E-mail: daniel.hare@ucr.edu

June 1, 2017

Prof. Susan Amussen
Division Chair
University of California, Merced
5200 North Lake Rd.
Merced, CA 95343

Dear Susan:

On behalf of the Review Team of the UC Merced Academic Senate Office, I am pleased to transmit to you and your Division Council the final version of the Review Team's report. As you will see, we evaluated not only the Divisional Senate Office but also the practice of shared governance on the UC Merced Campus. We offer suggestions about how both might be improved, though we generally leave it to the Merced Division and Administration to determine what might work best for the UC Merced campus.

I want to thank the Review Team for their diligence in completing this report. I especially want to acknowledge the particular role of Prof. Peggy O'Day on the Review Team. Peggy provided valuable local context but wisely allowed the issues be brought to the Review Team through the Team's interviews of a wide variety of campus personnel. As noted in the report, we also are grateful to Program Review Manager and PROC Analyst Kerry Clifford for her outstanding assistance to the Review Team and flawless management of the site visit.

The Review Team prepared the Report with numerous campus audiences in mind. We urge that the Report be shared widely among the faculty and administration but defer to you as to whether it should be shared in full or in abbreviated form. I'm sure that I speak for the entire Review Team that we appreciated learning more about UC's newest and smallest campus and hope that the Division's and administration's leaders might find some of our suggestions useful as UC Merced manages its unique near-term challenges.

Sincerely,

J. Daniel Hare, Ph.D.
Review Team Chair

Introduction

In keeping with local practice, the office of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate was due for a periodic review in 2016-17. All administrative units undergo such assessments to ensure efficient, effective operations that align with institutional priorities and overarching mission. By design, reviews aim to be both *formative*—shaping actions for ongoing development—and *summative*—identifying issues and problems along with steps to address them. The Division office has not had this type of review since the campus opened in 2005.

Beyond routine assessment convention, there was a second impetus for evaluation: to provide a Systemwide perspective on development of the Merced Division office. Of particular interest is whether the Division has the requisite resources as well as organizational supports to function successfully. A founding framework created by Executive Directors from other UC campus Division offices in 2004 (and updated in 2010) provides a critical reference point. Endorsed by then President Bob Dynes, the framework articulated broad concepts to guide establishment of the new divisional office, identified specific start up requirements, and outlined requisite resource needs (including staff FTE) for the developing organization. After more than a decade, Executive Directors from around the system recommended a "health check" for the Merced Division office to assess framework implementation. The current and immediate past Chairs of both the UCM Division and the Systemwide Academic Senate supported this effort.

Review Team

The review team consisted of five members and a professional staff person to provide support. In accordance with the campus *Policy for Annual Assessment and Periodic Review of Administrative Units*, these members included at least two individuals external to the unit undergoing review. The following members were chosen for respective experience in system level Senate activities, the Merced Division, early development of another UC campus, and leadership of other division offices.

- *J. Daniel Hare* – former Systemwide UC Senate Chair and Professor Emeritus of Entomology, Riverside
- *Peggy O'Day* – former UC Merced Division Chair and Professor of Life and Environmental Sciences
- *William Parker* – UC Irvine Division Chair and Professor Emeritus of Physics & Astronomy
- *Natalie Schonfeld* – UC Irvine Division Director
- *Matthew Mednick* – UC Santa Cruz Division Director
- *Hilary Baxter* – UC Academic Senate Executive Director (staff)

Review Materials

The Self-Study prepared by the Office of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate served as the primary resource among materials provided for the review. The study contained hyperlinks to multiple items of interest, including the Division website, information on standing committees, Division office budget and recent resource requests, campus organization charts, faculty and student data, etc.

Other materials the team received prior to the review and during its two-day site visit were annual reports for key Division committees (DivCo, CAP, COR, CAPRA, UgC, GC); July 2016 Regents presentations on the Merced 2020 Project and a campus financial overview; information on Faculty

Executive Committees for the Schools of Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts; a sample summary (for public posting) of a periodic review report; and the 2004 *Framework for Establishing a Divisional Senate Office* as well as its 2010 update).

Site Visit and Acknowledgments

The review team visited the campus on May 3-4, meeting with key Division leaders, faculty, and staff as well as senior management from all parts of the administration. The full agenda is provided in Appendix 1. It reflects the comprehensive nature of sessions planned and opportunities for productive exchange.

The team would like to thank Division Chair Susan Amussen and the Division staff for their strong support of this undertaking and participation in the site visit. Of note, we very much appreciate the work of Executive Director Laura Martin for her instrumental role in bringing about this review—both in drafting a thorough Self-Study and integrating Systemwide interest in a divisional "health check" with the campus periodic review process. In addition, the team extends its thanks to all members of the Division and the administration who shared their time and insights during the visit. The Review Team is especially appreciative of Chancellor Dorothy Leland's open and frank discussion with us. Finally, we want to acknowledge Program Review Manager and PROC Analyst Kerry Clifford for her very capable, gracious efforts overseeing logistics while we were on campus and shepherding the team through the steps in the periodic review process.

Scope of the Review

Based upon information in the Self-Study about the effectiveness of shared governance at UC Merced (summarized on pp. 14-15 of the Self-Study), we expanded our review beyond a relatively simple review of the resources (e.g., number and competence of personnel, amount and quality of physical space, and budget) of the Division Office. We also include an analysis of the effectiveness and the practice of shared governance at UC Merced. By first understanding how UC Merced practices shared governance, then we became better prepared to evaluate the abilities and capabilities of the Division Office to support the Division committees and Division leadership. During our interviews, we also heard specific concerns about such matters as the size and growth rate of the faculty, staff, and student populations. Although we agree that such concerns are worthy of discussion between the Division and the Administration, it is beyond the scope of the review team to opine on those concerns.

Organization of the Report

We present our Findings and Recommendations about the practice and implementation of shared governance at UC Merced first, then our specific Findings and Recommendations about the Division Office. For the latter, we evaluate and make recommendations about the size of the Division office, its need for more independence and predictability in budgetary matters, the amount and quality of space, and the organizational relationships of the Division Office to the UC Merced administration and the Systemwide Academic Senate.

Findings and Recommendations pertaining to Shared Governance

Overall, we find that the faculty and administration have a strong, shared belief in the future of UC Merced. We also found, however, concerns about the means and effectiveness of the abilities of the faculty to communicate about their shared beliefs. The amount of concern varied among administrative

units. The Office of Research and Economic Development the Academic Personnel Office were mentioned as two whose interactions with their most relevant Division committees to be highly effective.   In general, all parties recognize that communication could be better and all parties want to communicate and work together better.

DEFINING AND IMPLEMENTING SHARED GOVERNANCE. The perceived challenges of genuine opportunities for faculty to influence the decision-making processes is at the center of the Review Team's concerns about the implementation and practice of shared governance at UC Merced. We heard from both faculty and administrators that neither side fully understood the concept and practice of shared governance. From the faculty, the review team heard that advice from Division committees was acknowledged infrequently and often was ignored. From administrators, we heard that some faculty believe that "shared governance" requires that advice from faculty must be accepted. In order to provide context for our recommendations to improve the practice of shared governance, we provide the following summary of the history and evolution of shared governance at the University of California.

Regents' Bylaw 40 provide the official codification of what shared governance entails. Briefly restated, these points are:

- o   Faculty participation in shared governance through the agency of the Academic Senate ensures the quality of instruction, research and public service and protects academic freedom.

- o   Furthermore, the Academic Senate:

- o   determines the conditions for admission and for certificates and degrees, and recommends to the President all candidates for degrees;

- o   authorizes and supervises all courses and curricula (with some professional school and extension exceptions, as specified in the codes);

- o   selects committees to advise the President and Chancellors on campus and University budgets;

- o   and may address the Board on any matter pertaining to the conduct and welfare of the University.

Over many decades, these foundational principles of shared governance evolved with changing times, shaping not only the contours of the Academic Senate, but also the highly successful multi-campus system as we know it today. Writing in 2009, former Academic Council Chair Daniel Simmons summed up the importance of shared governance at the UC as follows:

> The faculty of the University of California does indeed exercise great influence on the affairs of the University. Without the faculty, there would be no prestigious research accomplishments. Without the faculty, there will be no educational program. … The relationship between the Academic Senate and the administration, both Systemwide and on the campuses, has evolved over the past few years into a partnership that works to **bring the faculty into decision-making processes at the formulation stage** [emphasis added]. The faculty becomes a partner with the administration in working out common ground from which to face the challenges of the times. (Simmons, 7).

The practice of shared governance therefore is more complex and nuanced than the Administration simply deferring to the faculty on curricular matters and making final decisions on all other matters. Faculty expressed their concerns, for example, about receiving briefings after decisions were made by administrators as satisfying the expectation of "consultation" with the faculty. Briefings do not meet the expectation of consultation. True consultation means that the faculty have the opportunity to contribute their experience and expertise in a two-way dialogue before decisions are made. Such faculty input therefore can inform, even alter, final decisions.

The review team noted that there seemed to be wide variation among administrators in how they responded to formal comments and reviews of documents provided by the faculty. An absence of acknowledgment of receipt was a common complaint of the faculty. Also often absent was any explanation or justification for not accepting the faculty's input. Both the absence of acknowledging receipt and response to specific suggestions contribute to a belief that the faculty are wasting time in providing their thoughts even when they are requested by the administration. At a minimum, acknowledging receipt should be a standard practice. Furthermore, by providing feedback to the faculty as to why the faculty's recommendation cannot be followed, the faculty may learn and appreciate other facets of the issues and may be better informed when further faculty input is requested.

Our recommendations about improving the practice of shared governance at UC Merced are as follows:

- o **Train new administrators, especially from outside UC, to engage the faculty in two-way discussions of new policies well before a decision is to be made. This is essential to establish the partnerships between the faculty and administration that are at the center of shared governance.** The Review Team was impressed by the efforts of Vice Provost for the Faculty, Gregg Camfield, to provide detailed orientations to shared governance to new faculty members, and we recommend that these efforts be supported and expanded. We also were heartened to hear that Chancellor Leland is considering expanding such orientations to new senior administrators. The review team fully supports these efforts but reminds the Division that the faculty and administration will need to establish their own conventions and practices that work best for the Division.

- o **Administrators should routinely acknowledge receipt of input from the faculty and should strive to explain why faculty recommendations are modified or not accepted**. The former is merely professional courtesy, whereas the latter serves to "close the loop" of the consultation process.

PRIORITIZING THE DIVISION'S REVIEWING EFFORT. Because of the small size of the faculty relative to other UC campuses, the faculty members, in general have higher service loads than on other UC campuses. This leads to frustration and resentment when reviews are requested on short notice. The Division has established a time interval within which the Division expects to complete a normal review and has publicized the length of this time period. It would seem that those asking for faculty input should be able to plan how far in advance to ask the UC Merced Division for their input. Such planning apparently is not done enough, and this problem is not unique to UC Merced. We also noted a concern shared by both the Administration and the Division that some of the procedures and practices that were developed when the campus first opened are either no longer suitable, or they may have been forgotten and replaced by *ad hoc* procedures.

