reviews. PROC agreed and this year, that committee sought to include this requirement when it revised the program review policy.

In fall 2015, the revised undergraduate program review policy was submitted to UGC and GC as the lead reviewers, but D&E chose to also review the policy given its position that as program review can be an opportunity for units on campus to reflect on their efforts to promote diversity and a welcoming climate for all. D&E's two main suggested revisions to the undergraduate program review policy were 1) to specify that a program must describe its efforts to recruit faculty from traditionally underrepresented backgrounds, particularly in terms of gender and ethnic diversity, and 2) that external reviewers meet with a diversity and equity representative during their site visit as it would add accountability to the program review process.

While D&E conducted regular Senate business throughout the year, these four issues guided the direction of much of the committee's work.

D&E also deliberated on the following:

Mentoring of President's Postdoctoral Fellows

D&E was concerned that assistant professors are not allowed to serve as postdoc mentors. With its preponderance of assistant professors, UCM is placed at a disadvantage not being able to allow untenured faculty members to serve as President's Postdoctoral Fellow mentors for the following reasons: 1) it diminishes assistant professors' roles in forming the collaboration with a postdoc; 2) postdocs often choose their advisors based on specific research interests (not status of their potential advisors), and not allowing a postdoc to apply to be a President's Postdoctoral Fellow because

their advisor is an assistant professor does a disservice to the specific postdoc and to the field as a whole; 3) the majority of current postdocs at UC Merced are ineligible to apply to be a President's Postdoctoral Fellow simply because their advisors are assistant professors. This puts UC Merced at a significant competitive disadvantage for attracting top postdoc candidates; 4) assistant professors are often ideal advisors for postdoctoral fellows as they have more recent and relevant experience with modern-day job searches, and 5) the presence of these postdocs not only serves to build an assistant professor's research profile, but can help assuage the faculty member's sense of intellectual isolation, especially on a small campus.

D&E strongly recommended that the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program requirements be modified to allow assistant professors in those fields where advising postdocs is the norm at all academic ranks (e.g. the laboratory sciences), to serve as President's Postdoctoral Fellow advisors and requested that Division Council forward D&E statement to systemwide Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson.

Systemwide Review Items

- Faculty salary increase. Campuses were asked to opine on the pool of funds available for redistribution which amounts to 1.5% of total faculty salary. D&E proposed that deans should examine each bylaw unit – and conduct an analysis across bylaw units – to identify gender, race-based, or sexual orientation inequities. If no inequities are found, then the deans should make an argument for redistribution based on exceptional merit, then on compression and inversion. Once the deans have submitted their requests for faculty salary increases, the Provost/EVC should redistribute the funds to the schools on the basis of these requests with the following priority: 1) equity; 2) exceptional merit, and 3) compression and inversion.
- Retirement Options Task Force Report. At the request of UC President Napolitano, a systemwide task force was formed to make recommendations on the revision of the UC Retirement program on which the campuses were asked to opine. One of the task force's recommendations was to create a defined contribution plan which D&E argued individualizes the investment risk and stands in contrast to the defined benefit plan that is the hallmark of the strong

benefits package currently offered by the UC. D&E therefore opposed the proposal, pointing out that it reduces retirement benefits for a significant portion of future employees.

- D&E endorsed the proposed revision to the APM that would change the name of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity to the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity.
- Search Waiver Guiding Principles. D&E did not completely endorse the guidelines as presented, as they did not include exceptions to allow for addressing the lack of under-represented minorities among UC faculty. D&E requested that the guidelines be modified to reflect stipulations for diversity.
- University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). Chair Golash-Boza kept D&E members informed about UCAADE business. The main items of discussion this year were the Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance, the revised presidential policy on sexual violence and sexual harassment, the retirement options benefits task force report, anti-discrimination policy, and a discussion with systemwide Provost Aimeé Dorr and systemwide Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs Susan Carlson about faculty diversity.

Respectfully submitted:

D&E members:

Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair (SSHA) – UCAADE representative

Wei-Chun Chin, Vice Chair (SOE)

Clarissa Nobile (SNS)

Ex officio, non-voting member:

Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

Staff:

Simrin Takhar

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE & ACADEMIC FREEDOM (FWAF)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2015-2016

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

Academic Year (AY) 2015-2016 was the inaugural year of the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom. The committee was empaneled as a result of the request made by the former Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF) that faculty welfare and academic freedom issues would be better served if they were placed under the purview of a separate, standing Senate committee such that exists on all other UC campuses. Following an approval vote by the Senate faculty in spring 2015, FWAF was officially created as a standing committee.

In AY 2015-2016, FWAF held a total of 4 regularly scheduled in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw [II.IV.5](#). Some additional business was completed via electronic mail discussions.

Areas of Focus

In the first meeting of fall semester, FWAF members agreed that its overarching goal is faculty retention. All its activities during the academic year were guided by this general goal.

Consultation with Vice Provost for the Faculty

FWAF benefited during the academic year from consultation with ex-officio, non-voting committee member, Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Gregg Camfield. In addition to VPF Camfield's attendance at meetings, the FWAF chair met with him via regular, standing meetings.

Among the many issues FWAF discussed with the VPF is "change management" which seeks to assuage the administrative burden faced by faculty members. The two-step approach was to: (1) identify the most crucial problems faced by faculty members and arrange for staff support to ameliorate them, and (2) examine the processes that are not working efficiently and begin finding solutions. Faculty members were asked to create lists of aspects of the campus and their campus life they wished worked more efficiently, and to submit them to the VPF, whereupon, the VPF asked for FWAF's input. Senior leadership

was tasked with strategizing about short- and long-term solutions.

Community building was another theme for discussion the committee had with the VPF this year, as a way to raise faculty morale and foster a sense of collegiality. The FWAF chair worked closely with the VPF to create a faculty social hour with external vendors where faculty can socialize and network with colleagues. The Chancellor expressed her support for this idea and announced in the last FWAF meeting in May, 2016 that she hopes to have such an event in place by fall semester 2016.

Other ongoing items of consultation between FWAF and the VPF included: **(1)** a new faculty orientation onboarding model in which all incoming faculty hires are assigned to campus transition teams comprised of individuals from relevant campus units, **(2)** the formation of Digital Measures focus groups to make the system more efficient for faculty, **(3)** faculty start-up funds, **(4)** extending Active Service-Modified Duty (ASMD), and **(5)** the development of a campus-wide Police Advisory Board.

Faculty Success Program

The Faculty Success Program (part of the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity) entered its second year and FWAF continued its partnership with the Academic Personnel office and VPF Camfield (begun last year when the committee was FWDAF) to secure funding for a cohort of assistant professors to complete the online development program. FWAF decided that last year's program cohort would assist the committee in reviewing the applications for this year. The program's "boot camp" event was held in spring 2016. Three applicants – one from each school – were selected this year.

Faculty Professional Development Series

Begun under last year's FWDAF, this year's FWAF continued its partnership with the Academic Personnel office on sponsoring a year-long series of workshops aimed at the professional development of assistant professors. Topics included strategies for promotion, an inclusive scientific community, writing an effective self-statement, and building successful mentoring relationships (an external speaker was invited for the latter).

