COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)
Wednesday, May 6, 2015
3:00 – 4:30 pm
KL 362
UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources

I. **Chair's Report – David Noelle**
  A. Meeting of the Division on April 23
  B. Division Council/CAPRA meeting on April 30

II. **Consent Calendar**   **Pg. 1-4**
  Action requested: Approval of April 22 meeting minutes.

III. **Campus Review Item**   **Pg. 5-39**
  A. UC Merced's Review under the WSCUC Standards.

  UC Merced initiated its efforts to re-affirm accreditation by WSCUC which will conclude with an Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 and, in June 2018, the WSCUC Commission decision to re-affirm accreditation for a period of 6, 8 or 10 years. The first step in the Institutional Review Process for re-affirmation is to complete, as an institution, the *Review under the WSCUC Standards*. All Senate standing committees are asked to review.

  Action requested: COR to review the report and send any comments to the Senate chair by May 15.

IV. **Senate Faculty Grants**   **Pg. 40-47**
  Action requested: COR members to finalize rankings and select awardees.

V. **Other Business**

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
April 22, 2015

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on April 22, 2015 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

I.   Chair's Report
       Chair Noelle updated COR members on the following topics of discussion at the April 13 UCORP meeting:
       --The new UC Care health plan has made a profit.
       --Standardization of the admissions criteria for community college, CSUs and the UCs.
       --Modifications to the UC sexual harassment policy which was submitted to all campuses for review.
       --3% faculty salary increase distribution.
       --Regis "Reg" Kelly, the director of the three-campus California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences ("QB3"), and now the UCOP Senior Advisor on Innovation and Entrepreneurship met with UCORP. He advised that UC investments must be conservative as they utilize pension funds. Kelly envisions that the UC system will establish innovation centers in the same manners as medical centers.
       --State Senate bill 15 passed out of the Senate Higher Education committee and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations. The bill would provide UC and CSU systems $75 million each in additional state dollars for more courses and advising, as well as funding to immediately expand enrollment in both systems. The initiative will not be entirely funded by the state's General Fund; some of the dollars will come out of the scholarship fund established last year to help middle-income UC and CSU students.
       --The Legislative Analyst's Office has stated that the state's tax revenue will be earmarked for K-14 education.
       --Revisions to the APM are underway to include provisions for Adjunct Professors working on "soft money" at the national laboratories.

--The UC is experiencing difficulties securing non-profit foundational funding. Non-profits are willing to give money to the UCs but there are issues surrounding intellectual property.

--The Natural Reserves system launched a fundraising initiative in celebration if its 50th anniversary.

--GradSLAM final competition will be held on May 4 at a venue near the UCOP building.

--Graduate Advocacy Day at the state capitol will be held on April 28.

--The UC Ventures team is planning to hire a firm to make investment decisions.

--Members of the Governor's staff have inquired about the efficiency of having multiple labs pursuing common research questions across the UC system.

II.   Consent Calendar

ACTION: The April 8 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III.   Campus Review Items

--Proposed revisions to the MAPP pertaining to the LPSOE and LSOE titles.

ACTION: The Senate chair will be informed that COR has no comments.

IV.   Systemwide Review Items

-- Guidelines on Accepting and Managing Equity in Return for Access to University Facilities and/or Services. COR members discussed the proposed revisions to the guidelines. The committee's concerns focused on Part IV. C. 2. which states "The support of new businesses affiliated with the University is in the public interest and furthers the University's training and educational objectives." This section does not indicate who determines whether a given business affiliation further advances the UC's educational objectives nor is there mention of which individual or body would adjudicate any conflict of interest. Committee members also noted that the proposed policy does not

provide for Academic Senate oversight and so recommends that an annual report is submitted to the Senate each year.

ACTION: COR to send memo to the Senate chair with the aforementioned comments.

--Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 pertaining to the University Committee on International Education (UCIE). The revisions would expand the functions of the UCIE. Members believed that this bylaw revision would greatly strengthen the Senate's contribution to the establishment of collaborative agreements that are aligned with campus research priorities.

ACTION: COR to send memo to the Senate chair stating its endorsement of the proposed revisions.