We also heard that the faculty members were frustrated by the number of reviews asked of them. This suggests that more thought be given to how Division input might be prioritized, given the relatively small size of the faculty. We offer some suggestions that might be considered further by the Division.

- o Develop a policies and procedures manual that includes a section about soliciting reviews by the UC Merced Division. This could include a reviewing schedule to obtain faculty input. Publicize the last date in the spring by which something needs to be submitted to the Division if a response is expected before the end of the Spring semester. It is likely that this cut-off date will be earlier in the spring than might be expected.

- o The Administration and Division leadership should consult near the beginning of the academic year, or perhaps before the beginning of the Fall Semester, about goals and objectives for the year and the timeline necessary to achieve those goals. Such discussion might also better determine the issues on which Division input is needed. Such planning also would help the campus and the Senate to establish expectations and priorities such that the Senate does not need to be so reactive.

- o Although Division committees are given the option to decline to opine, the review team believes that this option is infrequently used. Perhaps the chairs of committees tangential to the subject of the review might be encouraged not to opine more frequently.

- o Not all divisions send all documents to all standing committees for review. With the Division's approval, the Division Chair and Executive director may choose to circulate some document for review only to selected, most relevant committees, and not to all Division committees.

SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES. We heard from nearly all parties that the School Executive Committees varied in their effectiveness. The review team believes that these committees could, and should, be the primary means whereby the faculty of a School advise their dean on issues pertaining to that school. Given that UC Merced is transitioning towards formal departments but they are not yet implemented, the Executive Committees should be the primary vehicle for the faculty of a School to communicate with the senior administration through their deans, and to communicate to the faculty of a school information coming from the senior administration and the deans of schools.

We received varying comments about the reviewing efforts being asked of Executive Committees. Some members complained that they were being asked to review items that they personally reviewed in another capacity, e.g., as a member of a Division standing committee. Others complained that they were surprised to receive items for review and had too little time to review them thoroughly. Uniform process for School review, and prioritization of items that need to be reviewed at the School, would help eliminate such confusion and redundancy.

The model of having staff from the dean's offices at UCM to support Executive Committees is used on other campuses. The review team heard of problems in this regard, specifically, a dean attempting to modify the minutes of a meeting of an Executive Committee. Although the review team agrees that this might be inappropriate, we also believe that this is insufficient justification to reassign the staff support for Executive Committees to the already over-worked Division office. The review team agrees with the

staff assigned to the Executive Committees, however that they have received insufficient training or orientation from the Division Office in how best to support their Executive Committees.

Based upon these comments, we make the following recommendations:

- o We recommend that standardized practices and procedures be adopted and implemented by all Executive Committees.

- o Currently, the chairs of Executive Committees do not participate on DivCo. Campus practices differ in this regard, but it may be valuable for these chairs to be invited to some or all DivCo meetings to better coordinate the activities of the Division's Standing Committees with the School's Executive Committees.

- o The Division may wish to consider if asking the Executive Committees to review all items sent to the Division Standing Committees will provide insights and analyses different from those of the Standing Committees. Campus practices differ in this regard, and not all campuses assign Division-wide reviews to their Executive Committees.

- o We recommend additional guidance to the deans about the proper function of the Executive Committee in the governance of their schools, and how such a function can be achieved.

- o We also recommend that additional training about shared governance and the role of the Division Office be given to the staff members supporting the Executive Committees.

- o Similarly, we recommend that the chairs of the Executive Committees carefully consider how best to utilize their support staff, recognizing that the assignment to support an Executive Committee is only a small fraction of the time and effort of those staff members.

Findings and recommendations pertaining to the Division Office

PERSONNEL. All faculty and administrators who met with the review team were extremely complementary about the abilities and performance of Division staff. Many noted the incredible knowledge of the staff and dependency of the faculty on the staff as the historical record for the Division's actions coupled with concern about the workload demands on the staff, especially now as a result of a staffing vacancy and a second staff member on medical leave. The small size of the Division Office means the staff does not have the capacity to adjust to temporary staffing changes or respond to additional demands without unreasonable stress to the Division operations. The review team queried both faculty members and administrators about what might be the appropriate size of the Division staff and concluded that the number more likely is determined by the number of committees and the level of their business rather than the number of Division members. Despite differences in size, all general campuses likely will require a similar number of core Division Committees. In addition, as Merced is a newly established and growing campus, administrative support for the Division operation can play a critical role in giving the excellent Division staff the capacity to strategize, plan, and support the shared governance efforts of the campus.

We 1) encourage the expedited filling of the vacancy, 2) find the justification for adding another staff member (title TBD) contained within the self-study report compelling, and 3) recommend the use of

students to lighten the burdens of analysts for tasks where the expertise of analysts are not needed. While we recognize that these recommendations will require additional funding, we believe that the health of the Division and shared governance at Merced is dependent on additional resources to support the Division operation.

BUDGET CONTROL AND PREDICTABILITY. The review committee was concerned about the lack of budget control and predictability that the Division Office has over its operation. The review team would encourage the Provost's Office to notify the Division annually of its permanent and temporary budget allocations. Such communication would allow the Division to plan the internal allocation of resources, give the Division responsibility for the management of those resources, and communicate to the Division Office and faculty the importance assigned by the administration to the Division and shared governance through the permanent allocation of resources. Although we believe it may be necessary, and even appropriate, for the Provost's Office to provide support for travel, ledgers, and purchasing, it is critical that the Division Office know its total budget, have the ability to plan its own budget and adjust the assignment of funds, have a mechanism for requesting additional funds if/as needed, and operate as an independent unit. As documented in "A Framework for Excellence: "Investing in Shared Governance for the New Century",

> Each Divisional Senate Office must have sufficient resources to independently manage its operations, as would any senior administrative office with campus-wide areas of responsibility (e.g., office of the chancellor, office of the executive vice chancellor, vice chancellors and vice provosts)....the Senate operation should be its own budgetary control unit, with a direct reporting line to the chancellor (or her or his designee) on budgetary matters.

On all other UC campuses, the Division is a distinct budgetary control unit. The funding flows down through the CP/EVC office, similar to all other campus units/schools. The Director makes accruals and approvals with oversight by the Divisional Chair. From the Campus Controller perspective, Division actions roll up to the CP/EVC, but only in cases where campus policy requires additional approval by a Principal Officer (e.g. exceptional staff equity action).

SPACE. With regard to space, the review committee was distressed to read the overview of the Division Office physical space in the Self-Study and toured the "office" and surrounding floor/units. The review committee validated the concerns and limitations articulated in the Self-Study, and strongly recommends that the issues related to critical business needs (lack of privacy for staff work, designated space for the Division chair, some distinct Division conference space) require immediate remedies. Subsequently, we hope that as the campus grows into new space, that the following standards and best practices will be observed.

Some principles to keep in mind when planning for Division Office physical space needs:

o Division Office work requires a high degree of confidentiality. The analysts, the Director, and the Division faculty leadership must have access to privacy, especially from the students and staff in other units, but also from one another. (e.g., the CAP analyst has the same confidentiality needs as an analyst in Academic Personnel, where staff have privacy walls.) Understanding the space constraints of the campus, in the absence of a forthcoming private office suite for the Division, the review committee recommended the campus consider creating "hotel" office space for the Division staff's unscheduled private conversations/phone calls.

- o The Division Office ideally should be located near enough to campus leadership such that frequent consultation is not a logistical hardship.

- o The Division Office should have ample separation and autonomy in its physical footprint. For example, ideally, the Division office should have a separate entrance such that faculty need not pass through administrative security to meet with their colleagues or staff.

- o On most campuses, the Division shares large conference space for their larger committees and councils with the administration. A small conference room, 6-10 occupancy, under the direct control of the Division affords needed flexibility for the majority of routine committee business.

IT INFRASTRUCTURE. We wish to highlight two IT issues in this report: 1) the resources to support teleconferencing/videoconferencing for Senate meetings, and 2) the resources available to ensure that the Senate is able to maintain accurate and complete historical records of its proposal reviews and actions. As noted in the self-study report and further reinforced during our visit, much of the work of the Division requires an effective videoconferencing/teleconferencing tool. These tools will become increasingly important in the coming years as units move off campus, making face-to-face meetings more challenging to organize than is already the case. During our visit, we were struck by the lack of consistency in service using the teleconferencing tool available to the campus, requiring that we divert our attention from the content of the meeting to managing the IT as we attempted to reconnect with faculty and administrators who could only participate via phone. We recognize that this is an issue for the entire campus and hope that strengthening the IT infrastructure for greater consistency when using teleconferencing or videoconferencing tools can be made a central priority.

The maintenance of historical records is important for any campus office, and even more so on a new and growing campus. The Academic Senate is generally the office of record for the campus for all academic actions, including the establishment of undergraduate and graduate degrees and schools and other academic units. It is critical that the Senate, for its own sake and that of the campus, have the resources to store, archive, and retrieve records. As noted in the self-study, Division records play a critical role in ongoing planning and decision-making efforts of both the Division and campus. On other UC campuses, the Division Office regularly is asked to provide historical records; it is critical that the UC Merced Division be provided with the resources to both transition their records from UCMCROPS and maintain future records electronically in an organized manner that allows for easy referencing and retrieval. UC Santa Barbara's document management system, referenced in the self-study report, currently is used by three UC Division offices.

ORGANIZATION CHART. It is a Senate-standard that on the campuses, the Division organization floats with a horizontal dotted line to the Chancellor and/or Provost. Their direct reporting line should flow upward to the Systemwide Academic Council. This clarification is especially useful in articulation of the autonomy of the campus Division, and of the partnership between the Division and Administration. It also clarifies the role of the Division and the shared governance model of the UC to those less familiar with UC traditions including outside constituents, students, and critically, new Principal Officers.

RECOGNITION AND COMPENSATION FOR DIVISION SERVICE. Service is part of UC's tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service, thus "service" is part of the job expectation for faculty. There is wide variation among the campuses in terms of which service as Division committee chairs and members may be recognized and compensated. In general, however, the amount and type of compensation for chairs of committees appropriately varies with the workload of the committee, and it should not be necessary to provide additional compensation or teaching relief to all committee chairs. Aside from formal compensation for committees that have high workloads and meet frequently (e.g., CAP) the review

team recognizes that Division service probably can be recognized informally through the assignment and distribution of teaching assignments. For a variety of reasons, not all classes require the same effort to teach, and this differential could be utilized to balance the overall efforts of faculty members who assume service obligations against the overall effort of faculty who do not have such service obligations.

The high service loads of the UC Merced faculty has been noted, but we also noted that the service loads are disproportionate among the faculty; some members do more than their share and others do not. Additional efforts to better balance the service obligations among the tenured faculty may be needed. Moreover, UC Merced is unique is that not only does it have a relatively small faculty, but also has a high proportion of assistant professors. On other UC campuses, there is a belief (perhaps mistaken) that assistant professors should be discouraged from Division service until after receiving tenure. The Review Team is not convinced that this is either necessary or desirable, but is more convinced that UC Merced cannot afford to exclude all assistant professors from Division service. For those assistant professors who are making good progress in the merit and promotion process (e.g., normative progress, positive appraisal, etc.), then bringing them into Division service could be of benefit both to the faculty member and to the campus.