Proposed Expansion of ASMD

FWAF submitted a memo to Division Council strongly advising that serious consideration be given to expanding the provisions of ASMD as currently outlined in APM 760-28 to include providing care for immediate, and/or close family members, and those that fall

under the provision of legal guardianship. Currently, ASMD is only available for faculty members caring “for a newborn child or a child under age five newly placed for adoption or foster care.” FWAF suggested that this language be modified to better match that of the recently-revised APM 133 dealing with “stop the clock” provisions for untenured faculty. This proposed change would not only better align ASMD with the new criteria adopted in APM 133, it would also provide relief for tenured faculty caring for an ailing family member or legal guardianship for whom the “stop the clock” provisions are not relevant. Currently, any relief given to faculty members in this situation (such as a reduced teaching load) is reliant on ad hoc departmental arrangements. Extending the provisions of ASMD to cover these circumstances would ensure equity in treatment across units and to promote family-friendly policies that extend beyond the birth or adoption of a child.

At the May 5 committee meeting, Provost/EVC Peterson confirmed that FWAF’s memo on the proposed ASMD revisions was being discussed at the system-wide level, as other campuses have suggested similar revisions to allow senior faculty to defer scheduled personnel actions without punishment. According to VPF Camfield, the system-wide Senate will issue a revised APM section on ASMD to the campuses for review in January 2017.

Recommended Alternatives for Faculty Start-Up Funds

In recognition of the fact that a number of faculty have fears that their start-up funds would be sequestered by the Provost/EVC if not spent in a prescribed manner, FWAF submitted a memo to Division Council in spring 2016 with recommended alternatives for the use of start-up funds. FWAF requested the Council’s endorsement and for the recommendations to be sent on VPF Camfield and Provost/EVC Peterson. The proposal stated: **(1)** all new hires to get access to start-up funds for six years, with an additional year possible by application to the dean in extraordinary circumstance (similar to stop-the-clock provisions). This may be especially important for new, junior faculty hires that are preparing their tenure cases in their 5th or 6th year, and thus, 6 years provides them sufficient time to use their funds accordingly to help ensure their successful advancement. **(2)** Allow new faculty hires to map out blocks of their start-up funds to be released for particular purposes over the period of 6 years (or up until tenure, should there be extenuating circumstances such as family or sick leave, or accelerated advancement). Faculty could have the option to modify this, with the dean’s approval. **(3)** If faculty are required to relinquish start-up funds because of an expiration date, the funds relinquished, either 100% or some reasonable percentage, will be returned at a later date such as when the faculty advances to tenure in

the form of a mid-career award or at promotion to full as an established career award. Similarly, if a faculty member is successful at obtaining a substantial grant while in the possession of start-up funds, allow the faculty to relinquish the funds as credit for later years as described for advancement to Associate or Full.

FWAF also strongly encouraged the Provost/EVC to dedicate all relinquished start-up funds to be used solely for supporting the research mission of the faculty as either funds: **(1)** to address retention of successful faculty, **(2)** to establish a bridge funding program, and/or **(3)** to enhance the existing Senate faculty research grant program.

Consultation with Director of Campus Climate

FWAF benefited from updates from Director of Campus Climate De Acker. Director Acker provided conflict resolution services, albeit informally, and served as a resource to all faculty, including Bylaw 55 unit chairs. The other two main components of her position are diversity and inclusion, and crisis intervention.

Director Acker also discussed with FWAF a resource guide on recognizing signs of a distressed colleague and with whom individuals can speak to for help or to report the behavior. FWAF members dedicated a significant amount of time on discussing how to address distressed faculty members and the roles of the deans, bylaw chairs, and faculty mentors. Faculty should feel comfortable with approaching their colleagues and mentors, but there is a question of whether unit chairs and deans are willing to assume the responsibility. This would require training for deans and unit chairs to properly prepare them to handle these situations. However, some faculty members are unwilling to speak to their senior colleagues or their mentors for fear of retaliation in their next personnel review. Several faculty members are also reluctant to report the distressed behavior of colleagues for fear of “exposing” their colleagues or “getting them into trouble”. Compounding these problems is the fact that there is a lack of appropriate mental health care in the community and no resources available for faculty members to find area providers.

At the end of spring semester, Director Acker and Associate Chancellor Luanna Putney circulated to FWAF members the proposed, new campus policy on Abusive Conduct. FWAF members asked for the proposed policy to be distributed to the Division Council for input by all Senate committees. At the end of the semester and academic year, Associate Chancellor Putney agreed to release the draft policy widely for campus input with a deadline of September 16, 2016 to ensure broad feedback from faculty.

Consultation with AVC & Chief of Police

In keeping with the theme of faculty retention and community – and in light of the campus events of November 4, 2015 – FWAF consulted with AVC of Public Safety and Police Chief Al Vasquez to discuss the development of campus emergency preparedness plans. FWAF recognized that campus stakeholders have different needs and any future plans should include input from a police advisory board, diversity and inclusion education, and emergency preparedness. The committee also advocated for training to be made available to faculty members and graduate student teaching assistants on self-defense and crisis responses. Given that students look to their faculty members for leadership in times of crisis and for guidance on proper procedures, it is imperative for faculty members to be part of the process to develop an overall campus emergency preparedness plan.

Members of FWAF felt strongly that campus police procedures be transparent and that the flow of communication be open and routine so that students, staff, and faculty feel safe at all times, and not just during crises. The committee recommended that students, staff, and faculty also be involved in advocating for the empaneling of a police advisory board, such that exists on other institutions. Such an institutional bond of trust will take a long time to create, but the campus should take the first steps to creating a culture of trust.

In January 2016, FWAF transmitted a memo to VPF Camfield that formally requested the initiation of the establishment of a task force or other committee that will be charged with formalizing the formation of a campus police advisory board.

After-School Program

FWAF recognized the need for after-school programming at the ECEC and for similar options for the multiple, traditional breaks such as Thanksgiving and Spring Break, as local schools' schedules do not align with UCM's academic calendar. FWAF agreed to partner with the Academic Personnel office in trying to determine how many parents on campus would utilize such a program. This is a carry-over item for the next academic year, as the Academic Personnel office may conduct a survey with FWAF providing input on this issue.

Consultation with Chancellor and Provost/EVC

As was traditional with the previous FWDAF, the last meeting of the academic year consisted of a debriefing with the Chancellor and Provost/EVC on the committee's business over the academic year and discussion of potential issues in the impending AY.

The Chancellor raised the following issues and topics with FWAF: **(1)** she requested FWAF's input on a campus version of the Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance, and acknowledged FWAF's position that the Regents' version provided too narrow of a definition of intolerance. A broader statement is to be implemented on campus in fall 2016 by the Chancellor's office per the Chancellor's request. **(2)** She offered her support to faculty and staff collaborating on establishing an after-school program either on campus or in the community. **(3)** She acknowledged the lack of the campus's workforce plan and stated with confidence that she would lead the effort over the summer to help ensure a plan is developed in a timely manner. **(4)** She has authorized the creation of a new administrative position to be housed in the VPF's office that will serve as the faculty "concierge" to improve staff support for faculty.