--APM 210-D pertaining to contributions to diversity. The proposed revisions give greater weight to contributions to diversity in the academic review process. COR members noted that the revisions still need further refinement, but the committee endorses them.

ACTION: COR to send memo to the Senate chair stating its endorsement of the proposed revisions.

V.   Senate Faculty Research Grants

COR members expect to receive the shortlisted proposals from the School executive committees by April 29. Between April 30 and May 5, committee members will review the shortlisted proposals.

Committee members agreed on the following:

Grading rubric will be a 3-point scale across the following categories:

Evidence of funding need: 3 (has none), 2 (has some that is unrelated), and 1 (has some that is related).

Past efforts to secure money: 3 (has tried and received positive feedback), 2 (has tried and been declined) and 1 (has not tried).

Likelihood of obtaining funding: 3 (specific programs identified, good chance of success), 2 (specific programs identified, uncertain chance of success), 1 (no funding programs identified)

There will be three tie breaking categories:

Quality of Composition: 1 (poorly formatted and incorrect numbers), 2 (acceptable), and 3 (well crafted).

Juniority

Time Since Last Award

COR members will select awardees at the May 6 meeting.

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

Attest: David C. Noelle, COR Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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

April 20, 2015

Jian-Qiao Sun
Chair, UC Merced Division of the Academic Senate
UC Merced

RE: UC Merced's Review under the WSCUC Standards

Dear Chair Sun:

As you know, this semester UC Merced initiated its efforts to re-affirm accreditation by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC, formerly "WASC"). This process, which involves several stages[1], will conclude with an Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 and, in June 2018, the WSCUC Commission decision to re-affirm accreditation for a period of 6, 8 or 10 years. The Chancellor and Provost expect UC Merced to earn a 10-year re-affirmation period, continuing our record of strong accreditation reviews.

The first step in the Institutional Review Process for re-affirmation is to complete, as an institution, the *Review under the WSCUC Standards*. Through this first step, UC Merced will

1. Undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards, the commitments, standards, and criteria UC Merced must be in substantial compliance with for accreditation to re-affirmed.
2. Identify strengths and areas of good practice.
3. Identify areas that may need attention.
4. Generate a required document for our accreditation review; the *Review under the WSCUC Standards* is the basis for the second essay of the institutional self-study report, and the conclusions and supporting evidence are carefully validated by the external review team.

The WSCUC Steering Committee has completed a draft of the *Review under the WSCUC Standards* on behalf of the campus, and is now seeking feedback on this draft.

Toward that end, I write to invite the Academic Senate to review the document, with a particular focus on Standards 2, 3, and 4, and return comments to me (with a cc to Laura Martin) by Thursday

---

[1] The stages of the Institutional Review Process (IRP) for re-affirmation, and the campus' timeline for this work, are available on the Re-affirmation page of UC Merced's accreditation website, accreditation.ucmerced.edu.

May 21st. If this is not possible, please respond with an alternative submission date as soon as possible.

When reviewing the document, the faculty of the Senate should consider the extent to which they agree with

1. The Steering Committee's *Self-Review Rating* (column 3) and rating of *Importance to Address* (column 4) for each Criteria for Review (CFR). WSCUC's scoring rubric is provided in the box in the upper left hand portion of p. 2 of the document.
2. The responses to the Synthesis/Reflections questions for each of the four standards.

If there is disagreement with a self-rating score, **these differences can be noted in the document using the PDF sticky note or highlight function. Alternative scores, together with a brief explanation for the conclusion, including hyperlinks and/or references to evidence in support of the conclusions, are welcome.**

Similarly, the PDF sticky note and/or highlight function can be used to comment on and/or modify responses to the Synthesis/Reflection questions.[2]

To increase the efficiency of the work, we recommend dividing the work of reviewing each Standard among individuals or teams of individuals.