To achieve a more even distribution of Division service as well as to encourage the participation of assistant professors in Division service, we recommend that there be ongoing thoughtful and detailed discussions between the Division and the Administration as to how service is evaluated in the merit and promotion process at UC Merced. Such discussions should include the extent service strengthens a file and how, and equally important, to what extent the absence of service might weaken a file. As alluded to earlier, when considering UC's tripartite mission, service is not optional.

Conclusions

The administration as well as the Division faculty are ambitious relative to the resources of the campus. They may not be able to do everything in the same way as more mature UC campuses, so they must prioritize their efforts, and they must develop procedures and practices that best serve the UC Merced campus.

With regard to the practice of shared governance, we urge careful reading of that section of this report by both administrators and the faculty. We encourage the development of written guidelines and practices for consultation. Some of these may already exist but may have been forgotten or fallen out of practice.

With regard to the Division's Academic Senate Office, our site visit validated the strengths and confirmed the limitations of the office as described in their self-study. The office has an excellent staff but is too small to meet its obligations in a timely manner. Their assigned space does not meet the functional needs of the office and requires the office staff to make their own arrangements when confidentiality is required. Dedicated office space for the Division Chair is essential and one or more dedicated conference rooms would be beneficial. The Division Office should have the predictability and independence of being its own budgetary control unit. The ability of the campus to support electronic communication is strained; such an ability should be improved. Plans and resources to support the transition to a new document system are inadequate to preserve and recover older documents, not only in the Academic Senate Office, but also throughout the campus. Addressing this immediate need is of high priority.

Appendix 1

Academic Senate Office Periodic Review Site Visit Agenda
Review Team
Daniel Hare, 2015-2016 Systemwide Senate Chair, University of California, Riverside (Chair)
William Parker, Senate Chair, University of California, Irvine
Natalie Schonfeld, Executive Director, Academic Senate Office, University of California, Irvine
Matthew Mednick, Senate Director, University of California, Santa Cruz
Peggy O'Day, Professor, University of California, Merced
Administrative Support
Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate, Office of the President

		Thursday, April 27
2:00 – 3:30 p.m.		**Review Team's Pre-Visit Conference Call**
		Wednesday, May 3
10:00 – 10:30 a.m.		**Travel to campus**
10:30		**Arrive on campus**
10:30 - 11:00	**KL 360**	**Team Orientation & Planning**
11:00 – 11:45	**KL 360**	**Susan Amussen, Division Chair**
		Kurt Schnier, Division Vice-Chair
11:45 – 12:30	**KL 360**	**Lunch with Tom Peterson, Provost**
12:30 – 12:45		**Break**
12:45 – 1:30	**KL 360**	**Senate Analysts**
		Simrin Takhar
		Fatima Paul (phone)
1:30 - 2:15	**KL 360**	**Standing Committee Chairs**
		Mukesh Singhal, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
		David Noelle, Chair, Committee on Research
		Lin Tian, Chair, Rules and Elections (leaving early)
		Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair, Diversity and Equity
		Jayson Beaster-Jones, Chair, Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom
		Jack Vevea, Chair, General Education Subcommittee
		Christopher Viney, Chair, Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee
2:15 – 2:30 p.m.	**KL 360**	**Break**
2:30 – 3:15	**KL 360**	**Executive Committee Chairs**
		Paul Maglio, School of Engineering
		Dave Kelley, School of Natural Sciences
		David Torres-Rouff (alternate for Jeff Gilger), School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
3:15 – 3:45	**KL 360**	**Graduate and Undergraduate Student Committee Members**
		Andre Frise-Valdez, UGC, LASC
		Lauren Stark, CAPRA (AY 2015-2016)
		Nicholas Dove, GC
3:45 – 4:00		**Break**
4:00 – 5:00	**KL 360**	**Open Session for Standing Committee Members**
		Fabian Filipp, GC
		Michael Scheibner, COR
		Peter Vanderschraaf, CRE
		Wei-Chun Chin, D&E

		Phil Roeder, CAP (call-in)
		Larry Marsh, CAP (call-in)
		Joe Konopelski, CAP (call-in)
5:00 – 5:15		**Break**
5:15 - 6:00	**KL 360**	**Laura Martin, Executive Director, Academic Senate**
6:30 p.m.		**Team Dinner – Five Ten Bistro**

		Thursday, May 4
8:00 – 8:30 am	**KL 360**	**Ed Klotzbier, Chancellor's Chief of Staff**
		Susan Sims, Provost's Chief of Staff
8:30 – 9:15	**KL 362**	**Deans, Vice Provosts, and Vice Chancellors**
		Mark Matsumoto, Dean, School of Engineering
		Jill Robbins, Dean, School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
		Elizabeth Whitt, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
		Marjorie Zatz, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education (call-in)
		Ann Kovalchick, Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology
		Michael Reese, Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services (call-in)
		Veronica Mendez, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget
		Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research
		Charles Nies, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
9:15 – 10:00	**KL 360**	**Dorothy Leland, Chancellor**
10:00 – 10:15		**Break**
10:15 – 11:00	**KL 360**	**Past Division Council Chairs, Vice Chairs**
		Jian Qiao-Sun, Chair, AY 2014-2015
		Martha Conklin, Chair, AY 2008-2009, 2009-2010
		Roger Bales, Vice-Chair, AY 2007-2008 (call-in)
11:00 – 11:15	**KL 360**	**Break**
11:00 – 11:30	**KL 360**	**Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty**
11:30 – 11:45		**Break**
11:45 – 12:30	**KL 360**	**Lunch with Campus Staff**
		Laurie Herbrand, Registrar
		Encarnacion Ruiz, Director, Admissions and Outreach
		Kathy Briggs, Curriculum Manager, SoE
		Megan Topete, Curriculum Manager, SSHA
		Eric Cannon, Graduate Division
11:45 – 12:30	**KL 397**	**Lunch with Executive Committee Staff**
		Bobbi Ventura, School of Natural Sciences
		Erica Magana, School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
		D.B. Quan, School of Engineering
12:30 – 1:00	**KL 360**	**Break**
1:00 – 2:00	**KL 360**	**Open Session for All Faculty**
		Ignacio Lopez-Calvo, CAP Chair, AY 2013-2014 Division Chair
		Anne Kelley, Vice Chair, AY 2010-2011, AY 2005-2006
2:00 – 3:30 pm	**KL 360**	**Team Time for Writing Report**
3:30 – 4:30 pm	**KL 360**	**Exit Interview**
		Dorothy Leland, Chancellor
		Tom Peterson, Provost
		Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council
		Kurt Schnier, Vice Chair, Division Council
		Laura Martin, Executive Director, Academic Senate Office

Self-Study
Office of the Academic Senate
Prepared in Support of Administrative Periodic Review
April 14, 2017

I.   Introduction

This section orients the reader to the unit and the self-study itself. Describe the unit's history (briefly), and function, role(s), and responsibilities within the university, including its mission. Describe any major changes to the unit since the last review or its inception. Describe relevant internal and external contexts that shape the unit. Introduce the reader to the organization of the self-study.

The Office of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate exists to provide the analytic and administrative support necessary for the faculty of the Merced Division to realize its mission of sharing in the governance, operation, and management of the University. This singular responsibility is captured in the office's newly minted mission,[1] which describes what the office does to achieve this end, contextualizing these efforts in the work of building a new UC campus:

Mission of the Office of the Academic Senate

The Office of the Academic Senate facilitates the functions of the Merced Division of the systemwide Academic Senate, and contributes to the development of the Senate and UC Merced, by providing the administrative infrastructure and research and analytic support essential to shared governance. As experts in Senate policy, process and protocol, and with the history of the Division in mind, the office staff supports the membership of the Senate in executing its Regentally-bestowed responsibilities, most directly by facilitating the deliberative and legislative activities of Senate committees in consultation and coordination with the administration, campus stakeholders, and the systemwide Senate. As liaisons between the Senate and campus constituents, the staff advance awareness of Senate structure, function, and contribution to realizing the mission of UC Merced and the University as a whole.

Currently, three staff are tasked with realizing this mission, providing support to 12 standing committees, two subcommittees of Undergraduate Council, and the Division as a whole. They are an Executive Director, an Associate Director, and a Principal Analyst. A fourth, full-time FTE for a Senior Analyst exists but is currently vacant, following the resignation of the incumbent in March of this academic year. Of the three current staff members, two are highly experienced; the Associate Director was a founding member of the office, joining it in academic year 2005-2006 as an Administrative Analyst and as the first hire made by the office's inaugural Director, Nancy Clarke. The Principal Analyst joined the Senate Office in 2008, as an Administrative Assistant II and, aside from a three-year period during which she held other administrative roles at UC Merced, has worked for the Senate.

By contrast, the Executive Director is very new; she assumed leadership of the Senate Office in August 2016, having previously worked closely with the Senate as the founding Director of the Office of Periodic Review, Assessment, and Accreditation Support (OPRAAS), and the campus' Accreditation Liaison Officer, the latter a position she still holds. The former Senior Analyst joined the Senate in February 2016, before leaving at the end of March 2017 to return to I.T. The Senate's organization chart is available here, and the job descriptions here. As reflected in the organizational chart, the Executive Director reports to the Senate Chair, who in turn reports to the

---

[1] Approved by Divisional Council at its January 19, 2017 meeting.

Chair of the systemwide Senate. Financially, the office constitutes a department within the Provost's organization.

History

The Office of the Academic Senate of the Merced Division was founded in 2005, the year of campus opened to undergraduates, by Nancy Clarke, an experienced director from the University of California, Irvine. Fatima Paul, the current Associate Director, joined the Senate Office that same year as an analyst.

At the time the office was established, UC Merced had 47 Senate faculty, 42% of which were tenured, and all but one of which were full professors. These faculty were teaching our first intake of 838 undergraduates (about 8% transfer) and our 37 graduate students, who had matriculated into one of eight undergraduate majors (or undeclared) or one of five emphasis within the interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP), and building a UC campus: hiring colleagues, proposing and approving new programs and courses, writing policy, planning and approving curriculum, and building and sustaining research programs. It was a busy time; by fall 2006, UC Merced has added 25 Senate faculty (~90% untenured), 411 students, six new majors, seven new standalone minors, and two new IIGP emphases.

Since then, the work of building a campus has continued unabated. As of fall 2016, the Merced Division is comprised of 219 Senate faculty, 54% of which are tenured and 22% of which are full professors. The campus enrolls 7,336 students, 7% of which are graduate, in 22 undergraduate majors, 23 undergraduate minors, and 12 graduate programs, [2] including the IIGP with three emphases. And the work is not done. Through the 2020 project, the campus is doubling its physical plant to provide the space for a campus of 350 Senate faculty and 10,000 students, ideally 10% graduate, in 2020. The faculty hiring, student enrollment growth, instructional, space, workforce planning, and fiscal and organizational development necessary to reach these goals is currently underway. The demands on faculty, including for service, continue to be substantial and atypically large for a UC faculty member.

Over this same 12-year period, the Senate and the Office of the Academic Senate has evolved as well, although not perhaps as dramatically as the campus. Since beginning with an initial set of Standing committees, largely populated by representatives from other campuses, the Division now has 12 standing committees.   The campus's reliance on faculty from other campuses to round out committee membership is now limited to the Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP) and Privilege and Tenure (P & T). In AY 2016-17, five of CAP's nine members are from sister UC's. P & T has two members, one of whom is from another campus[3].