Systemwide Review Items

- UCFW updates. Major items of discussion this academic year were:
 - Modifications to the UC Retirement Program. A task force, comprised of faculty and administrators, was asked to recommend to UC President Napolitano whether the defined benefit plan would be supplemented by a defined contribution plan to make up the shortfall. Many faculty believe that this new process will negatively impact the UC's ability to recruit good faculty due to uncompetitive salaries. The consensus at UCFW is that the proposed revisions are unpopular for three major reasons: **(1)** the process violated the spirit and letter of shared governance; the proposed modifications to the retirement program were determined by the "Committee of Two" (UC President Napolitano and Governor Brown), and did not include Senate faculty; **(2)** the review period for the Academic Senate to review the modifications and respond was unreasonably short, and **(3)** the proposed revisions would significantly disadvantage the benefits of UC employees hired after July 1, 2016.
 - The nascent plans to create a UC Care HMO have been postponed at this time. The UC will only make small changes to the current UC Care plan.
- UCAF updates. Major items of discussion this year included the Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance, the retirement options benefits task force report, and cybersecurity measures taken by UCOP. Regarding the latter, UC faculty did not necessarily have concerns about the measures, rather, they were alarmed at the lack of Senate consultation when UCOP selected a cyber security vendor.
- Guiding principles for search waivers. FWAF did not completely endorse the

guidelines, as they do not include exceptions to allow for addressing disparities in diversity among faculty ranks such that Targets of Opportunity would allow.

- Retirement Benefits Task Force Report. FWAF agreed with UCFW's aforementioned position that the secrecy of the negotiations between Governor Brown and President Napolitano, combined with the unreasonably short review period for such a complex issue, showed a marked lack of respect for the spirit of shared governance. In addition, the various options put forth by the task force essentially ensure that any new tier that is created will significantly disadvantage new employees. Furthermore, in the absence of a corresponding increase in salary, this will cause the UC to fall even further behind comparator institutions, harming UCM's ability to recruit and retain top faculty.
- Allocation of 3% of faculty salary increase. It was announced that 1.5% of the increase was to be allocated directly to each faculty member. Each of the 10 campuses was asked to opine on how the remaining 1.5% was to be earmarked. Areas under consideration were one or more of the following: **(1)** salary compression, **(2)** salary inversion, **(3)** salary "inequities", and **(4)** exceptional merit and scholarship. In making its recommendations, FWAF requested additional information on ameliorating the costs of **(1)** and **(2)** above. The committee concluded that if funds are not available to completely (100%) resolve the disparities in salaries caused by **(1)**, **(2)**, and **(3)**, it would recommend addressing these disparities to at least 75-80% of the existing disparity for each case.
- Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance. While FWAF was in favor of the present discussions to potentially draft a Statement for the UC, it also recognized the controversy surrounding these discussions because of the potential of any statement to infringe upon First Amendment rights of freedom of speech and the University's protection of academic freedom. Nonetheless, the committee agreed that the rights and safety of all constituents present at academic institutions need to be protected, and inflammatory and hateful rhetoric has no place at institutions of higher education.
- FWAF reviewed and endorsed the proposed modifications to Senate Bylaw 140 pertaining to the renaming of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity to the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity.

Campus Review Items

- FWAF reviewed and endorsed the Honors Task Force Report.

Respectfully submitted:

FWAF members:

Rudy Ortiz, Chair (SNS), UCAF representative

Jayson Beaster-Jones (SSHA)

Laura Hamilton (SSHA)

UCFW representative:

Sean Malloy (SSHA)

Ex officio, non-voting member:

Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

Staff:

Simrin Takhar

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the academic year 2015-2016, the Graduate Council (GC) met 16 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw [II.IV.3.B](#). The issues that GC considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

Administrative Structure

- The Graduate Council operated with three standing subcommittees that met via email throughout the year:
 - Awards Subcommittee reviewed guidelines, applications and provided recommendations on awardees to the Graduate Division.
 - Membership: Nancy Burke (SSHA [Chair]), Ramesh Balasubramaniam (SSHA), Victor Muñoz (SOE), Changqing Li (SOE), Ricardo Cisneros (SSHA), Kurt Schnier (SSHA), Sachin Goyal (SOE), Ming-Hsuan Yang (SOE). As an experimental procedure to spread the burden of the review process, one round of reviews was facilitated by an expanded review panel including additionally one member of each graduate. A similar expansion for the OTA recruited LPSOEs and LSOEs.
 - CRF Subcommittee reviewed all graduate course request forms and provided a recommendation to the council as a whole.
 - Membership: Kurt Schnier (SSHA [Chair]), Mike Dawson (SNS), Laura Martin (OPRAAS)
 - Policy Subcommittee provided the initial review and recommendations on all graduate policies and systemwide policies.
 - Membership: Mike Dawson (SNS [Chair]), Ramesh Balasubramaniam (SSHA), Victor Muñoz (SOE)
- GC invited informal consultants to the membership that included Eric Cannon from the Office of Graduate Studies and Laura Martin, the Director of the Office of Periodic Review, Assessment, and Accreditation Support (OPRAAS), and Angela Krueger, Substantive Change and Graduate Assessment Coordinator, in order to provide an opportunity for administrative consultation.
- OPRAAS requested GC consider its role in graduate program review, with GC responding that GC can provide:
 - higher-level guiding statements on the characteristics of a successful graduate program;
 - input during the review process on experiences dealing with a particular program.

CCGA Proposals

- **GC Lead Reviewers and Process**
Proposals were assigned to individual GC members as lead reviewers, who did not have a conflict of interest. GC recognized the value of support letters from the school deans, Graduate Dean, and Provost, and encouraged Lead Authors to include such letters with their proposals.
- **IIGP extension**

GC unanimously voted in favor of recommending renewal of the Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP) for AY 2016-17, with a formal request for renewal sent to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs. Response is pending.

- **Program Advancement**
 - Mechanical Engineering (ME): approved by CCGA,
 - Public Health (PH): advanced to CCGA,
 - Economics (ECON): approved by CCGA, pending approval by the President,
 - Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS): GC anticipates revisions by early Fall 2016,
 - BEST (BEST): a revised proposal is expected by end of Fall 2016.

Graduate Course Requests

- **Course Request Forms**
GC approved 11 courses.
- **Course Request Form deadlines**
With UGC and the Registrar, GC agreed to establish the existing CRF deadlines as hard deadlines—with the possibility of occasional prior request for extension—for acceptance by the Registrar (rather than as flexible dates for submission of CRFs to the Registrar).
- **“Course (or Curriculum) Proposal and Management Information System” (CPMIS) Committee**
GC, in partnership with UGC and the Registrar’s Office, convened a new committee focused on unifying the procedures for CRF handling between GC and UGC in an electronic application, with the consideration of including additional documents such as CLOs and PLOs, and the potential for incorporating additional features, such as curriculum approval workflow, integration with the Student Information System (SIS and Banner), and Acalog, etc. Work will continue through the Fall, with a possible pilot in 2017. Committee membership included representation from Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, Registrar’s Office, OPRAAS, Undergraduate Education, School of Engineering, School of Natural Sciences, and School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, and Information Technology.