Laura Martin, the campus' Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), and I are happy to meet with the Senate to review this process and/or answer questions. Please note that the first page of the worksheet includes a helpful overview, including

- the purpose of the worksheet , *Purpose of Worksheet*
- the relationship of the WSCUC Standards, Criteria for Review (CFR), and Guidelines, T*he WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines*
- guidance for completing the worksheet, *Using this Worksheet*

Finally, please know that, in addition to the Senate, a broad array of institutional stakeholders have been invited to review and comment on this draft, including but not limited to the School Executive Committees, campus administrative leadership, and student leadership.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, thank you very much for your assistance in completing this significant first stage in our re-affirmation of accreditation effort. We look forward to your feedback.

Sincerely,
Nate Monroe
Associate Professor, and Chair, WSCUC Steering Committee

---

[2] We chose not to offer Word documents as we have found the tables quite difficult to work with and somewhat unstable in their formatting.

Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for evaluation as evidence for Component 2 of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four checklists that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the federal requirements cited in the checklists. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

033114

Review under WSCUC Standards

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.</td><td colspan="2">Institutional Information

Institution: University of California, Merced

Type of Review:
    ® Comprehensive for Reaffirmation

Date of Submission: ____/_____/_____
                   Mo   Day   Year

Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO</td></tr>
<tr><td>Self-Review Rating
1= We do this well; area of strength for us
2= Aspects of this need our attention

3= This item needs significant development
0= Does not apply</td><td>Importance to address at this time
A:U= High priority – Urgent
A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth.
B= Medium priority
C= Lower priority
0= Does not apply</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Institutional Purposes						
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	2	C	Though functional, the mission could benefit from revision. A recurrent theme is that the mission statement is overly long and slightly outdated. Recently, CAPRRA noted that the mission is not a relevant reference document. Rated as a lower priority in light of more urgent and important priorities. Steering Committee noted that UCM might consider updating its mission after the self-study is complete, permitting revisions to be informed by the outcomes of the self-study process.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: *Introduction.* • Mission • Principles of Community	

033114

Criteria for Review	Guidelines	Self-Review Rating	Importance to Address	Comments	Evidence (Un-shaded only)	Team/Staff Verification
1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning outcomes. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2		2	B/A:OA	• To what extent are educational objectives widely recognized? How do we know? • How are educational objectives shared/communicated within the institution (students, faculty, staff) as the institution grows? • As an institution, need to consider how we will make public "evidence of student learning outcomes", beyond those reported in the UC Merced Profile and in keeping with our campus principles of assessment. • IRDS makes data on student achievement including retention and grad available, but it is difficult to get there from any of main landing pages. Propose adding assessment/student success link on campus homepage under "About."	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 5: *Student Success*. Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Integrity and Transparency						
1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	1	C	• Commitment is publicly stated in system-wide APM (APM – 010). Hard to know how easy it is to locate from campus. • What about for staff who work with academics? Do they need/receive orientation on academic freedom? Is there existing policy for non-academic staff regard academic freedom?	• Academic Freedom Statement in system-wide Academic Personnel Manual (APM -010) • Academic freedom for Unit 18 lecturers is provided in Article 2 of MOU with UC. • Principles of Community	

033114

1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.	1	A:OA	• Campus has a clear commitment to diversity as stated in our mission, but needs to continue to focus on diversity as a campus, including in all its definitions, across all areas. • Would campus benefit from a strategic plan for diversity?	Evaluated during comprehensive review.
1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. X 3.6 – 3.10	The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.	1	C	The University is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." Consistent with this, the UC Merced operates with appropriate autonomy.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.
1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12	The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.	1	C	Truthful information about academic goals, programs, services and costs to students is available to students and the larger public on campus websites including those of the Registrar, Student Affairs, Disability Services, Office of Student Life, Student Conduct (Student Judicial Affairs), and Financial Aid.	Evaluated during comprehensive review. Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. X 3.4, 3.6. 3.7		1	C	UC Merced has a high level of integrity and transparency in its operations as evidenced by commitment to an appropriately resourced Office of Campus Culture & Compliance (OC3) placed within the Chancellor's Office for the highest degree of independence when evaluating campus operations. OC3 is organized to ensure coordinated independent evaluation of business processes through the Internal Audit function as well as through compliance monitoring within the Ethics & Compliance Program. Coordination of campus-wide policies and procedures has been consolidated under OC3 to enhance access to and development of local procedures. Timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances have received robust attention at UC Merced. Coordination of complaints across all functional areas at UC Merced is being carried out by OC3, with emphasis on promoting efficiencies, improving accountability, and tracking complaints and outcomes through disposition so we are better able to understand and improve culture in real time.	Audits submitted with Annual Report.	