Over this same period, the office has had four Executive Directors (ED), including the incumbent. The founding ED held the position for four years, retiring in 2009. The office's second ED held the position from 2010 to 2012, leaving to join the Provost's Office as the campus' first Special Assistant to the Provost/EVC and Chief of Staff. The third held the role from April 2013 through April 2015. The current ED assumed the role in August 2016.

Since 2010, the Senate has three staff FTE in addition to the ED. The FTE held by the Senior Analyst was converted from a represented to non-represented position in 2015.

This is the first periodic review of the Office of the Academic Senate at UC Merced.

---

[2] M.A. and Ph.D. program in Economics will be implemented in fall 2017.

[3] Division Bylaws stipulate at least five members, who may be from any Division. (Title III. Part 4.)

Organization of the Senate Office's Self-Study

In the sections that follow, we describe the office's service goals and values (Section II); how the office is organized and resourced to support achievement of our goals (Section III); our efforts to assess the extent to which we are meeting these goals and our plans for responding to assessment results with action (Section IV); progress on Senate-related action items stemming from the campus' Initial Accreditation (Section V); and finally our thoughts related to the strategic direction of the Senate Office in light of the importance of effective shared governance for UC Merced's success, UC Merced's plans for growth, and the permanent nature of resource constraints, particularly for staff growth during the period leading up to the office's next periodic review in seven years (Section VI).

In conducting this analysis, we are guided by the standards ("concepts") established by UC Senate Directors, and endorsed by Academic Council and system administrative leadership, to inform the structure, function and resourcing of UC Senate offices outlined in the *Framework for Excellence: Investing in Shared Governance for the New Century* (2010), an update of the 2004 document *Framework for Establishing a Senate Operation* (2004). The concepts outlined in 2004, and updated in 2010 (pp. 3-4), are intended to offer a framework to guide divisions and respective administrations in the funding of Senate operations. As such, they serve us well in examining the Senate Office as it stands now, 12 years into operations, and as we plan for the next seven years, by which time the campus will have transitioned from the current period of intensive growth and development into our intended steady state of 10,000 students and 350 to 400 Senate faculty.

Although not explicitly noted in the *Framework* documents themselves, these concepts reflect a fundamental aspect of the Senate's organizational location in relation to sharing in the governance of the campus and University: The chair of a Senate Division is a campus and system leader equivalent to senior management;[4] thus, the resources afforded to the operation of the Division must be consistent with this role and sufficient to enable timely and productive execution of associated responsibilities.

In addition to this *Framework*, the *Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education* (CAS) promulgates a set of General Standards that consist of 12 criteria essential to quality services and programs. Although developed for student services programs, these 12 categories[5] are appropriate to any organization in higher education, as such as possible, we have considered these categories in the analysis that follow.

II.	What does the unit intend to do?

How does the unit envision its work in support of its mission? What are its service goals and intended outcomes?   How does the unit use the campus' mission or campus-wide strategic planning documents to make decisions, set priorities, and plan strategically? As relevant, describe the role of professional standards in the unit's work.

As reflected in the office's mission, and captured by the *Framework*, the office intends to provide administrative infrastructure and research and analytic support essential to shared governance. The office staff do this principally by working with the officers of the Division to facilitate the deliberative and legislative activities of the Senate's 12 standing committees and associated subcommittees, and the Division as a whole during, for example, biannual meetings of the Division. As outlined in the *Framework* (2010, p. 2), this includes supporting Senate committees in executing an essential subset of the core functions, including the

---

[4] At the system level, this positional leadership is visible in the University of California Organizational Chart.

[5] Mission; Program Organization and Leadership; Human Resources; Ethics Law, Policy, and Governance; Diversity, Equity, and Access; Internal and External Relations; Financial Resources; Technology; Facilities and Equipment; Assessment

- Establishment, transfer, consolidation, and discontinuance of programs
- Major and degree approvals
- Course approvals
- Program Reviews
- Academic personnel actions
- Grievances and charges
- Elections
- Policy and budget reviews
- Administration of research funds

At Merced, the office supports all of these functions except academic program review, which is overseen by the [Periodic Review Oversight Committee](#), a joint committee of the Senate and administration, and managed by the PROC Analyst and Program Review Manager in the Office of Periodic Review, Assessment, and Accreditation Support in accordance with policy established by the Academic Senate.

In conducting its work, the office staff consult and coordinate with the administration, campus stakeholders, and the systemwide Senate.

As part of the preparation for this review, and in keeping with campus [policy](#), in fall 2016, the Senate Office drafted a set of service goals outlining the core functions by which the Senate Office achieves its mission, and in turn supports the faculty in realizing the mission of the Academic Senate:

For Division officers, Division committees, and the Division membership as a whole, the Senate Office staff

1. *Facilitate informed, procedurally appropriate, and timely execution of committee and Division business, including by*

   a. *Providing proactive, responsive, administrative support.*
   b. *Advising on policies, procedures, and committee precedent and related courses of action*
   c. *Researching issues before the committee*
   d. *Managing Senate-sponsored programs*
   e. *Promoting diverse representation and perspectives*
   f. *Promoting transparency of process, while ensuring appropriate levels of confidentiality*

2. *Facilitate timely, informed communication with, and execution of, systemwide Senate business*

3. *Maintain Senate records.*

For the Division as a whole, as well as the campus more broadly, Senate Office staff also

4. *Promote campus knowledge of Senate structure, function, process, and offer guidance on Senate policy and protocol.*

A number of routine activities underpin achievement of these goals including scheduling meetings and managing meeting logistics; drafting meeting agendas, minutes, committee memos, and annual reports;

tracking and ensuring completion of requests for Senate review and Senate action items; maintaining committee records; and managing all aspects of the Senate website. On an annual basis, office staff support committee chairs as they orient members to the work of the committee. This happens primarily through a review of the Handbook for each committee, and includes discussion of conflicts of interest and/or a review of committee-specific conflict of interest policies. Looking forward, the office plans to implement an annual orientation to the Senate for incoming chairs and vice chairs, as well as committee members.

Because the campus and Division are new, the staff is also frequently involved in the development, and/or revision, of policy to address the increasingly diverse portfolio of campus needs and activities. Recent examples include the review and approval of credit-bearing Extension courses and certificate programs, instruction of upper division undergraduate courses by graduate students, the devolution of authority to deans for appointing assistant professors at step III and below, and revisions to the polices guiding the establishment, revision, and disestablishment of academic programs. This is an ongoing aspect of growth and development at UC Merced that takes considerable time and resources.

Finally, as reflected in the office's mission, we, the Senate Office staff, very much see ourselves as active contributors the campus's efforts to realize the campus's mission. Beyond the contributions outlined above, we make every effort to stay abreast of campus developments on behalf of Senate leadership in order to facilitate committee awareness, workload prioritization, and goal setting as appropriate. In this way, we intend to help make the Senate itself a proactive rather than reactive partner in the management of the campus and university.

In executing this work, we strive to provide the highest quality support for committee chairs, members and the Division as a whole by being
- Proactive
- Responsive
- Transparent
- Problem solvers
- Mission-driven
- Appropriately confidential

As an outcome of this review, we plan to develop a multi-year assessment plan describing how we will measure success in achieving our service goals, both in terms of the extent to which our stakeholders are satisfied with our support and the qualities of the processes we enable (e.g. timeliness).

Use of the Campus's Vision to Make Decisions, Set Priorities, and Plan Strategically

In spring 2016, the campus undertook a visioning process to develop a "compelling mental image of what we want UC Merced to be like in 2020 and beyond" [6]. The resulting Vision and Change Alignment Map[7] is intended to

---

[6] http://bfsi.ucmerced.edu/vision-summit. Reviewed 2.26.2017.
[7] The map articulates a vision of UC Merced as an institution characterized by culture of inquiry discovery and learning, transformative education and excellence in research, leading in creativity and innovation, engaging the public in scholarship and creativity, enriching the valley, and that is sustainable by design. The vision will be achieved through a set of priorities/projects/initiatives, to be updated annually, that fall within one of five change pathways - hiring and supporting the best faculty, recruiting and supporting talented students, engaging exceptional staff, modernizing systems and processes, and 2020 and space planning. To be selected for resource investment, pathway-aligned priorities/projects/initiatives must positively impact one or more of the following campus priorities: research excellence, academic distinction, student success, services and support, professional development, organizational sustainability, and diversity and inclusion. As per the map,

guide prioritization and planning on campus as we move forward through the period of growth associated with 2020, and ultimately to a university of 10,000 students. Because the Vision and Change Alignment Map was finalized within the last year, the Senate Office has not yet been able to use it to set priorities and plan strategically. However, the map informs the priorities outlined Section VI: Future Directions below.

III.   How is the unit organized and resourced to foster achievement of its goals and outcomes?

Describe the resources available to the unit to foster its outcomes: personnel, space, financial, etc. Provide an organization chart(s) illustrating the organization of the unit and its relationship to other campus units.

The section of the self-study is organized into two parts. First, we provide an overview of the organization of the office and its resources, including with respect to personnel, budget, space and facilities, technology, equipment, and professional development opportunities. Second, we evaluate our resources in relation to the seven standards outlined in the *[Framework for Excellence: Investing in Shared Governance for the New Century](#)* (2010).

Overview of Office Organization and Resourcing

The Office of the Academic Senate is resourced with four, full time FTE. Three of the four positions are currently filled. Staff working titles, with job titles provided parenthetically, are Executive Director (Executive Advisor Manager 1), Associate Director (Project Policy Analyst 5), Principal Analyst (Project Policy Analyst 4), and Senior Analyst (Project Policy Analyst 3). Positions descriptions are available [here](#). The staff provide support for 12 standing committees as well as all other office business; staff committee assignments as of AY 2016-17 are [here](#). Since December 2016, the Office of the Provost has provided analyst support for travel, ledgers, purchasing, and planning for the biannual Meetings of the Division, thus transitioning what had been helpful, but ad-hoc support (initially provided during a period in which the office was understaffed) into regular, ongoing support. Prior to this arrangement, the office's Senior Analyst handled many of these responsibilities. This agreement is not subject to any timeline.

For budget purposes only, the Office of the Academic Senate constitutes a department within the [Provost's organization](#). As outlined in [this organization chart](#), the Executive Director reports to the Chair of the Merced Division of the Academic Senate who in turn reports to the systemwide Chair of the Senate. The relationship of the Division Chair to the campus' senior management is not reflected in any campus organization chart. To facilitate campus-wide understanding of shared governance and related reporting relationships, we suggest the Senate Chair be added to the organization chart for the campus' senior leadership. [UCSC's organization chart](#) might serve as a model.

The [office's budget](#) is relatively simple, consisting of staff salaries, benefits, supplies and expense (S&E), the grant program, and stipends. The latter consists of Senate awards together with remuneration provided to the chairs of senate standing committees, and CAP members, to help sustain a chair's research activities during this period of intensive service. In the absence of discretionary funds, S&E supports all other office and Senate costs. It would also be the source of funds to support staff participation in professional development opportunities beyond those offered by the campus. That said, this year the Associate Director was able to participate in the 2017 *UC Women's Initiative for Professional Development* in part because costs that were intended to be paid by the unit were covered by the Provost's Office. The grant program and stipends "pass through" the Senate meaning any unused funds, should there be any, are not available to meet other needs.