Conflict of Interest Policy

- GC voted to approve the AY 13-14 policy for use in AY 15-16.

Request for University Librarian to teach Interdisciplinary Humanities (IH)

- GC received a request to allow the UCM Librarian to be listed as an instructor of record for IH 205 for Fall 2016. The Chief Librarian is senate faculty, and GC welcomed a formal Lecturer Without Salary (LWOS) application for the proposed instructor(s), with a provision that any future requests would be reviewed annually. The formal application is outstanding as of the writing of this report.

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Scores

- UC Merced has one of the highest requirements for TOEFL Speaking score, and the Mechanical Engineering graduate program proposed a clarification to the Graduate Division admissions website. This revised text was presented for Graduate Council consideration. The committee agreed with the revision to the admissions website, and also agreed to revisit the idea of

amending the minimum TOEFL Speaking requirement to Fall 2016, when a full assessment of what impact the scores have can be conducted.

Membership in Graduate Programs

- GC discussed the roles of affiliate members within Graduate Programs. Currently, UC Merced has some affiliates in place that did not go through a formal approval process, but there is no current policy on campus for what Graduate Groups may be able to do, particularly in reference to CCGA proposal reviews. Using the [UC Davis Graduate Council policy](#) as a point of reference, this subject will be added for discussion by GC in Fall 2016.

Graduate Professional Development Course

- Throughout the year, GC has discussed the request from Graduate Division to teach a professional development course for credit. GC supports professional development activities by Graduate Division, as well as other entities, however policy prohibits Graduate Division from offering graduate courses for credit. To remain within policy, as well as minimally impact graduate group workloads, GC supports a cross-listed course. GC also noted that this matter is important because it addresses the fundamentals of UC organizational structure, academic policy, and shared governance at UC Merced. Graduate Division is an “academic administration” unit, unsanctioned to offer graduate courses. GC identified alternative approaches to achieve the goal of offering a professional development course, including:
 - Continuation of the series of professional workshops as already offered by Graduate Division
 - Professional development courses offered as a part of individual graduate groups’ curricula, as already offered by some Graduate Groups
 - Professional development courses as cross-listed offerings within existing Graduate Groups

The third approach generated additional discussion, with GC firmly stating they did not wish to prescribe or recommend any details of implementation, leaving that to Graduate Division and the Graduate Groups, so long as graduate policy is consistently followed. GC also emphasized several desirable outcomes, including integration of professional development with scholarly pursuits, facilitation of interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary activities, and investment (if required for such a course) being made in the graduate groups such that capacity for holistic development of professional scholars, and interdisciplinarity, can be an integral component of graduate groups’ activities.

Graduate Group Policies and Procedures

- **Annual Review:** In order to ensure continuing compliance with campus and systemwide policies and streamline the review process, GC members were assigned as primary and secondary reviewers of each Policy & Procedure document for content. OPRAAS reviewed the documents for each Policy & Procedure against what was published online, and the GC analyst reviewed each Policy & Procedure document for the inclusion of a cover letter and table of contents, requesting them from the Program Chair if missing. The Applied Math P&P were approved; CIS is recommended for approval pending minor corrections. All other programs’ P&P require additional revisions and review. This effort will continue into Fall 2016.

Designated Emphases and Concentrations

- GC members reviewed the revised policy on the establishment of designated emphases and concentrations, approving of the revisions.

- Programs not submitting a proposal:
 - Sociology
 - Chemistry & Chemical Biology
 - Psychological Sciences
 - Applied Mathematics
- Programs proposing:
 - IH – Anthropology
 - Quantitative & Systems Biology (after a request for extension)
 - QSB plans to submit 2-4 concentration proposals in AY 16-17.

The deadline for these will be in conjunction with CCGA proposals, and will be handled by the GC Chair in Fall 2016.

Grade Appeals Policy

- GC members agreed that campus should have one policy that includes instructions for both undergraduate and graduate students, revising an existing policy focused on undergraduates. GC approved the revised policy for campus distribution.

Attached (but not conjoined) Courses

- GC unanimously approved the proposed [policy](#) for the Registrar's Office to list all undergraduate and graduate courses that have been co-taught but not formally conjoined.

Revised Policy for Undergraduate Program Review

- A joint Graduate Council-Undergraduate Council-PROC Policy Review Subcommittee (JPRS) considered a revised policy for Undergraduate Program Review. GC was tasked to advise on whether a similar process of revisions and format would work for Graduate Program Review documentation, with GC members generally agreeing with the review procedure. The JPRS was reconstituted in 2016 to undertake revision of graduate policy during AY2016-17.

Course Conventions Review

- GC was presented a document for review from the Registrar's Office. GC provided their suggested revisions, and charged the Registrar with sending the document to UGC & GC biennially as part of a continuing discussion.
- The issue of a B/B- as a split point for a pass or fail grade was discussed and submitted to the Registrar's Office, with GC requesting them to update their website to clearly state a B- is not a passing grade. All graduate groups were also asked to clarify this split point in any new or revised curricula through the CRF process.

Consultations with Administrative Leadership

- To increase familiarity and communication of GC with Administrative Leadership, and vice versa, GC initiated a series of consultations during the year to complement the long-standing invitation to Provost/EVC Tom Peterson. Visitors included
 - Abigail Rider, AVC Real Estate Services
 - Laurie Herbrand, Registrar
 - Joshua Reinhold, Associate Registrar
 - Charles Nies, (interim at time of meeting) AVC Student Affairs
 - Kyle Hoffman, VC Development and Alumni Relations

- Jan Mendenhall, AVC Development and Alumni Relations

Requests regarding Graduate Students

- **Graduate Student Researchers (GSR)**
 - GC reviewed the topic of GSRs working in a professional unit, and cited the excellent opportunities this would provide. GC noted issues with faculty oversight, appropriate working hours, and the logistics of paying the GSR with regard to a PI's grant or from the professional unit. GC members agreed that the definition of GSR should not be weakened and any GSR assignment should be directly related to research.
- **Teaching as Scholarship**
 - With regard to some units offering 399 courses as part of an apprenticeship, but not making these available across all areas of campus, GC agreed that TAs should be emphasized as scholarship and apprenticeship rather than a mere job, in order to provide the adequate training for graduate students' future careers. GC members discussed which individuals on campus should be consulted on advancing teaching as scholarship, with a list of recommended campus units/individuals created. Due to time constraints, no further action was taken.
- **Petition to allow appointment of Graduate Student TA in a Graduate Course**
 - GC considered a petition from Psychology to allow appointment of a graduate student TA in a graduate course. Such an appointment would be in contravention of policy, as stated in the document "[Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses](#)", approved March 18 2015. The petition was declined and the policy affirmed as generally applicable and desirable.