033114

1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.		1	C	UC Merced carefully attends to accreditation requirements, including those related to substantive change, with the support of the ALO and Substantive Change Coordinator. UC Merced continues to develop practices (e.g. ALO ex-officio on Graduate Council) to ensure that we abide by these expectations. When questions arise we work with WSCUC staff to gather answers and understand the implications for the campus.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: *Introduction*. Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.

033114

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One
1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard? • Our mission is outdated and could benefit from revision. The Steering Committee suggested that revisions might be an outcome of the self-study process associated with re-affirmation of accreditation. • We meet these expectations but our documentation needs to be more accessible to stakeholders. For instance, the academic freedom policy and student success data.
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard? • The campus does a good job of collecting data that illustrates we meet to this Standard (and CFR), in fact and in spirit.
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard? • We need to better job of making crucial information—such as, the eight guiding principles, academic freedom, commitment to diversity, and student outcomes—easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

033114

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
		Teaching and Learning				
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	1.5 - UG 1.5 - Grad	A:OA	Content, length, and standards of academic programs, graduate and undergraduate conform to recognized disciplinary and professional standards. Programs are also subject to rigorous peer review, both at the time they are proposed and once every seven years via program review. Faculty: student ratios at the institutional level are in keeping with our UC peers, although ratios vary across programs. Faculty are appropriately qualified for the curriculum as vetted through faculty hiring and peer review processes and, in some cases as appropriate, administrative review. Additional faculty are needed as programs continue to grow. We are engaged in integrative planning as an institution in support of the goal of 10,000 students by 2020.	Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist"	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees. X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4		2 - UG 1- Grad	A:U - UG C - Grad	At the undergraduate level, entry level requirements are clearly defined and set at the system-level. Within the major and standalone minors, PLOs and associated rubrics define levels of student achievement that represent more than an accumulation of courses or credits. As an institution, we are in the process of clarifying and fully defining the meaning of the baccalaureate degree as part of our re-examination of General Education. At the graduate level, degrees are clearly defined in terms of entry level requirements as articulated in program-level policies and procedures, and the Graduate Advisor Handbook. Capstone experiences are required for masters (thesis or comprehensive exam) and PhD (dissertation); expectations associated with degree completion (PLOs, rubrics) define levels of student achievement necessary for graduation and represent more than an accumulation of courses or credits. There is a coherent philosophy that guides the meaning of graduate degrees, including learning outcomes for the Masters and PhD, and processes to ensure the quality and integrity.	Program descriptions in Catalog. • UCM Catalog See also program websites: • School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts • School of Natural Sciences • School of Engineering Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality*.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3	The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).	3 – UG	A:U	The score of three reflects the status of GE; we are in the process of revising General Education to address the description outlined in the guideline. A process is in place to attend to student development and assessment of the core competencies for all majors through the program learning outcomes.	Description of General Education program with reference to Core Competencies. Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality*.	