---

projects and priorities will be revisited annually, with new investments made according to the extent to which proposed projects advance campus progress along change pathways.

UC Merced's budget is sufficiently tight that there has not been a budget call in two years, and none is expected this spring. New campus revenue is being prioritized for faculty and staff hiring in support of 2020-related growth. The fiscal limitations are so severe that the campus, as a whole, expects to add only 125 new staff FTE (see slide 9) during the period FY 2016-17 through FY 2020-21. To ensure these resources are allocated as strategically as possible, this spring (2017) the campus is engaged in a comprehensive workforce planning effort, the outcome of which will be a multi-year hiring plan to be released by the Chancellor in July 2017. A summary of the process, including the timeline, is provided here. As part of this process, the Senate Office has requested two additional FTE: an analyst to provide administrative and communication-related support for FY 2017-18 and an additional project policy analyst to provide committee support beginning in FY 2018-19.

The lack of a campus budget call also means there has been no formal mechanism to request incremental increases to the Senate Office's budget to accommodate natural increases in the number of Senate committees as the campus grows, and the associated need for remuneration for committee chairs[8], to grow the faculty grant program in keeping with growth in faculty numbers, or to permanently fund new initiatives like the Committee for Diversity and Equity's program, begun in 2015-16, to bring a diversity-related speaker to campus annually. To date, the office has been able to address these needs through salary savings, campus partnerships, and with the support of the Provost. For example, in 2016-17 D&E partnered with the Office of Academic Personnel to host its diversity speaker. The Provost supported this collaboration providing $3,000 of the $4,000 budget, with the Senate Office providing the outstanding $1,000 from S&E. Likewise, in 2015-16, the Provost made a three-year commitment to increase the faculty grant program by $49,000 to $175,000 through AY 2017-18, contingent upon the opportunity to request a budget increase to cover the additional 2016-17 and 2017-18 costs. (The 2015-16 costs were covered by salary savings.) Although there was no budget call in spring 2016, in fall 2016, the Provost honored the agreement for 2016-17. In this period, the Provost has also provided funds to initiate a Faculty Equity Advisor Program (created via a partnership of the Committee for Diversity and Equity and the Academic Personnel Office) and to support the purchase a new curriculum management system (a joint project of the Registrar and Senate). Staff salaries have also increased as a function of new hires and/or reclassification. Thus, despite the lack of a campus budget call, several initiatives have been realized. Looking forward, a process for requesting additional resources, including to address existing gaps, will be critical as the Senate continues to mature with the campus.

Physically, the Senate Office is located on the third floor of administrative wing of the Kolligian Library together with the Provost's Office, the Chancellor's Office, the Academic Personnel Office and the Vice Provost of the Faculty, the CIO, and the Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs, Research and Economic Development, Development and Alumni Relations. A number of these offices[9] are slated to move to off-campus locations this spring to generate much needed space for core functions. This transition will require attention to ongoing communication strategies, as opportunities for regular informal interaction will be limited. As campus space planning progresses, it would seem essential, however, to ensure that ultimately the offices of the Senate and administrative leadership end up in close physical proximity to facilitate regular communication and strong working relationships.

---

[8] For example, in 2014 the Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom divided into two committees, the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom, and the Committee for Diversity and Equity.
[9] The Chancellor's Office, and the Vice Chancellors for Research and Economic Development and Development and Alumni Relations are slated to move off campus in spring 2017.

In terms of office space, the Senate Office is located on the third floor of Kolligian Library in space originally allocated to the Senate in 2005.[10]When the Senate Office staff expanded to four from three, the space was reconfigured to its current organization: the Executive Director's office and three, immediately adjacent cubicles open to the each other and to the larger shared space of the third floor. There is no office space for the Senate Chair[11] nor for analysts to host planning meetings with committee chairs, to conduct private conversations, or to hold committee meetings. Committee business is conducted in meeting rooms across campus, although primarily in the Kolligian Library, access to which is secured through the campus reservation system.

In terms of technology and technical support to enable the office and Senate work, the office has always used the campus' enterprise solutions. Currently, this is *Box* for document management and *Qualtrics* for elections and surveying. *Zoom* is available to support remote access to meetings. This spring the campus approved the purchase of a curriculum management solution to be deployed over the next year, which will support and unify in one system undergraduate and graduate course request processes and management of the related catalog content. The Academic Personnel Office is also implementing a case management tool that will enable us to move away from *Box* for managing faculty personnel files for CAP. IT support is provided by UC Merced's IT department. Looking forward, the office is actively considering the Senate-specific document management system developed and supported by Senate-related IT staff at the Santa Barbara Division, and which is also used by the Irvine Division and is of interest to Los Angeles. Adopting such a system, however, will require an increase to the office's budget (see Section VI: Future Directions, below).

Evaluation of Resources in Light of the Seven Standards of the Framework

The *Framework for Excellence: Investing in Shared Governance for the New Century* (2010) offer seven standards or "concepts" to inform the structure, function and resourcing of UC Senate offices. Below, we list each and briefly summarize the extent to which the current context is consistent with the standard.

1. *Each divisional Senate Office must have sufficient resources to manage independently its operations, as would any senior administrative office with campus-wide areas of responsibility (e.g., office of the chancellor, office of the executive vice chancellor, vice chancellors and vice provosts).*

The office is resourced to manage its operations independently with the exception of its budget, which is currently managed in collaboration with the staff of the Provost's Office.

2. *All Senate operations, committees and programs should be fully supported by professional staff hired and supervised directly by the Senate Office (i.e., fiscal resources for these staff positions should be allocated on a permanent basis to the Senate budget) as determined by the divisional Senate.*

All Senate operations are supported by professional staff that are supervised by the Senate Office, with two exceptions: the budget and the School Executive Committees. With respect to the former, under existing practice, the Provost approves office hiring and reclassification decisions, because the office's budget falls within the Provost's Office; in the absence of a process for requesting incremental increases in budget, the Provost has historically provided the funds to support increases in staff salaries associated with reclassifications or new hires (into existing positions). Staff support for School Executive Committees is provided by a staff member in each school, as one of a portfolio of responsibilities. The staff report to the school dean. This situation has the potential

---

[10] The administrative space on the third floor of Kolligian has been on loan from the Library since the campus opened.
[11] The ED's office was initially intended for the Senate Chair.

to generate conflicts of interest for the staff member who is assigned to support a Senate committee, while reporting to the school's administration.

3. *Senate offices should be supported by sufficient administrative FTE to support the full range of Senate administrative functions and sufficient analytical FTE to conduct independent analyses as needed. Staff positions should be classified at the appropriate level so that Senate leaders are provided the same level of administrative support and analysis as that provided to senior administrators at each campus.*

Currently, the office has four staff FTE, including the Executive Director. These individuals provide all the office's administrative and analytic functions, with the exception of the support for purchasing, travel, and ledgers provided by the Provost's Office. With the exception of the Executive Director, all are classified in the project policy analyst series. The office has no other dedicated administrative support.

To examine the question of sufficiency of administrative and analytic support, we gathered information on office staffing for the two Divisions closest to Merced in terms of faculty headcount (Table 1).[12] These data suggest that the Merced Division might possibly be appropriately staffed in terms of analyst support, but perhaps not in terms of administrative support; both the Santa Cruz and San Francisco Divisions have at least one administrative staff member.

Table 1: Division staffing for two the Divisions closest to Merced in numbers of faculty (headcount). [10, 13] Assuming no significant faculty growth at these two Divisions, they will continue to offer the closest benchmark even when the Merced Division reaches 350-400 faculty in 2020-2021.

Division	Ladder Rank Faculty Headcount (spring 2016)	Number of Standing Committees (2016-17)	Number of staff, including ED	Number of administrative staff	Average number of committees per analyst
Merced	200	12	4	0	3
Santa Cruz	484	22	7	1*	~ 4
San Francisco	320	19	7	2**	~4

*Assistant to the Director; also supports one standing committee
**Senate Coordinator and a Senate Communications Specialist

These comparisons, however, do not capture the committee workload associated with a growing Division and campus. The demand for policy development and revision is high as the campus adds new functions and campus planning processes mature, requiring commensurate revisions to existing, and the creation of new, policies. For example, in AY 2016-17 the Senate is establishing policy with respect to its role in the review and approval of Extension courses and certificates, graduate student instruction of upper division courses, and new WSCUC policy related to non-degree granting programs. It is also revising CRF policies and contributing to revisions in associated

---

[12] Faculty headcount was used, as opposed to student enrollment or other attributes, anticipating that the number of faculty is likely associated to some extent with the number of committees a Division can sustain, recognizing that the demand for particular committee functions and expertise is independent of faculty numbers. In other words, all Divisions are expected to contribute to the management of the university with respect to a suite of duties that exist regardless of the number of faculty to meet these responsibilities.

[13] Riverside is the next closest at 610, with plans to add several hundred additional faculty.

administrative policy. A number other policies are flagged for revision in the coming year, including policies for establishing and reviewing Organized Research Units, establishing new graduate programs, establishing new undergraduate programs, and establishing graduate certificates. Similarly, as the Division continues to develop, there will be ongoing work to revise and expand Division Bylaws. Looking forward, we anticipate these types of demands to persist as the campus continues to mature and Division duties and responsibilities evolve and grow in response.

4. *Senate agencies should have the authority to request data and analysis from campus and systemwide institutional research entities and staff on an equal footing with administrative units.*

Like any administrative unit on campus, the Senate Office is able to request data and analyses from UC Merced's institutional research unit, Institutional Research and Decision Support (IRDS), as well as the Office of Admissions and Office of the Registrar. Like most campus units, IRDS capacity is stressed, and where possible the unit has been facilitating self-service. Survey support is an example of such a transition, and like most units on campus, the Senate now runs its own surveys using *Qualtrics,* the campus' enterprise survey solution. Under the newly hired IRDS Director, in partnership with IT, we anticipate development of a comprehensive data reporting strategy for the campus, and the Executive Director intends to strengthen the Division's access to data and analytic support useful to the work of Senate committees.

5. *In addition to staff FTE, Senate operations should be supported by sufficient financial resources, office space and equipment, including:*

   a. *Funds for regular meetings of Senate agencies.*

The Senate has funds sufficient to support regular meetings of Senate agencies.

   b. *Funds for programs, projects and special events, faculty training/leadership retreat and other operational needs as deemed necessary and appropriate by each division.*

As described above, the office's Supplies and Expense budget ($23,942) is the only source of discretionary funds for the Senate to support special events, projects, and training. Where possible and appropriate, the Senate partners with other administrative entities to deliver special programs, for instance, D&E's newly implemented annual diversity speaker. The Senate grant program is currently permanently funded at the level of $126,000 annually, with a $49,000 supplement provided by the Provost through 2016-17, for a temporary allocation of $175,000. The program's base funding has not grown since the program was initiated. The absence of ongoing incremental increases to the program's budget reflects the campus' larger budgetary context. At Merced, however, the Senate's grant program takes on outsized importance given the relatively few sources of discretionary funds available to faculty beyond startup and incidental funds.[14] Given the campus' budget context, it would seem important for the campus to develop a holistic approach to faculty support of this kind, into which the grants program should be factored and commitments made to incrementally increase the program's allocation in keeping with its agreed upon role.

   c. *Dedicated office space and administrative and analytical support for all divisional Chairs.*

---

[14] Incidental funds are allocated annually at the rate of $3,000 per faculty member. In some schools, faculty receive the entire amount, in others 50% of the allocation is retained by the dean to support other faculty needs, for instance, funding for disciplinary seminar series, and to provide bridge funding for faculty between grants, etc. This is an area of ongoing policy and practice development, including in relation to policies and practices for sweeping funds.