Requests from the Division Council

- **Review of GASP Major Proposal:** GC endorsed the revised proposal.
- **Academic Degree Policy:** GC approved of the policy with only minor editing comments.
- **Revised Public Health Bylaw 55 Unit proposal:** GC had no comments.
- **Proposed World Heritage Minor:** GC declined to comment, as the proposal had no implications for graduate education.

Requests from the Graduate Division

- **Continuing Student Fellowship**
 - **Review and Rankings:** A total of 103 applications were received for the continuing student fellowships. GC provided complete rankings for the 2015-2016 Faculty Mentorship Program Fellowship, Graduate Student Opportunity Program Fellowship, Fletcher Jones Fellowship, Miguel Velez Scholarship, President's Dissertation Year Fellowship.
- **Outstanding Teaching Award**
 - **Review and Rankings:** A total of 16 applications were received for the 2015-2016 Outstanding Teaching Award. The Awards Subcommittee provided their rankings, which were approved by GC. A tie was identified, and GC requested that the Graduate Division (1) allow for the school to split the award and name the two tied students as winners, as the honor of winning the award would be more valuable on a C.V. than the monetary award, or (2) as per the PDY fellowship, find additional funds to cover one additional

award. Due to various constraints, Graduate Division made the award to one of the two tied nominees.

- **Proposal for new Award:** GC discussed the creation of a new award for an overall well-rounded graduate student, with the possibility of naming it after Professor William Shadish. The GC membership was in favor of the idea, but the funding of a new award would require further investigation. GC Chair spoke with VC Hoffman, who supported the idea and would try to speak with the Chancellor about the concept. GC can create an award, select an awardee, and make the recommendation to the Graduate Division. GC Awards Subcommittee Chair drafted a proposal to the Senate Chair and VPDGE Zatz.
- **Graduate Advisors Handbook – I**
 - GC considered a request from Environmental Systems (ES) to amend the Graduate Advisor’s Handbook for consistency with ES Policies and Procedures regarding the composition of Master’s Thesis Committees. The final authority on MS thesis committee composition is delegated to the graduate groups under certain circumstances and with some restrictions, with the Graduate Division, on behalf of GC, retaining the right to grant or decline exceptions.
- **Graduate Advisors Handbook – II**
 - Following revisions initiated with Graduate Division during AY2014-15, a fully revised copy of the Graduate Advisors Handbook was provided to GC on December 15, 2015. Due to the volume of other business, chapters were assigned to primary and secondary reviewers in March 2016. Review will be completed during Fall 2016, in readiness for new graduates enrolling Fall 2017.
- **Catalog: Graduate Studies Section**
 - GC voted unanimously in favor of the 2016-2017 UCM Catalog Graduate Studies Section as presented. During the review, some PLOs in the catalog were found to be different than those on the Graduate Division website. OPRAAS identified five Graduate Groups having discrepancies in their PLOs, and GC reviewed and approved the revisions for these as received.
 - A new policy for revising PLOs is being proposed for consideration by the incoming Council members.

Systemwide Business

- **Search Waivers:** GC was asked to review the guiding principles for search waivers in UC academic appointments, with the membership declining to comment as the issue does not hold direct implications for graduate education.
- **APM 360 and 210-4:** GC reviewed and had no objections or comments to the documents related to the proposed revisions of APM 360-Librarian Series, and APM 210-4-Instructions to Review Committees.
- **APM 278, 210-6, 279, 112, and 350:** GC reviewed and had no objections or comments to the documents related to the proposed revisions of APM 278-Health Sciences Clinical Professor Series, APM 210-6-Instructions to Review Committees, APM 279-Volunteer Clinical Professor Series, APM 112-Academic Titles, Clinical Associate, and the new APM 350-Clinical Associate.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael N Dawson, Chair and CCGA Representative (SNS)
Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Nancy Burke (SSHA)
Victor Muñoz (SOE)
Sachin Goyal (SOE)
Changqing Li (SOE)
Ricardo Cisneros (SSHA)
Kurt Schnier (SSHA)
Ming-Hsuan Yang (SOE)

Ex-Officio

Cristián Ricci, Divisional Council Chair (SSHA)
Joshua Viers, Divisional Council Vice Chair (SOE)
Marjorie Zatz, Vice Provost & Dean of the Graduate Division

Student Representative

Jason Davis (SNS)

Consultants

Laura Martin, Director, Office of Periodic Review, Assessment and Accreditation Support
Angela Krueger, Substantive Change and Graduate Assessment Coordinator

Senate Staff

Simrin Takhar, Senate Principal Analyst
Gregory Fellin, Senate Senior Analyst

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
ANNUAL REPORT
2015-2016**

To The Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its standing subcommittees held a total of 15 regularly scheduled in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw II.IV.2. Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate subcommittee(s), followed by full Council review. The structure of UGC and the issues that the Council considered this year are described briefly below.

Undergraduate Council Organization

The Undergraduate Council designated several subcommittees that met separately throughout the year:

- General Education (GESC), chaired by Dr. Virginia Adan-Lifante
- Admissions and Financial Aid, chaired by UGC Chair and BOARS Representative Christopher Viney
- Undergraduate Academic Programs/Policies/Courses, chaired by UGC Vice Chair and UCEP Representative Anne Zanzucchi

In addition, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed for the reviews of nominations for the Undergraduate Distinguished Teaching Awards for Faculty and for Non-Senate Lecturers, and for the review of the Catalog.

UGC received regular updates on systemwide committees' activities from UC Merced representatives on the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), the University Committee on International Education (UCIE), and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). All these systemwide committees are represented by UGC members. UGC and GESC representative Kelvin Lwin and UGC Vice Chair and PROC representative Anne Zanzucchi provided regular reports on General Education and on the Periodic Review and Oversight Committee (PROC) activities. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Charles Nies, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Whitt, and Director of Admissions Ruiz were also invited to update UGC regularly on enrollment, admissions, the Transfer Pathway Initiative, and activities related to undergraduate education.

Admissions

At sister campuses, the BOARS representative sits on his/her campus's admissions committee. In an effort to align UCM with other campuses in the UC system and reinforce the delegated role of faculty in the admissions process, UGC approved a [charge and membership](#) for a UCM Admissions Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is chaired by the UC Merced representative on

BOARS. The Subcommittee's membership includes representatives from Student Affairs, the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships and an undergraduate student, appointed by the Associated Students of UCM. The Subcommittee convened once a month.

- Parental Alumni Status on the UC Application

UCOP leaders proposed the inclusion of a question in the UC application form about the UC alumni status of the applicant's parents. The Senate's general concern was (and is) that this change may be perceived as "legacy" admissions and could discourage some students from applying to UC. It was decided to delay the implementation of this proposal. At its October 2016 meeting, BOARS was informed by Provost Dorr that, based on feedback from BOARS, Regents, and other constituencies, the UC President agreed that the application form should include the new request for parents' names, address, and email, but should not include the proposed new questions about parents' college of graduation.