2.2b The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3	Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.	1 -Grad	B	See CFR 2.2. We clearly meet all aspects of this CFR, including as described in the guideline. We demonstrate this to WSCUC with every substantive review for new graduate programs. Initially, there were a number of conjoined undergraduate/ graduate courses; with growth of faculty this has decreased to an appropriate number.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality*.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.3 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment. X 3.5	The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.	1 – UG 1 -Grad (with respect to the CFR, 3 with regard to the guideline, if we choose to accept the guideline)	A:OA (with respect to the CFR); B with respect to the guideline.	As described in the CFR, this is an area strength for us. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow. Regarding the guideline: there are questions about resourcing for co-curricular experiences like internships or service learning that address the needs of our students specifically, e.g. financial needs, or the factors related to local context.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs.*	
2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. X 4.3 – 4.4	Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.	1 – UG 2 – Grad	A:OA	By Regental authority, policy and practice, faculty are responsible for curriculum, including student learning outcomes, standards of performance, and for demonstrating through assessment student achievement of these standards. Student learning outcomes are required for approval of new courses, and appear in the syllabi of nearly all courses. At the graduate level, shared expectations for learning as reflected in systematic assessment of program outcomes that advances a shared set of standards among faculty is still evolving. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4		2 - UG 1 - Grad	A:U – UG A:OA - Grad	Rated as a 2 for the undergraduate level, because we need to address these expectations for General Education. There is also some thought that expectations for student performance, and support to help students meet those expectations, may not be uniformly high across all undergraduate programs. Some programs and courses may benefit from development in this area.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4	The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.	1.5 – UG 1.5 -Grad	A:OA	UCM has a strong academic assessment infrastructure, growing understanding of practice and use of results to inform teaching and curriculum. Student achievement of academic standards is also considered during program review. Assessment of student learning in GE is in development. At the graduate level, we need continue to attend to assessment as programs grow and new programs are added.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6		1 – UG 1 -Grad	A:OA	All academic and co-curricular programs are subject to program review on a seven year cycle. By policy, reviews consider student learning outcomes, retention and graduation rates. The process is overseen and coordinated by the Periodic Oversight Review Committee, which is working to strengthen periodic review as a means for advancing program and institutional goals.	• Academic program review policies: Undergraduate, Graduate • Academic program review schedules: Undergraduate, Graduate • Student Affairs Program Review policy and schedule [Description of Program Review process and calendar for academic and co-curricular units.] Also addressed during review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* Component 5: *Student Success,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Scholarship and Creative Activity						
2.8 The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2	Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	2 - UG 1 - Grad 1 - Faculty	A:OA	The extent to which expectations for research, scholarship and creative activity is defined for undergraduates varies with major as described in program learning outcomes and degree overview. The institution is working to clarify this aspect of the meaning of the baccalaureate degree. These requirements are available to all faculty, Senate and non-Senate as codified in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 210) and MOU, respectively. Instructional and curricular innovation is encouraged. Faculty are encouraged to apply for graduate training grants from funding agencies, and this activity is recognized in personnel reviews. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow. [Note: Recommendation by Review Team for Initial Accreditation (p.30): "In the tenure and promotion process, consider research on teaching as a standard, acknowledging the firm foundation of assessment. View this as a form of scholarship."]	Policies related to faculty and student research. • Senate Faculty: APM 210 • Non-Senate, lecturing faculty: MOU	