As described above, the Senate does not have dedicated office space for the Divisional Chair. Meetings are held in the Executive Director's office or the Chair's personal office, with ongoing communication and consultation taking place via email, phone, etc. Administrative and analytic support is provided by the Executive Director.

> d. *Dedicated office space for staff, and meeting space (e.g., dedicated access, regular cleaning and periodic refurbishing) sufficient to conduct meetings of the division, standing committees and other official Senate functions.*

As described above, the office space dedicated to the Senate consists of the Executive Director's office, and three cubicles. There is no dedicated space to conduct meetings of any type, beyond the Executive Director's office. All meetings, including meetings of the Division and standing committees, are held in meeting space reserved through the campus reservation system. This includes staff consultations with Senate officers, which may also be held in officers' personal offices. Senate offices are cleaned regularly by the campus' custodial staff. S&E supports furniture replacement or ergonomic-related changes to workstations as needed.

> e. *Furniture and office equipment appropriate to conduct the business of each division.*

With respect to circumstances under which currently operating, (see d. above), the office is fully equipped to conduct the business of the Division.

> f. *IT infrastructure, including desktop hardware, equipment and ongoing information technology/programming support (e.g., hardware, software, database development, online resource development).*

As described previously, the office uses enterprise software solutions, with support from IT, for document management, surveying, teleconferencing/videoconferencing, etc. Senate-specific implementation of these tools, e.g. *Box* as a document repository, is up to Senate staff. IT staff are available to provide some level of introduction to the tool, but Senate staff must determine how best to use the tool to aid Senate workflow.

Like all units, office staff are tasked with managing and updating all website content, as well as website design beyond the generic campus template. (The campus' Communications unit provides advice and support for implementing some aspects of website design.) In fall 2016, the Senate transitioned to a slightly newer version of the campus' content management system, and we have plans to reorganize the website content during summer 2017 with the goal of increasing its accessibility and user friendliness. We are also actively looking into subscribing to UCSB's document management system to increase the efficiency with which we manage and archive committee and system business.

As described above, the office is struggling with the campus' transition to *Zoom* as a teleconference/videoconference tool, which is of concern, given that the ability to hold effective, broadly participatory meetings is core to the business of the Senate. As long as the office has access to Ready Talk as a backup, and to meeting rooms with a telephone line, the Senate will be able to meet its teleconferencing needs. It is our understanding, however, that the Ready Talk contract will end June 30, 2017, which means our issues with Zoom must be resolved by then. Toward this end, the Executive Director is working with IT to procure a Jabra that can support meetings of more than five or six participants, and to identify and resolve other issues that impede full participation of remote participants.

In general, S&E is the source of funds for purchasing office IT equipment, including computers, printers, Jabra pods (necessary for Zoom), etc. office staff also have access to network printer systems at the cost of $0.07 per page for black and white printing. The office is developing a regular refresh cycle for its computers.

> g. *On-campus storage facilities or a permanent budgetary appropriation to fund offsite storage of essential, historical Senate records; funds to support development and maintenance of an electronic archiving system*.

Nearly all of UC Merced's Senate records are digital at this point. Like most, possibly all, campus units the office has always relied on enterprise solutions for electronic storage and archiving. The question of archiving in the digital age is not trivial; it requires forward-thinking, organizational planning by individuals with some level of specialized expertise, dedicated time, and tools (e.g. indexing) to ensure future access by users who lack institutional history. To date, the Senate has not had the benefit of that kind of support. The result is that the Senate archives are not systematically structured to facilitate access by users lacking historical knowledge.

Transitions in enterprise solutions further exacerbate the situation with some historical data stored in more than one system (e.g. communications in UCMCROPS, which is no longer supported by campus IT). This is an area that requires attention going forward, particularly given the importance of the Senate records to ongoing planning and decision making in the Senate and on campus more generally, including academic program review, tenure and promotion, etc. Adoption of the Santa Barbara's document management system would address many of these concerns going forward, as it is specifically designed to support the unique needs of the Senate and is underpinned by a searchable database. At the same time, resources will need to be devoted to appropriately archiving existing documents for future access.

6. *Upon request by the Division, the Senate operation should be its own budgetary control unit, with a direct reporting line to the chancellor (or her or his designee) on budgetary matters.*

The Senate has a direct line reporting the Provost/EVC for budgetary matters. As described previously, the Senate is not its own budgetary control unit at this point in time.

7. *Senate Chairs should not be asked to choose between Research Grants funding, on the one hand, and Senate office staff, on the other. Both are essential aspects of the Regental Standing Orders and require sufficient funding.*

As described previously, the campus budget is very limited with all units struggling to appropriately resource and deliver core functional needs. For example, the Library acquisitions budget has remained flat for at least the last five years, despite growth in the student and faculty FTE on which subscriptions are based. In this context, the lack of growth of the Senate's budget and/or resourcing is symptom of, and must be addressed within, this larger institutional challenge.

IV.   To what extent is the unit meetings its intended goals and outcomes, and how does the unit know?

Describe how the unit assesses its performance in order to identify strengths and weaknesses and to improve its contributions (or quality of those contributions) to UC Merced, including who does this work. What strengths have been identified, and what is the evidence for those conclusions? What challenges or areas for improvement have been identified, and what is the evidence for those conclusions? What actions has the unit taken to strengthen its contributions and to what extent have these efforts been successful?

At UC Merced, expectations for administrative assessment are outlined in the *Policy for Annual Assessment and Periodic Review of Administrative Units,* an umbrella policy that establishes the minimum expectations for coupled annual assessment and periodic review processes for the purposes of ".. maintain[ing] focus on contribution, quality, and improvement, and in support of transparency and accountability." (p. 1). As per policy, units are expected to establish and implement an assessment plan that describes how the unit will undertake annually an evidence-based appraisal of the extent to which a unit is meeting its desired outcomes for the purpose of taking action to improve effectiveness. Results and actions to improve effectiveness are to be reported annually. Productive assessment plans are anchored in a clear set of intended service goals and outcomes, and address the quality of service by gathering and triangulating data on both client satisfaction and objective measures of process outcomes (e.g. timeliness, accuracy, etc. of work product).

Since the policy went into effect in July 2011, transitions in Senate Office leadership, and or staffing issues, have significantly limited the time office staff had to fully develop and implement such a plan. Thus, while the office staff are committed to continuously improving the quality of the office's support and the contribution the Senate makes to the university, there has been no routine, systematic attention to defining and assessing office goals and outcomes and adjusting practice and process as suggested by the results. This is not to say that improvements to advance office support for Senate priorities have not been made; they have. Rather, a shared set of service priorities have been collectively elaborated and evaluated.

In support of the current review, and to gather some data on the quality of office support for the purposes of continuous improvement, in February 2017, the Senate office invited all chairs, vice chairs, and members of Division standing committees and subcommittees over the period AY 2014-15 through AY 2016-17 to answer a brief, six question survey. Eighty-nine faculty were invited to complete the survey, which asked about the benefits of senate service, actions that would make senate service more rewarding, advice to strengthen the effectiveness of senate committees, a global evaluation of the extent to which the Senate Office provides high quality support, and actions that would improve the support provided by the Senate Office. Forty individuals attempted the survey; individual questions were answered by between 25 and 33 respondents for question-specific response rates of between 28% to 37%. Below, we summarize the survey results, drawing conclusions about the quality of the office's services in relation to its (newly defined) goals, and identifying actions for improvement as indicated.

Quality of Office Support

In terms of a global assessment of the quality of staff support for Senate committees, a vast majority of respondents (85%) agreed (21%) or strongly agreed (64%) with the statement "The Senate provides high quality support to Senate committees." This is a commendable outcome, given that the office has been understaffed for significant fraction of the period covered by this survey. The results also suggests that the office is achieving its intended service goals to a large extent at a global level. Our goal is 95% agreement with this statement, so building from this survey we will work to further identify and address specific concerns. Toward this end, several themes emerged from the open-ended responses to the question *What one thing would improve the support provided by the Senate Office?*

1) *Increase Senate resources*: 38% (10/26) of the responses to this question identified increasing office resources in some way, with 80% of these responses specifically recommending increasing the number of office staff. Several noted the need to increase the Senate Office budget, or staff salaries. One respondent recommended adding resources "to strengthen the office as an institutional memory, efficiently offering knowledge of past activities and issues to regularly shifting committee memberships."

2) *Provide additional support to committee chairs and members*: 23% (6/26) of respondents recommended additional forms of support that could be provided to committee members and chairs, including new member orientation to his/her role, tracking and preparing members for system level meetings and for Division Council, drafting (not finalizing) memos for all subcommittees, and making committee work less of a time sink for faculty.

3) *Faculty role in staff performance*: 8% (2/26) recommended that faculty have "more direct input" to staff performance review[15] and relatedly, have higher expectations of staff and be honest when performance falls short with the goal of supporting staff career development, and ultimately office support.

4) 12% (3/26) were "singular responses", recommendations unique to a given respondent. These variously emphasized the importance the office being fiscally independent of the Provost's Office to ensure shared governance; the importance of good communication between the committee chair and the Senate Office, and the need for office staff to be dedicated and have deep knowledge.

Nearly 20% (5/26) of respondents offered no additional recommendations; 31% (8/26) recognized the quality of the support provided by the staff in some way.

Advancing Committee Work

Because Senate offices can support committee effectiveness beyond just material support for routine committee work, survey questions 3: *What one thing would have made/would make your experience on a senate committee more rewarding?* and 4: *What advice would you offer future senate leadership to strengthen the effectiveness of Senate committees in realizing their duties?* were intended to provide insights into committee-related needs.

Several themes were common to responses to questions 3 and 4:

1) *Committee focus and function*: 31% (9/29) and 48% (12/25) responses addressed this theme in questions 3 and 4, respectively. Respondents variously recommended

   - Focusing meetings and/or balance the time spent on agenda items to place more emphasis on/invest more time in topics/issues for which substantial benefits to the campus are in reach and/or of importance/relevance to faculty members.
   - Guiding membership to proactively identify topics or issues to be addressed.
   - The importance of promoting continuity in committee priority and precedent (2 comments), and focusing committee work on the duties outlined in the bylaws.
   - That committees maintain direct relationships with faculty so that the administrative partner is not the gatekeeper for committee information.

