

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
DECEMBER 4, 2008**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, December 4, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presided. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. She introduced the Chair of the Academic Council, Mary Croughan.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Martha Conklin

The Senate Chair reported on the following topics:

- The Divisional Council sent a letter to the Academic Council requesting that Merced be considered a budget priority. The Academic Council endorsed DivCo's sentiment and forwarded the letter on to UC President Yudof. The letter detailed the lack of classroom space and the lack of funding for the Science & Engineering II Building (S&EII).
- The Academic Senate also sent a letter to Chancellor Kang indicating the Senate's campus priorities. Among them: focusing resources on core campus development and sustainability issues, and creating a sustainable funding model.
- UCOP released the [University of California Accountability Framework Draft Report \(9/21/08\)](#) in which UC Merced was not portrayed well because the report compared the campuses on a per dollar basis and research for number of students. The Academic Senate requested that metrics be examined on a per capita basis. On a positive note, UC Merced is a standout because it has two Presidential scholars.
- A new Senate/Administration Council has been established and will include the Chairs of certain Senate committees and the equivalent Administrative leaders. The Council will meet monthly and work on issues such as resource allocation and the need for more transparency. The Council is not a problem-solving committee; it will instead ensure that problems are directed to the right people. Faculty is encouraged to contact Chair Conklin with key issues they think need to be addressed.

Chair Conklin ended her comments by thanking all faculty members who serve on Senate committees.

Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang

Campus Accolades

- UC Merced's chapter of the National Society of Black Engineers won a regional competition, defeating teams from Stanford, USC, UCLA, the University of Washington, and Cal Poly Pomona. The team will be advancing to the national competition.

- For the second consecutive year, UC Merced has two winners of the Presidential Early Career Award for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE): SSHA Professor Sean Newsam and an awardee to be announced from the School of Natural Sciences. They will receive the award at the White House on December 19, 2008.

Campus Update

- We continue to work on the Long Range Development Plan. The campus footprint is 815 acres. The university community south of the campus will be about 2,000 acres. We are seeking the permit for the northern half which is 833 acres. The reaction of the community at last week's open session was positive and supportive. We are hoping to get the Regents' approval by March. We will then submit final documents for approval by the Army Corps of Engineers for a 404 permit, which is a permit related to navigable waters. We should have the permit by April or May 2009. This will be an important milestone for this campus.

Building Projects

- The child care center will hold 80 children and will be finished by early next year.
- The Social Sciences and Management building is being built near the end of Scholar's Lane and will be completed by February or March 2010.
- We still do not know what the funding source will be for the S&E II building. We are pushing for \$75 million plus a \$10 million loan so we can have a bigger footprint. OP sent \$1.5 million for design preparation. They are withholding sending money until we have full funding.
- Student Housing III Project will begin soon. It will add as many as 340 beds and additional space for student activities.
- We are preparing for additional parking spaces.

Strategic Academic Planning

- We are on the ninth or tenth iteration. Some improvements need to be made, such as emphasizing the international eminence of our faculty research. State support is not enough; we have to engage in private fundraising. OP questions whether we can pay the borrowed money back.
- The current funding model by OP is inadequate. We have to work with them to figure out how OP can properly fund our campus. We must show accountability. Student enrollment will be reaching 5,000 and the supplemental support from the state is running out. Each year for the past three years, the supplemental support was \$14 million, this year it is \$10 million, next year it will be \$5 million and thereafter it will be zero.
- UC Merced is the most diverse campus in the UC system. We need to keep promoting our excellence in this regard. We need to recruit diverse professors as role models for our students. Efforts will be made to recruit an individual to serve a Special Advisor to the Chancellor on Inclusion and Equity.
- We need to work together and continue shared governance.

- We want to continue to strengthen and develop the campus during the state's budget crisis. There is a gap between what is needed and what the state is providing. President Yudof is supportive of UC Merced. We have to have enrollment growth according to our long range enrollment plan, space expansion, more financial support for our students (more than half of them come from poor families or are first generation college students), WASC accreditation, successful completion of the long range development plan, and the 404 permit process. I am working with John Garamendi, Jr. and an outside consultant on a fundraising campaign.