- Compare Favorably

At the request of President Napolitano, BOARS conducted a review of the [UC Compare Favorably](#) for nonresident admission. Data shows that Merced is in good standing (regardless of whether or not the non-resident students are disaggregated into out-of state and international designations). As the smallest UC campus, Merced has a smaller proportion of non-resident students in comparison to other students. The identification and adoption of robust, clearly articulated compare favorable standards is a continuing project for BOARS.

General Education

In light of ongoing General Education program review activities, the Undergraduate Council and the General Education Subcommittee (GESC) prioritized campus efforts towards the revision and sustainability of a General Education program that is comprehensive. Towards this end, the GESC engaged in several activities (including two retreats) to incorporate external feedback processes and learn more about the GE program. The GESC also collaborated with campus constituents to explore and receive feedback on current GE design, mission statement, outcomes, and the guiding principles of General Education. On November 19, 2015, the General Education Subcommittee submitted a memo to UGC and the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC), in response to the external review team report. The response included an action plan and a proposed template for a GE program at UC Merced. This effort will continue through AY 16-17.

On April 26, the GESC unanimously approved GE Program Learning Outcomes. GESC Chair Adán-Lifante and Vice Chair Amussen provided an update on the subcommittee's work and presented the PLOs and Hallmarks of GE at the May 5 UGC meeting.

Budget Framework Implementation (BFI)

The Academic Senate is engaged in the development and implementation of 14 programmatic initiatives, also known as the Budget Framework Implementation included in the agreement between the UC and Governor Brown. The goal of this initiative is to improve efficiency, access, and student outcomes. Some of these programmatic initiatives, such as the Transfer Pathway are directly connected to undergraduate education. The Office of the President organized a series of meetings in October that brought together faculty across the system whose goal was to identify a common set of lower-division courses to prepare Community College students for transfer to any UC undergraduate campus in an additional 11 of the University's most popular majors (systemwide transfer pathways for ten such majors having already been agreed to in June 2015).

Course Withdraw Policy

“After the third week of instruction and until the end of the tenth week of instruction, a student may withdraw from a course for emergency reasons or for good cause with the signed approval of the instructor of record and confirmed by the dean of the School with which the student is affiliated [...]”

It was brought to the attention of UGC that there were concerns among Senate faculty about the implementation of this policy, specifically, how in some cases withdraw requests were approved by assistant deans, which in effect overruled an instructor's role in the assignment of grades. Without formal consultation and a signature, there were risks that the withdraw requests would not otherwise be approved by relevant faculty. While some routine administrative decisions are the responsibility of the relevant School staff, the actual authority for all aspects of courses, particularly implementation of grades, falls under the purview of Senate faculty; therefore, UGC recommended to the Deans that procedures for handling withdraw requests receive attention to ensure that the instructor of record signature is the only basis for implementation of this grade.

Proposal for a Major in Global Arts Studies

This proposal was initially reviewed in academic year 2014-2015 by the Academic Senate and the Administration. UGC (GC and CAPRA) expressed concerns about the resources required to deliver the major and demand for the major. The recommendations of the Academic Senate were sent to SSHA on May 6, 2015.

In academic year 2015-2016, a revised proposal was submitted to the Senate. UGC reviewed the proposal over the course of several meetings and requested some clarification regarding enrollment projections. In November 2015, UGC received a revised proposal which included UC enrollment data for similar programs across the nation. On November 24, 2015, UGC recommended approval of the GASP major, effective fall 2016.

UGC opined on the **Process for Establishing Concentrations and Designated Emphasis within Graduate Programs**, proposed by the Graduate Council. The policy initially was developed in response to a need within one graduate group to recognize disciplinary strengths

within its interdisciplinary curriculum. The intent of the policy was to support interdisciplinary education in a way that allowed extrinsic groups to recognize that interdisciplinarity is built on expertise in disciplines and consequently to (1) aid recruitment, (2) help students develop foci that improve their courses of study, and (3) increase opportunities for subsequent employment/study by making clear to potential employers/researchers that our graduates have specialist knowledge in addition to interdisciplinary breadth.

Academic Degree Programs Policy

The revisions to the Academic Degree Programs Policy were proposed by the joint Senate-Administration Academic Degree Programs Working Group. This working group was established at the request of Provost/EVC Peterson. On November 24, 2015 UGC established a subcommittee/working group composed of three UGC members representing the three schools, the VPDUE, and the Director of Institutional Assessment (now named the Office of Periodic Review, Assessment and Accreditation Support). The UGC working group's task was to review the undergraduate and WSCUC (WASC) components of the policy by, at the same time, integrating the existing UGC policy, [drafted in 2009](#). This task was carried over to AY 16-17.

Revised Proposal for a Bylaw Unit in Public Health (discussed in November 2015 and February 2016)

UGC's initial concern in November was related to the potential impact the implementation of this unit may have on the Psychology major. In February, UGC conducted a second review of the proposal, following revisions by SSHA, and voted in favor of the establishment of this unit. UGC also encouraged i) the proposers to involve the relevant SOE faculty (Bioengineering, Environmental Engineering) to reinforce the multidisciplinary foundation of this unit; and ii) the Senate leadership to formally require letters from the Deans when Bylaw Unit proposals are submitted for review.

Proposal for an Honors Program at UC Merced

In December 2014, the Provost asked VPDUE Whitt and Special Assistant to the Chancellor Lawrence to co-chair a task force charged with developing an institution-wide Honors program. The task force membership included Senate faculty representatives Jack Vevea and Mario Sifuentez and undergraduate students. The task force came to the conclusion that it should recommend a university Honors program. A Faculty Advisory Board composed of faculty from the three schools will oversee the program creation and development. This group will make decisions about admissions, policies, curricula, and other required specifics. The Honors program was to be launched in fall 2017 and implementation had to be delayed due to institutional context. When implemented, the program will provide for incoming first-year, transfer, and continuing students. With 10,000 students, there would be about 450 students in the University Honors program.

UGC voted in favor of postponing the establishment of this program until identification of faculty and diversity resources.

UCM Chorale

In January 2016, the UCM Chorale and some other Arts-based courses -- looked after by the VPDUE's office as an interim arrangement put in place by former Provost Keith Alley -- was turned into a student club. UGC recommended that SSHA go through the normal process of requesting discontinuances of the relevant ARTS courses: ARTS 2A, 2B, and 190.

Proposed Revisions to the Undergraduate Program Review Policy

The revisions were proposed by the joint GC-UGC-PROC Policy Subcommittee, co-chaired by UGC Chair Viney and GC Chair Dawson. UGC's comments were related to the role of the Senate liaison to the external review team; the decoupling of the roles of senate committee vice chairs and associated service on PROC; and faculty workload in general.

Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR)

In April 2016, UGC reviewed Entry Level Writing Requirement petitions. During its May 5 meeting, UGC considered a long-term framework for an ELWR petition policy, which defines appropriate cases for UGC review and provides a process with timeline. After the UGC discussion and following consultation with the petition committee, the framework was updated to reflect recommendations. A set of criteria and guidelines for reviewing ELWR petitions was adopted by UGC in June, 2016.

Proposal for a Masters in Management of Innovation, Sustainability and Technology (MIST)

Undergraduate Council sent comments to the Graduate Council. The proposal will be revised by the authors and revisited in AY 16-17.