2) *Relationships with the administration*: 21% (6/29) and 28% (7/25) responses addressed this theme in questions 3 and 4, respectively.

   a. *Improved consultative relationships*: 83% (5/6) and 57% (4/7) of these responses respectively focused on the need for improved consultative relationships with the administration. Respondents desired

---

[15] In spring 2016, committee chairs were invited to provide input on analyst performance. It is unclear how this was handled in the preceding year (the period covered by this survey). Performance reviews for 2017 have not yet been initiated.

- An administration that actively seeks and values timely Senate input into decisions, and responds to Senate input in a timely fashion.
- Clarity around the meaning of shared governance, the lack of which complicates roles and expectations.
- Avoiding unnecessary antagonistic positions against the administration, and trying to find common ground.
- Feeling that the time and effort put into committee work benefitted the university.
- Faculty respect for and use of the Senate to address issues of concern to the faculty.

b. *Effective relationships with the administrative partner on the committee (ex-officio member):* Several respondents focused on the importance of effective relationships with the administrative partner on the committee (ex-officio member), noting the importance of preparing committee chairs to understand the extent to which they can and should collaborate with their administrative partners, and building relationships with faculty constituents to ensure committee perspectives are reaching faculty through more than one channel. One respondent felt the committee's efforts had been "undermined" by the administrator's misrepresentation of Senate business and unwillingness to support initiatives originated by the Senate.

3) *Member preparation for and participation in committee work*: 10% (3/29) and 32% (8/25) of responses addressed this theme in questions 3 and 4, respectively. Respondents variously recommended

- Clarifying membership expectations, beyond circulating a document at the start of the year.
- Clarifying lines of communication both among committees and among committee and school committees and constituents.
- Delegating responsibilities to committee members.
- Promoting involvement of all committee members; ensure all members are held to the same expectations for responsible and equitable participation (3 comments).
- Being passionate about engaging, without regard to service credit.
- Identifying a mentor on the committee.

4) *Compensation and recognition for committee service*: 14% (4/29) and 8% (2/25) of responses addressed this theme in questions 3 and 4, respectively. Respondents variously recommended

- Course reduction to offset the workload associated with committee service and maintain research productivity (3 comments).
- Appropriate financial compensation for service.[16]
- Increasing the weight placed on Senate service in promotion and review.

5) *Committee size, terms of service, and membership:* Four comments across two questions addressed this topic. Recommendations included

- Increasing the size of committees to distribute workload.
- Decreasing the size of committee by expecting more than is currently expected of existing members in terms of preparation and participation.

---

[16] As per APM 666-16 faculty should not receive honoraria for service on campus or systemwide committees.

- Staggering and lengthening terms of service (at least two years' duration was suggested) to strengthen the effectiveness of Senate committees.
- Ensure cross-school representation on committees so that committee decisions are representative, and the likelihood of objection to committee recommendations is reduced.

A number of singular responses were received for questions 3 and 4. These included having more clear and stable documentation on system websites, promoting mission-oriented creativity and problem solving among office staff, and specific strategies for managing Senate-related email.

Benefits of Senate Service

A number of themes regarding the benefits of Senate service emerged from responses to question 2: *Please identify one way in which service on a senate committee has benefited you personally or your unit or your school*. These themes are

1. *Learning*. 52% (15/29) respondents identified new areas of knowledge or understanding as a benefit of Senate service. This include knowledge of

   - Institutional operations and campus and system issues, challenges, and goals (53% (8/15))
   - Policy development, implementation, and regulations 26% (4/15)
   - Shared governance (20% (3/15))

2. *Communication and information flow*. 17% (5/29) respondents describe the benefits of conveying information back to their school and/or units. Respondents reported that this information

   - Facilitated "decision-making at all levels."
   - Increased awareness of issues important to faculty or units.
   - Generated interest in senate service so concerns could be addressed,
   - Hhelped position units to advocate for needs.

3. *New colleagues*. 14% (4/29) respondents identified the value of meeting and interacting with colleagues from other units/disciplines. Specific benefits included

   - Understanding the work and challenges of other faculties.
   - Building relationships around area of shared interest.

Collectively, responses to this question suggest that Senate service builds understanding and awareness of campus and system-level issues, priorities and processes, promotes the flow of information to the benefit of schools, units, and the campus more broadly, and provides an opportunity to build cross-unit relationships and understanding essential to moving forward as an institution. In other words, it helps to unify and align knowledge of campus practice, process, challenges, and priorities across faculty units to the benefit of units and the campus.

Conclusions and Avenues for Action

These results provide one line of evidence indicating that the office is meeting to good extent Service Goal 1: *Facilitate informed, procedurally appropriate, and timely execution of committee and Division business.* The results also suggest some important actions for strengthening the office's achievement of this goal, as well as

goals 2: *Facilitate timely, informed communication with, and execution of, systemwide Senate business* and 4: *Promote campus knowledge of Senate structure, function, process, and offer guidance on Senate policy and protocol.* Actions suggested by these survey results include the following:

1. *Strengthen faculty preparation for Senate service*. Several respondents recommended a retreat or other opportunity to orient members to Senate service. Consistent with long standing intentions[17], we plan to initiate this in fall 2017, and will look to survey themes as potential discussion topics, including for example, facilitating committee focus and function, developing effective relationships with the administrative partner on the committee, member preparation for committee work, facilitating communication and information flow, managing committee-related workload, and effective partnerships with committee analysts.

2. *Strengthen relationships with the administration*. For a good fraction of respondents, this action is important to making Senate experience desirable and rewarding and making committees more effective. Over this academic year, good progress has been made in this area and it will be important to continue to advance these efforts. Actions for consideration include integrating a consultation period with administrative leadership into the start of the year retreat. Potential topics include discussing common goals for the upcoming year. This action also dovetails with the office's Service Goal 4: *Promote campus knowledge of Senate structure, function, process, and offer guidance on Senate policy and protocol*, since effective partnerships are grounded in common understanding. We return to this topic in Section VI: Future Directions.

3. *Increase resources to the Senate Office to address workload issues for both the office and committee chairs and members*. Recommendations from survey respondents dovetail with analyses from Section III. We return to this in Section VI: Future Directions.

Looking forward we will formulate a complete multi-year assessment plan for the office. As part of this, we plan to establish an annual "exit" survey of committee chairs and members, consisting mostly of closed-ended questions with opportunities for open ended comment in order to facilitate high completion rates. This instrument will address specific aspects of committee support to pinpoint areas for ongoing attention and improvement.

V.	Progress on Accreditation–Related Action Items

As relevant, summarize the unit's contributions to addressing WASC-related action items identified in the most recent UC Merced Self-Study, WASC Visiting Team Report and WASC Commission Action Letter. For these materials, see accreditation.ucmerced.edu.

In its action letter granting UC Merced initial accreditation in 2011, the WSCUC Commission recommended that the campus address issues in three broad areas: 1) Financial, Strategic, and Academic Planning; 2) Assessment of Student Learning; and 3) Student Success. To the extent the Senate advises on or otherwise oversees these functions, the Senate, with the support of the office, have contributed to addressing these issues as described in the campus' draft institutional report in support of reaffirmation for accreditation due in July 2017.

Under Assessment of Student Learning, the Commission specifically recommended extending assessment to administrative units, which includes Senate Office as per campus policy. Since July 2011, when the letter was issued, transitions in Senate Office leadership, and or staffing issues, have slowed progress in this area. However,

---

[17] The Senate Office has intended to do this for several years, but only now is it possible with staffing levels restored to the historical baseline.

we are committed to assessment as a means of continuous improvement and outline plans for that in Section VI: Future Directions. In its report in support of initial accreditation, the WSCUC Visiting Team also recommended that the Senate "consider a self-assessment" (p. 29). This periodic review is consistent with this encouragement.

VI. Future Directions

A. *Strategic Planning. Reflect on the unit's contributions and role at UC Merced, the institution's evolving context, plans and related needs, and the unit's strengths and weaknesses. What is the unit's vision for its future in light of UC Merced's plans for growth and development? How does this vision relate to its current mission, service goals, and intended outcomes? Describe plans for developing the unit in relation to its institutional context and contribution and the demands UC Merced's growth and development are anticipated to place on the unit. What strengths will the unit build on? What any areas in need of strengthening will the unit address, and how? What resources are needed to effectively achieve this vision, including support to improve or develop the skills of the staff in the unit? How might these resources be mustered? Can the unit re-prioritize its current resources and/or are new resources required?*

B. *Assessment. Reflect on the methods and process used to assess the unit's outcomes. Have they been effective? Have they or can they be improved? Do they need to be revised in light of the unit's strategic planning? How will the unit engage in continuous improvement in support of the vision and related goals articulated above?*

Our vision is for the Merced Division of the Academic Senate to be an effective partner in the planning and decision making essential to achieving the campus' and university's mission, vision, and goals. In this vision, the committees of the Senate ensure that institutional planning benefits from faculty input that reflects faculty experiences at UC Merced, and faculty knowledge as experts in a variety of disciplines relevant to governing the university. The Senate Office plays a critical role in this effort; its contributions outlined by the four service goals articulated in Section II of this report.

With this vision in mind, below we outline six priorities for Senate and Senate Office development over the period leading to the next office periodic review. These plans reflect what we have learned through this self-study, including our evaluation of the office's history (Section I), organization and resourcing (Section III), and feedback from past and current Senate leadership and committee members (Section IV). Our plans are also informed by physical expansion of the campus (2020 project), related growth of faculty, student and staff numbers, the campus' evolving budgetary and planning context going forward, and the campus' intentions to achieve an "R1" Carnegie classification. Given our strongly resource-limited environment, the latter can only be achieved through robust, ongoing collaboration between the faculty and the administration. As the faculty structure for contributing to the management of the university, Senate engagement will be critical to achieving the R1: Highest Research Activity designation.

Six Priorities for Senate and Senate Office Development

1. *Strengthen Senate Involvement in the Management of the Campus and the University*

Advancing this priority will be critical to ensuring that the campus' very limited resources are allocated in keeping with campus priorities, as outlined for example in the campus' vision, and ultimately for achieving R1 status. Longer term, a strong Senate-administration partnership will be essential to periodically reaffirming and, as needed, redefining campus strategic priorities, goals, and strategies for achieving these outcomes. Strengthening Senate involvement in the management of the university is also critical to making Senate service desirable, rewarding, and meaningful for faculty. Currently, it can be challenging to fill committee rosters and, while a number of factors contribute[18], strengthening the role of the Senate in campus planning will increase the profile of Senate committees and interest in serving.

---

[18] For example, the sheer number of service roles to be filled with a small faculty

Progress in this area would seem to depend in part on advancing stakeholder knowledge of Senate structure, function, and responsibilities (as defined in the Bylaw 40 of the UC Regents[19]), and perhaps most importantly how to effectively partner with the Senate. Although the Academic Senate and the administration of the UC share common purpose in that both are focused on the management of the university, structurally and operationally they could not be more different. The administration is a hierarchical bureaucracy while the Academic Senate is a representative, deliberative and legislative bureaucracy. Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that the Senate's mode of operation would be unfamiliar to a majority of new members of the campus community, and perhaps many existing members.   Further, the Senate's highly formalized role in the governance of the UC is exceptional; it is very unlikely that a new member of the UC community will have experienced anything like it at a non-UC institution. As such, it seems incumbent upon the Senate, with the support of the Senate Office (see office Service Goal 4), to effectively convey to the campus community at large, as well as to new administrators, staff, faculty and students, the nature of the Senate as a *senate* (a representative deliberative and legislative body) together with guidance about how to effectively partner with a representational, deliberative body.