Campus Standouts

- In terms of absolute numbers, the amount of our students participating in the Science and Math Initiative is high.
- We have more than \$1 million in support for telemedicine and we are working with UC Davis to benefit the rural area for health care.
- Jorge Aguilar is a national leader in educational partnership programs. He is bringing in millions of dollars per year in federal support.

The Chancellor concluded his remarks by noting that even though we have a lot of challenges, we should celebrate the positive things being done on our campus.

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

Application Pool

- So far, in the freshmen application pool, we have received 8,826 applications. That is slightly down from last year so it is a cause for concern. By contrast, the transfer applications are up - right now there are 1,057 applications. This year, we will graduate our first class which will be a very exciting event. We have to backfill the 450 or so students that graduate this year. In addition, we have to grow by the approximately 700 students that we have in the Plan. The goal for next year is to recruit about 1,050 first year students, 250 transfer students, and 100 graduate students. This is a big increase from last year. The referral pool is expected to be large. The unknown factor this year is the economy. There might be pressure on many of our students to drop out of school to work to support their families. But, it might be a positive for us that students will gravitate towards public education rather than private because we might have a chance at a larger percent of the referral pool than we had in the past.

An Assembly member inquired if there will be more financial aid with the increased number of undergraduates we are bringing in. EVC Alley answered that it will scale as the numbers go up. For the last couple of years, OP has provided our campus some scholarship funding but it is unknown whether the funding will continue at the same level.

WASC Accreditation

- I thank the faculty for its efforts. The campus is now preparing for the Capacity Review and the documents have to be in on July 7. The Review is September 30-October 1, 2009. In the past, it has been about facilities, budget, and faculty. Now, it is about educational effectiveness: WASC wants to see if we have the capacity to deliver the instruction that we say we are going to deliver. We are the first campus that has gone through this. The faculty have shown a good understanding of this process and I am confident we will do well when WASC does its review.

SSHA Dean Search

- We are moving forward on the search for the next Dean of SSHA. A consulting firm has been contracted to assist in the process.

Budget

- Today, the Chancellor is signing a memo informing all units that we are instituting a hiring freeze. We are not sure how long the freeze will be in place. We are also reducing the supplies and expense budget by about 25%. This cut is not for this year - it is in preparation for next year. Next year, we lose the \$5 million from the state. That money was to be backfilled by the marginal cost dollars that would come from the state for enrollment growth. There is no clear indication that we will get those dollars. This year, we received \$6.3 million as marginal cost dollars from the other UC campuses. We might not get that money again next year, because all the campuses are preparing for significant cuts in the coming academic year. There are about thirty faculty lines out there: fifteen are in the budget already and are safe positions; ten were in the budget for this year; and five that we included in the budget models for next year. We will probably have to take a more detailed look at start-up costs. We may have to spread out any new faculty start-up for more years than we'd planned.

An Assembly member inquired if the campus can reinvest indirect costs into research infrastructure. EVC Alley replied that we have kept almost all the opportunity fund dollars to get a bigger S&E II building. Putting money aside that would allow us to pay the debt service on a loan to increase the size of the building was the most reasonable approach. Chancellor Kang stated that he is interested in investing some discretionary funds and creating a small incentive program where faculty can submit proposals to prepare for bigger proposals.

Academic Council Chair Mary Croughan:

The Council Chair prefaced her remarks by praising Chair Conklin for raising UC Merced's issues at every Academic Council. She then reported on the following topics:

Eligibility Reform

- There is a change in the freshman admission criteria that would take effect for the entering class of 2012 or for the students applying by November 30 of 2011. This was brought about by the fact that the Master Plan says that the UC is supposed to admit the top 12.5% of public high school graduates.

(We actually do not distinguish between public and private high schools when doing our admission process.) We have been around 15% again. The primary barrier for high school students is the SAT II subject test. By removing the subject test, we are eliminating one of the eligibility criteria for admission to the UC.

The Senate proposal is to use a 2.8 unweighted GPA to broaden the pool of students who are visible to the UC. The President's amendment is a 3.0 weighted and capped GPA which is what it is now. The other broadening is to go from 4% of eligible in the local context to 9% eligible in the local context. That significantly advantages students who come from schools who otherwise aren't producing students in the top 12.5% of the state. It makes them visible to the UC. In the end, about 10% of the UC's undergraduates will come through straight metrics of GPA and SAT reasoning test scores and an additional 2.5% of undergraduates will come from the broader pool of students eligible for comprehensive review. The fees that go to admissions are \$60 per applicant and a lot of students get a waiver. We have discovered that a lot of that money gets siphoned off instead of going to the Admissions Office so Student Affairs and the Senate is doing an audit.