| 2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service.

X 3.2 | | | 2 – UG
2 - Grad | A:OA | Appropriate linkages are recognized in system-wide policy governing appointment and promotion for Senate faculty: "Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions." (APM-210). Some non-Senate faculty also engage in scholarship on teaching, pedagogy, and assessment. However, interpretation and recognition of these expectations varies across by-law units. The campus also continues to work on recognizing assessment as part of teaching (at course and program levels). Toward this end, the Graduate Division, the Office of Institutional Assessment and the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence offer a learning community "Assessment as Pedagogy and Planning" for faculty and graduate students. Interest in the learning community increases with each offering suggesting a growing recognition of the importance of assessment/culture of assessment. The campus is also working on mechanisms for assessing mentoring in interdisciplinary context, especially across schools. | Policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

• Senate Faculty: APM 210
• Non-Senate, lecturing faculty: MOU | |

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Student Learning and Success						
2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.	The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.	• 2 - UG (TTD, and degree completion) • 1.5 – Grad • 1 -both (for data collection and disaggregation, etc.)	A:U - UG A:OA – Grad and both	UCM's data collection efforts are sound in relation to the expectations described in this CFR. At the undergraduate level, we are actively seeking to understand barriers to completing a degree in four years in order to improve the fraction of students completing in a timely fashion. These efforts could benefit from greater coordination campus-wide. On finer scales than described in this CFR, we need to improve data gathering and use in support of student success. At the graduate level, TTD and degree completion rates are commensurate with national norms, but we strive to continue to improve. We are in the process of further systematizing data collection at the graduate level.	Included in Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5		UG: • 2 (for alignment and support for all students' personal and professional development), • 3 (for integration), • 2 (for assessment and use of results) Grad: • 2 (for alignment and support for all students' personal and professional development), • 2 (for integration), • 2 (for assessment and use of results)	A:U – UG A:OA - Grad	At undergraduate level, co-curricular programs are designed to support all students' personal and professional development, and are aligned with academic goals. They are not, however, integrated with academic programs. At the graduate level, Student Affairs and Graduate Division are offering programs that are aligned with academic goals, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. At both levels, co-curricular assessment is happening but not consistently.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6	Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.	2 - UG 2 - Grad	A:U	UG advising is an area to strengthen, particularly with respect to ensuring *all* students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely and useful information. For instance, data suggest that a significant fraction of students struggle with degree planning. At the graduate level, annual student reviews are critical to ensuring students understand and receive timely advice about degree requirements; we are working to strengthen this aspect of graduate education.	Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in "Marketing and Recruitment Review" Checklist.
2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1		2 - UG 2 - Grad	B	UCM provides all listed services for undergraduates. We are unclear about the extent to which services are systematically assessed to ensure they meet the needs of UC Merced's students. Relevant services also exist at the graduate level, but we have additional needs, including residential life for international students in particular, and mental health services oriented for graduate students. Assessment is happening but not consistently at both levels.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.
2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process. X 1.6	Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.	3 (UG) 0 (Grad)	A:U	At undergraduate level, it is not clear what is working and what is not working. Transfer success is a system-wide priority.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: *Student Success.* Also documented in "Transfer Credit Policy Checklist".

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

Undergraduate Level:
- Clarifying the meaning of the baccalaureate degree, including as a means for contextualizing the contributions of the major, GE, and the co-curriculum. (CFR 2.2)
- Addressing all aspects of GE including its contribution to the undergraduate degree, the learning outcomes of General education, its contributions to student development of the Core Competencies, its design to cultivate intended learning outcomes, and our mechanisms for sustainably assessing student achievement of intended outcomes. (CFR 2.2a, 2.5, 2.6)
- Undergraduate advising (CFR 2.12)

Graduate
- Assessment of graduate academic programs is evolving and needs continued development to ensure meaningful, valid and reliable results on which to take action. (CFR 2.4, 2.6)
- More consistent implementation of annual reviews of student progress. (CFR 2.12)

Undergraduate and Graduate
- More systematic collection of data to assess the extent to which our services meet the needs of our students, including intended learning outcomes, and using the results for improvement. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

With respect to Standard 2 CRF's, the evaluations above were made on the basis of available and informative evidence. This includes data/information on academic program outcomes assessment and student success metrics (at least at undergraduate level), demographics etc.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

- Graduate assessment: At the graduate level, we are still building systematic review processes and data sets as programs move to standalone status. We are working toward program-level dashboards.
- Undergraduate: strengthening our ability to further disaggregate data to explain and examine patterns in IRDS data.
- Undergraduate and Graduate, Academic and Co-Curricular: We are working to improve our ability to easily track assessment activity and aggregate results at levels above the program/unit to inform planning and decision making. Data exist but need to be readily available to a broader array of constituents and would benefit with being coupled to other metrics (e.g. student success) to provide a holistic picture of student learning, student success, and support for these core institutional functions.

Review under WSCUC Standards

Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.	Institutional Information

Self-Review Rating   **Importance to address at this time**
1= We do this well; area of strength for us   A:U= High priority – Urgent
2= Aspects of this need our attention   A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth.
3= This item needs significant development   B= Medium priority
0= Does not apply   C= Lower priority
        0= Does not apply
	Institution: University of California, Merced
	