Advancing community knowledge about the unique organizational nature of the Senate seems particularly important at this juncture in the campus' development. The campus is in the process of redesigning essential, routine planning functions (e.g. for budget, space, and the allocation of staff FTE), and it will be important to consider how best to include in these types of annual workflows appropriate consultation with the Senate. Broadly shared knowledge and understanding will also promote appropriate consultation in response to ad-hoc issues. Reciprocally, the Senate must be a faithful partner, making every effort to contribute in an appropriate and timely fashion. That will be most achievable when campus planning timelines, including those the Senate influences, explicitly account for consultation with the Senate.

Toward these longer term goals, UC Merced's Business and Financial Strategic Initiatives unit has already initiated an effort to clarify, on behalf of UC Merced's administration, the structure and function of the Senate. We appreciate these efforts very much, and look forward to continued collaboration on this work, as it represents a significant and important step to achieving effective shared governance, a desire indicated by a number of respondents to the survey results described in Section IV above.

Finally, strengthened engagement in shared governance by both the faculty and administration will help to unify and align knowledge of campus practice, process, challenges, and priorities across faculty units and the campus more broadly, as increased numbers of faculty experience the benefits of Senate service as described in Section IV above. This kind of common understanding will greatly facilitate achievement of the campus's vision and goals going forward.

2.   *Strengthen Faculty Preparation for Senate Service*.

As we work to strengthen campus and knowledge of and partnership with the Academic Senate, we will also want to better prepare faculty for Senate service to make service easier to assume, to make committees more effective, and to make membership more rewarding. Toward this end, as outlined under bullet 1 of the *Conclusions and Avenues for Action* of Section IV of this report, we plan to initiate in fall 2017 a retreat or other opportunity to orient members to Senate service, and will look to survey themes as potential discussion topics. An annual retreat may also be an opportunity to connect with the administration in light of the coming year's priorities and work.

---

[19] Formerly, the Regents Standing Orders

Following feedback and advice from committee members, we will also further develop resources, for instance, quick online, reference guides, to help Senate members (and non-members, e.g. guests and consultants) answer questions and to support ongoing committee work. Currently, committees have handbooks that provide an outline of the duties of chairs, members, analyst, consultants, and guests, but handy online reference guides that help all members of the campus community, including committee consultants and guests, understand how committees function would seem beneficial, including in light of priority 1 above.

3. *Identify Appropriate Space.*

As per our analysis in Section III of this document, the office's current space is not consistent with the standards outlined in the *Framework for Excellence: Investing in Shared Governance for the New Century* (2010). Specifically, concepts 5c and d: *Dedicated office space for all divisional Chairs and for meeting space sufficient to conduct meetings of the division, standing committees, and other official Senate functions.* Dedicated office space for the Division Chair and office space for Senate staff that enables private conversations are particularly critical to effective functioning of the Senate. Regular presence of the Chair would increase the effectiveness and efficiency of communication. Dedicated staff space for private conversation would reduce the lost time and disruption that result from having to find a vacant meeting room down the hallway or otherwise leave the office location to have confidential in person and phone conversations. The demand for routine access to space for private conversations is critical as confidential conversations are a regular part of Senate business.

Dedicated space to conduct standing committee meetings, meetings of the Division, and other official Senate functions is very desirable as well. However, at Merced, space is a very limited resource, and will continue to be even after the 2020 project is completed. Further, mixed-use space was a core principle of 2020-related space planning and continues to be (see slide 17). This campus context likely means that the Division will continue to share meeting space with campus constituents. Priority access to certain rooms would, however, facilitate routine use of particular spaces, which would be helpful to busy committee members and promote timely starts to committee meetings.

In late February 2017, the campus announced the formation of new Space Planning and Allocation (SPA) Board, tasked with developing principles to guide allocation of space among the major divisions of the campus (see slides 12-22). SPA Board membership includes the Senate Chair and the Chair of CAPRA. As the SPA Board's work proceeds, it will be important for the Senate Chair to clarify with SPA membership whether the Senate office is considered its own division for the purposes of space planning or whether it is assigned to a division. In either case, the Senate Office's needs for additional, private space will need to be factored into divisional allocations.

As outlined in the memo establishing the SPA Board, planning is already underway to convert some of the administrative office space on the third floor of Kolligian Library to space for students. As planning for relocation of remaining occupants continues, it will be important for the Senate to be involved directly in those conversations. Longer term, we recommend that the Offices of the Senate, Provost, and Chancellor ultimately end up in sufficient physical proximity so as to enable regular in-person interaction of office staff and principals. We anticipate that such proximity will further facilitate achievement of priority 1 above.

4. *Address Senate Budget Needs and Plan for Senate Growth*

As described in Section III above, budget planning and management at UC Merced has been undergoing significant development. Over the last several years, the campus has developed a budget model and a long range financial plan to facilitate responsible fiscal planning, and all funds budget. Plans are also underway to develop a suite of essential budget polices, including carry forward and sweeping policies. As a result of the campus' very

tight budget, there has not been a budget call for several years, and thus no process for requesting budget augmentations. Funds have also been swept annually to balance the campus's budget. As a result, the Senate has had no opportunity to increase its budget allocation over the last several years. Rather, funds have been found, through salary savings or from the Provost, to temporarily augment the Senate grant program and to support new initiatives related to faculty diversity and curriculum management.

Looking forward, and as outlined in Section III, most immediately it will be important to permanently increase funding for the Senate's grant program and to plan for its continued growth in step with the increase in faculty numbers. As noted previously, this might be most productively accomplished by taking a holistic, campus-wide look at the need for and resources devoted to discretionary funds for faculty, and ultimately outlining a portfolio of funds, including the grants program, and a plan to incrementally grow these funds in concert with the increasing number of faculty.

Over the period until the next periodic review, it also seems possible that several new Senate committees will likely form as part of the ongoing growth and maturation of Senate functions. This will require additional funds for remuneration of chairs, at a minimum. Other possible costs could be the need for an additional analyst, assuming an FTE is not allocated through the current workforce planning effort. Given that the campus's budget will continue to be very tight for the next four years (see slide 16), it would seem important for the Senate to develop, as an outcome of this review, a plan, including estimated resource demands (e.g. space, staff, IT/workflow and document management) and costs, for growing Senate committees over the next four to seven years. Such a comprehensive plan would be highly valuable to the Senate and the campus.

Finally, it will also be important for the Senate to become its own budgetary control unit, with a direct reporting line to the chancellor (or her or his designee) on budgetary matters. The approach to resourcing this will depend in part on the outcomes of workforce planning, and how the campus decides to allocate scarce staff FTE to address diverse, competing campus needs. It seems likely that service centers will emerge as a model for these types of common support needs. Thus, while independence is an important long term goal, its implementation will depend on continued development of the campus' budget planning processes and the outcomes of workforce planning.

5. *Address Senate Resource Needs (Other than Space and Budget)*

As noted in priority 4 above, the Senate would benefit from a comprehensive plan for its ongoing development and maturation over the seven years leading to its next periodic review. As identified in Section III of this report, and supported by the results of the faculty survey reported in Section IV, critical elements of such a plan would include staffing and relatedly plans for increasing efficiencies in document and workflow management. We will also need to devote resources to appropriately archive Senate records, which are currently organized in ad-hoc manner in UCMCROPS (the campus' original file sharing, storage and collaboration system), in *Box* and to some extent on the Senate website. We expect UCMCROPS to be fully phased out in the not too distant future, so archiving and indexing information from this system will soon be critical.

As part of workforce planning, the office requested two staff FTE: an analyst to provide administrative and communication (website) support for the office and an analyst to support committee work. As per Table 1 Section III of this report, the addition of an administrative analyst is consistent with staffing at Santa Cruz and San Francisco Divisions. Such an individual would manage meeting scheduling and organization (as under Space above, it seems likely we will continue to share meeting space), the Senate website, survey support, data

archiving[20], etc. Such a position is consistent with standard 1 of the *Framework*[21]; dedicated administrative support exists for all senior administrators at Merced. It would also increase the time existing analysts have to devote to committee work, including the ongoing demand for policy development.

Although Table 1 does not necessarily indicate an immediate need for an additional analyst, we suggest that such an addition would enable the office to extend *analyst*-level support to the School Executive Committees. This kind of centralized, specialist support would help to advance priority 1 above by improving coordination and communication among school-based committees, the Division, and the system.[22] It would also eliminate the potential conflicts of interest inherent in the current arrangement.

In addition to increasing office FTE, the office urgently needs to adopt a document and workflow management system. This critical need is, as email is currently the primary means for managing and tracking Senate business in conjunction with *Box* for file management and archiving, and the website for communicating public aspects of committee business. This is inefficient and unsustainable in the long term; it also establishes conditions in which, without careful stewardship, Senate records are potentially tied to personal email accounts. A well-designed document management and workflow system would unite the management of committee and Senate business and its archiving in one enterprise. It would also enable us to gather data essential to improving Senate processes (e.g. timeliness; critical to priority 1 above) and for assessing the workload of committees as a means for adjusting analyst responsibilities and ultimately for determining the need for and how best to deploy additional analysts.

The Santa Barbara Division has developed a document management system specific to the business processes unique to the Academic Senate. System modules support Senate and committee business, the office's tracking of this business, voting, the grants program, Senate awards, and member service records (with self-service access). Committee business is automatically populated to the Division website (with access determined by permissions set by the Division). The system is actively supported by IT developers at Santa Barbara and, as such, can be modified to address needs specific to a Division. The system was recently adopted by the Irvine Division, and it is under consideration by the Los Angeles Division. A recent demonstration for the Merced Division staff suggests it would address a number of our Division's critical administrative needs, and would enable the office to scale services as the Division grows and matures. It is also consistent with the campus' intentions to use technology to increase efficiencies. We are in the process of gathering more information about system costs, including to support Santa Barbara IT developer time (i.e. "subscription" rate) and the demands it would place on Merced IT, both in implementing and maintaining the system. We recommend serious consideration of this option, as the development of a document and workflow management system is critical to the Merced Division.

6. *Assessing Progress toward Our Goals*

Our final priority is the need to implement routine assessment of the office's effectiveness in supporting the work of the Division, and the progress toward Division goals. This is critical not only to continuously improve the efficacy of the office and the Division but also to comply with campus policy. Toward this end, a multi-year assessment plan will be developed as part of the action plan to stem from this review. In this way, the plan will

---

[20] We will still need professional advice on how to organize and index these materials in order to ensure future access by individuals without specific knowledge of Senate history.
[21] 1. Each divisional Senate office must have sufficient resources to manage independently its operations, as would any senior administrative office with campus-wide areas of responsibility (e.g., office of the chancellor, office of the executive vice chancellor, vice chancellors and vice provosts).

[22] Informal assessments suggest that information flow could be greatly improved.

reflect the recommendations stemming from this review and provide data and evidence that directly address the strategic priorities and plans the office and Division lay out for the periodic leading up to the office's next periodic review.