The Regents will vote on the eligibility reform proposal at their February meeting and next week I will go to the CPEC meeting because we need their permission. I will also spend time with state legislators and their staff. There is a side issue about eligibility reform that has surfaced in the local press. A well-funded fringe group claims that UC is lowering its standards and says that the elimination of the subject test is a disservice to the students of California. They have a lot of incorrect factual information. I am writing op-ed pieces and talking to legislators to counter this group's claims.

An Assembly member asked about comprehensive review. Council Chair replied that shared review has still not been approved between all the campuses. President Yudof has called for an examination of best practices of comprehensive review and we are probably going to do a workshop for all the admissions offices across the UC system. The campuses all have different models so shared review will not work yet.

Budget

- We expect an announcement in January of an additional budget cut. We are expecting it to go back to the \$98 million dollar deficit we had in the original Governor's proposed budget a year ago. Basically, it is \$200 million below what it takes to run the UC. There was \$28 million dollars worth of savings at the OP last year from layoffs and the volunteer separation program and there will be about another 400 layoffs this year. OP will go from 1,800 employees to about 700.

An Assembly member asked Chair Croughan to comment on EVC Alley's discussion on the budget. The Assembly member was concerned that only 60% of our students get enrollment support next year. Chair Croughan responded that UC Merced is funded on a different model than the other UC campuses. President Yudof is requesting full funding of the UC system in the 09-10 budget. There is no proposal to change the funding model of the campuses.

The Assembly member then commented that UC Merced has been guaranteed funding for only 2,000 students next year even though we are aiming to take 3,400. We are not going to be fiscally solvent below 5,000 students. Chair Croughan said that she will check with OP to see how many students UC Merced is actually funded for and will relay that information to Chair Conklin.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of the Draft Minutes for the Division Meetings of December 5, 2007 and May 22, 2008.
- B. Acceptance of the Senate Committee Annual Reports for 2007-2008.
- C. Proposed Academic Senate Bylaw Changes: Senate Bylaw II.2.A., II.2.B., II.4.B., II.4.C., and Senate Bylaw II.1.A.

ACTION: Consent Calendar Items A and B were approved as presented. Consent Calendar Item C, Bylaw Changes II.2.A, II.2.B., II.4.B., and II.4.C. were approved as presented. The proposed changes to Senate Bylaw II.1.A. were pulled from the Consent Calendar for discussion.

Discussion:

CRE Chair O'Day explained that the proposed change seeks to address the issue of conflict of interest in terms of faculty serving on Senate committees. She said that the CRE looked at other UC campus's Bylaws regarding this issue and proposed the wording based on UC Davis's Bylaws to distinguish when it is appropriate or inappropriate for Senate members to serve on particular committees while they are in an administrative role. The intent is to eliminate a conflict of interest.

An Assembly member commented that CRE did not actually adopt UC Davis's language because theirs says these restrictions do not apply to Chairs of academic departments or programs. It was asserted that the CRE language was stricter than any of the cited campuses. Secondly, the Assembly asserted that true conflict of interest exists except only on personnel matters.

CRE Chair O'Day replied that UC Merced is unique right now because we don't have any academic or administrative chairs or heads. The only formal titles we have used are at the Dean level. It may be that an academic chair would not have a conflict of interest because his or her administrative responsibility is defined in a different way. Right now, it's impossible to state one way or another because we're not using those titles.

The Assembly member then asked if CRE could issue an opinion to that effect, to make it clearer that this isn't a problem for current chairs.

CRE Chair O'Day said that a formal Ruling had been made but, unfortunately, was included in today's Agenda.

ACTION: Senate members will receive all background material associated with the proposed Bylaw change and will be invited to forward their comments to the Divisional Council. Comments will be compiled and then, based on faculty input and additional comments by Divisional Council, the CRE will consider revisions to the proposed Bylaw language for consideration at a future Division meeting.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Committees (COC) – *Professor Henry Forman*

The Committee has done everything it could to get as many faculty included as possible.

There being no further business, committee adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest: Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by Simrin Takhar, Senate Assistant