Proposal for World Heritage Minor

After thoughtful deliberation, the Undergraduate Council unanimously voted in favor of approving the World Heritage Minor, effective fall 2016.

UGC provided comments to Vice Provost for the Faculty Gregg Camfield on **chapter 5 of the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures manual (MAPP)**.

Chemical Sciences Program Review

UGC discussed the academic program review of the Chemical Sciences major and recommended that the review of the program be closed.

Policy for Review and Approval of New and Revised Courses

The UGC policy/CRFs subcommittee proposed revisions to the policy for reviewing and approving new and revised courses. This item will carry over to next year's UGC.

ASUCM Proposal

UGC discussed a proposal from ASCUM representative Andre Frise to consider the possibility of UCM providing Scantron and exam booklets to students, and to discuss the sustainability of the ASUCM budget vis-à-vis Scantron services given the growing student population.

It was recommended that the ASCUCM report its concerns to Student Affairs as these issues are not within the purview of UGC.

UGC reviewed and made recommendations on 131 courses request forms.

Systemwide Review Items discussed by UGC this year included:

- **Proposed revisions to Bylaw 140 (governing UCAAD)**
UGC considered UCAAD's (University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity) proposal to amend Bylaw 140 to include the word "equity" in its title. UGC recommended a more succinct and functional title for the committee: "University Committee on Equity" since the inclusion of "Equity" should render "Affirmative Action" and "Diversity" unnecessary.
- **Proposed Modifications to Senate Regulations 417 and 621**
These regulations address applicants who complete coursework at a college while enrolled in high school, and the standardized examination credit that students may present to the University.
UGC unanimously endorsed the proposed changes to these regulations.
- **UCEP Enhanced Use of Advanced Placement, the College Board's College-Level Examination Program (CLEP)** – As the UCEP representative, Vice Chair Zanzucchi provided regular reports on this topic.

Carry-Over Business

- UGC's recommendations on the CSE and the General Education program review will be conveyed to the program leads in AY 16-17.
- Revisions to the policy for review/approval of undergraduate courses.
- Revisions to the Academic Degree Programs Policy and the policy for review and approval of undergraduate majors and minors.
- Review of Course Management Software options to integrate undergraduate and graduate CRFs.

Respectfully Submitted,

Voting Members:

Christopher Viney, Chair

Anne Zanzucchi, Vice Chair

Laura Beaster-Jones

YangQuan Chen

Marcos Garcia-Ojeda

Paul Gibbons

Nigel Hatton

Kelvin Lwin

Sholeh Quinn

Linda-Anne Rebhun

Mario Sifuentez

Ex-officio, non-voting:

Andre Frise, Undergraduate Student Representative

Charles Nies, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Elizabeth Whitt, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education

Cristián Ricci, Senate Chair

Joshua Viers, Senate Vice Chair

Unit 18 Lecturer Representatives

Mark Harris, Lecturer

Nathan Perry, Lecturer

Iris Ruiz

Staff

Fatima Paul



ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

November 7, 2016

To: Thomas W. Peterson, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Division Council
Deans Council
School Executive Committee Chairs

From: Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)

Re: CAPRA Proposal to Revise Campus Faculty Hiring Practices

Following the joint survey administered by CAPRA and the Provost in 2016, the Provost has opened a dialogue regarding the current faculty hiring practices on campus and the role of the SAFI moving forward. CAPRA greatly appreciates the Provost's willingness to engage in this open dialogue and work with the faculty Senate to build a collaborative approach to planning and resource allocation. CAPRA has developed three hiring models and two alternative cluster hiring options that we believe can serve as a foundation for addressing the growing concerns as we approach 2020, while meeting the goals of the SAFI, and balancing the many competing interests and concerns reflected on our campus.

Before presenting the different proposed hiring models that are intended to stimulate further dialogue among the faculty and administration, we outline the steps that we took to elicit broad faculty feedback on these questions.

As representatives of the faculty, CAPRA is acutely aware of the different interests and perspectives regarding future hiring practice. To develop an understanding of these interests we invited and met with all of the SAFI pillar representatives (i.e., Steering Committee and/or Search Committee chairs and members) to hear their preferences as well as their evaluation of the process to date. Many of these individuals are the same individuals that the Provost consulted with following the survey implemented last spring, which resulted in the Provost's decision to continue the SAFI hiring into the 2016-17 AY. Based on the feedback that these individuals have provided, as well as a thorough review of the input provided by the faculty on the survey, we have combined this information to develop three hiring models (Models 1,2 and 3) and cluster hiring options (Options A and B) outlined below.

The next stage in this process of consultation is to present these hiring models and cluster hiring options to each of the school Executive Committees (ECs) for feedback. After we have received feedback from the school ECs CAPRA will develop a single hiring model that will be presented to all of the faculty at the Meeting of the Division on November 28, 2016. Following the conclusion of this meeting CAPRA will again modify the proposal to reflect the faculty comments and present the model to the Provost. Therefore, this request is the next step in our efforts to ensure that the faculty are duly consulted and that the model presented to the Provost accurately represents faculty consensus.

In developing potential hiring models, CAPRA has sought to address several key concerns.

- First, many (though not all) faculty members believe that, at 70%, the proposed percentage of faculty lines allocated to the SAFI pillars is too large.¹ The CAPRA survey conducted in 2016 revealed that an allocation between 20% and 30% would be preferable according to a majority of faculty members.
- Second, many faculty members feel that the pillars are too broadly defined and not focused enough to successfully develop concrete areas of excellence.
- Third, SAFI hiring is seen as, at best, unpredictable with regard to growth of the campus, and at worst, inconsistent with projected undergraduate and graduate program growth.
- Finally, the process of hiring through the SAFIs is viewed by many faculty as an inefficient use of faculty time.

The three hiring models and two cluster hiring options developed by CAPRA attempt to address these concerns.

We recommend the following solutions:

- Maintaining a commitment to providing opportunities for interdisciplinary hiring and scholarship
- Reducing the percentage of lines allocated to cluster hiring
- Shifting to a more targeted approach to the development and execution of cluster hiring
- Establishing a link between the growth of the student population and FTE allocation
- Providing a clearly defined set of procedural options for future cluster hiring

In sum, we as a faculty must develop a hiring model that is resilient enough to ensure that we meet projected growth, flexible enough that it does not compromise the objectives of interdisciplinary scholarship, and still respects the interests of those who wish to pursue disciplinary based hires.

A central feature of our proposed hiring models and cluster hiring options is the determination of the minimum number of faculty hires that must be allocated to units to execute their undergraduate and graduate programs when the university reaches its steady-state enrollment targets under the 2020 Plan (9,000 undergraduates and 1,000 graduates). This is not only central to the development of academic plans, but also necessary to ensure that we reach the enrollment targets required for the 2020 Plan to succeed. CAPRA, in consultation with many groups across campus, is currently undertaking a project, referred to as the 10K in 2020 project, to determine precisely these needs. Therefore, our first hiring recommendation for all three of the models is that, at a minimum, the percentage of faculty hires allocated as “Foundation” hires must meet these needs. However, there are a number of ways that these needs can be met and still be compatible with the objectives of the SAFI. These are outlined in the following hiring models.

¹ Note that after this year only 54% (20/37) of recent hires will have been SAFI hires)

Determining the Share of Cluster Hires

The following three hiring models outline the options to determine the share of hires allocated to Foundation lines versus the cluster hiring process.

Model 1

Under this model the share and allocation of Foundation lines will be informed by the percentage recommended from the 10K in 2020 project. All remaining hires will be conducted using a cluster hiring process. The selection of Foundation lines will follow the traditional processes for unit-directed hiring on a UC campus.

Model 2

Under this model, a predetermined share of future faculty lines will be allocated to cluster hiring. This share would be set between 20 and 30%. The remaining share of lines will be Foundation lines, and allocated based on the 10K in 2020 recommendations (as in Model 1).

Model 3

In this model, the percentage of Foundation lines follows from the 10K in 2020 recommendations (as in Model 1) and the percentage of lines allocated to clusters is capped at 20%. The balance of lines not designated as "Foundation" (as informed by the 10K in 2020 project) or cluster hires (20%) will be allocated to meet the objectives of the existing SAFI pillars, while still retaining the unit-directed nature of the Foundation hires. This will be achieved by allowing bylaw units to propose individual hires that meet the objectives of the SAFI as well as their unit's strategic mission. A review committee consisting of the Provost, the Deans Council, CAPRA and the chairs of each school's EC will review the unit-directed SAFI hiring requests. Final decisions regarding FTE allocation will rest with the Provost.

Procedures for Cluster Hiring

In order to address the faculty concerns regarding the structure of the cluster hires, a new model for the selection of clusters will be implemented. All faculty will be allowed to submit cluster hiring proposals for review. This will help to address faculty concerns that the existing SAFI pillars are too broadly defined and can benefit from a more targeted approach. Furthermore, it will allow groups on campus who feel that they are not adequately represented in the existing SAFI an opportunity to propose a cluster hire. The selection committee for the proposals will consist of the Provost, the Deans Council, CAPRA, and the chairs of each school's EC. This committee will be responsible for developing the criteria for the selection of cluster hires as well as their selection. The final selection of clusters in each hiring year will rest with the Provost.

Each of the proposals submitted must select between one of two cluster hiring options (Option A or B listed below) and articulate how they meet the criteria outlined by the joint administration-faculty selection committee. Proposals must also recommend a structure for the search committee (or committees).

Cluster Hiring Option A

Under Option A, the cluster hiring proposal will indicate precisely which bylaw unit each hire will end up and all searches will be conducted at the unit-level. This option addresses the faculty concerns that SAFI hiring is at best unpredictable with regard to growth of the campus, and cluster hires should be unit-directed.

Cluster Hiring Option B

Under Option B the cluster hiring proposal will not dictate which unit a faculty member will be hired into, but will instead indicate a set of bylaw units in which the faculty may be hired. This option will allow faculty interested in conducting interdisciplinary hiring to continue. However, the reduced set of potential bylaw unit homes will reduce the faculty workload associated with the hiring process and (hopefully) minimize disagreements among faculty.

Summary of Hiring Models and Cluster Options Interactions

The proposed models and cluster hiring options outlined allow for there to be four different types of hires on campus: (1) unit-directed Foundation lines (Models 1,2, and 3), (2) unit-directed cluster hires (Models 1, 2, and 3, Option A), (3) interdisciplinary cluster hires (Models 1, 2, and 3, Option B), and (4) unit-directed SAFI hires (Model 3, Option A). Through the selection of these different procedures we believe that the faculty will be able to find the effective blend of disciplinary and interdisciplinary hirings to effectively meet programmatic needs as well as the strategic objectives of the university.

The construction of the joint administration and faculty committee to review the unit-directed SAFI hires and cluster hiring proposals will help to ensure that a broad set of factors are considered and that hires meet the strategic objectives (i.e., SAFI pillars) and needs of the institution. Furthermore, by leveraging the existing administration and faculty Senate structure it will preserve the faculty governance structure governing the UC system.

Having outlined these models CAPRA would greatly appreciate your opinion on the relative strengths and weaknesses of each model and cluster hiring options, as well as any other recommendations you may have. Please keep in mind that is our objective to be able to combine the comments received from each of the school's ECs to develop a singular model that can be presented to the faculty at the Meeting of the Division on November 28, 2016. **Therefore, we request that you provide feedback to CAPRA before November 22, 2106.** Thank you for reviewing our proposed models and cluster hiring options. We look forward to receiving your input.

cc: Susan Sims, Chief of Staff to the Provost/EVC
Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUITY
TANYA GOLASH-BOZA, CHAIR
tgolash-boza@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

September 9, 2016

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council
Lin Tian, Chair, Committee on Rules and Elections

From: Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair, Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E)

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tanya Golash-Boza".

Re: Proposed Senate Bylaw Revisions – D&E Committee Membership

As the Committee for Diversity and Equity begins its second year as a standing Senate committee, it has become apparent that an additional member is needed in order to more efficiently carry out our suite of initiatives, including the Faculty Equity Advisors program, endowed chairs proposal, and engagement with PROC to ensure that issues of diversity and equity are included in academic program review. Indeed, an additional member will greatly assist in the balancing of the workload among current members.

Appended to this memo is our proposed modification to Senate Bylaw Part II. Title III. 6.

We request that Division Council and the Committee on Rules and Elections consider this proposed bylaw modification at the September 22 Division Council meeting.

cc: Diversity and Equity members
Committee on Rules and Elections members
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty
Senate Office

UC Merced Bylaw Part II. Title III. 6

6. Diversity and Equity

A. Membership: This Committee is composed of at least ~~three~~ four members of the Merced Division, preferably at least one faculty member from each School. The Vice Provost for Faculty serves as *ex-officio*.

B. Duties

1. The Committee Chair or designed serves as the Division Representative to the Systemwide University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity.
2. Initiates appropriate studies and reports on campus diversity and equity.
3. Acts for the Division in all matters of equality and diversity in general and in particular in reference to underrepresented faculty populations.
4. As needed reviews, evaluates and proposes revisions to institutional policies and procedures as they relate to equality and diversity.
5. Reports to the Division on recruitment, promotion, and retention of faculty from underrepresented groups. The Committee provides advice to the Academic Senate on issues relating to diversity and equal opportunity in the University community.
6. Reviews information on diversity and equity provided by campus and systemwide administration and advises the Division and the administration accordingly.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
LIN TIAN, CHAIR
ltian@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N LAKE RD
MERCED, CA 95343
PH: 209-228-4209

September 19, 2016

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Divisional Council

From: Lin Tian, Chair, Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)

Re: Proposed Senate Bylaw Revisions – D&E Committee Membership

The Committee on Rules and Elections reviewed the request from Diversity & Equity for the proposed Senate Bylaws revisions to their committee membership. CRE unanimously approves of the proposed bylaw modification as presented.

cc: Senate Office