	Type of Review:
	    ⑧ Comprehensive for Reaffirmation
	
	Date of Submission: _____/_____/_____
	                  Mo Day Year
	
	Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Faculty and Staff						
3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b	The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.	1	A:OA	The institution engages in fair hiring practices to ensure diversity in staff and faculty recruitment efforts. Diversity efforts are based on Affirmative Action Goals per the institutions Affirmative Action Plan. While we are confident in the fulfillment of this core deliverable, it remains a continuous high priority to maintain adherence to and delivery of a consistently high standard.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4		2	A:OA	The institution has established policies to ensure recruitment and hiring of faculty and staff are aligned with the mission. HR's Strategic Plan recognizes the long-range smart growth plans as detailed in the UCM's Workforce Planning exercise so that all hiring, training and development is integrated around a smart growth model to leverage people, skills and technology in the most efficient, effective and self-fulfilling way possible with continued focused dialogue anchored in the University's mission. Once on-boarded, the staff are evaluated annually with emphasize on essential functions, goals, achievements, core competencies, and professional development needs. Performance management training for supervisors is offered annually. Enhancement to our staff performance appraisal system, coupled with mandatory training and a reemphasis on overall employee training and development is a key component of the new HR Strategic Plan. Significant changes to streamline the appraisal process are underway. Institution offers cash and non-cash awards to recognize exceptional performance and innovation.	Faculty Handbooks Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP) UC Policy PPSM 20 Recruitment PPSM 23 - Performance Management Policy, Performance Management Guidelines, Performance Appraisals, Employee & Supervisor Resources, Halogen. STAR & Innovation Awards	

| 3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes.
X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4 | The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development. | 2 | A:OA | Faculty development in support of teaching, learning and assessment of student learning outcomes is provided in several ways: through programming and resources provided by the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE),) in the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Academic Personnel Office, and in small part by the Office of Institutional Assessment. Faculty work on program assessment is supported by assessment specialists, one per school and one at the graduate level. CRTE resources are available to all faculty, lecturing and Senate. They are also available to staff and complement professional development opportunities in assessment offered by the Division of Student Affairs.

At an institutional level, the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) is charged with advisory and oversight responsibilities for academic and administrative assessment, annual and periodic. This includes recommending appropriate resourcing in support of assessment, and facilitating processes by which assessment practices act to align resources with academic mission, campus strategic plans, and resources.

A score of "2" is given for several reasons: (1) in part because the CRTE is undergoing periodic review in spring 2015, including an examination of "sufficient support". (2) It also reflects the need to better integrate engagement in assessment (as teaching at course and program levels) into the tenure and promotion process. (3) Also, while lecturing faculty are involved in program review, their involvement in annual program assessment varies across programs. (4) Under PROC's guidance, we are still developing assessment processes that facilitate alignment of educational and administrative activities and resourcing with campus goals. The "A" score reflects the need to continue to attend to these needs this as the campus faculty numbers grow rapidly over the next five years in keeping with 2020 planning. | Policies, budgets, or other indicators of faculty development programs.

- Center for Research on Teaching Excellence Faculty Development Services

- Non-Senate Faculty access to Instructional Support in MOU

- Assessment specialist services for faculty and staff

- PPSM 50 Professional Development Policy for Staff Members

- Professional Development Programs for Staff Members

- Lynda.com Access for staff and faculty | |

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives. X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7	The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it.	2	A:OA	UC Merced's budget is based on estimated revenue expected to be received which is reviewed and adjusted to actuals throughout the year. Enrollment management is done in coordination with the University of California system as a whole and is reconciled against the long range plan for UC Merced. A tone at the top has been established and communicated campus-wide regarding current and future budget alignment with our Academic Strategic Plans, workforce planning initiatives, and our long range 2020 Project, which is a long-term strategic plan to grow the campus over the next 5 years. A long range financial plan has been developed to forecast the financial impact of the aforementioned plans. The financial plan outlines the targets that must be met for the campus to achieve financial sustainability. The diversification of revenue sources has been the most difficult in that the campus is in growth mode and many of the sources are not eligible to be used for capital use. Revenues received totaled $224.8 million from a variety of sources from student tuition and fees, which accounted for 23% of total revenues, State Educational Appropriations from the State of California (47% of total revenue), auxiliary enterprises (10%), Grants and contracts (8% of total revenue), and other sources. State Educational Appropriations requires advance approval from the State of California before it can be used for capital purposes but the amount eligible is capped. As a result, a majority of the amounts are not eligible for capital use. Likewise, grants and contracts are typically not eligible for capital use. Additionally, over the last three years, the Campus has shown positive increases in the net position of the campus (i.e. no operational deficits). While individual campuses within the University of California do not issue stand-alone financial statements, the University of California System-wide maintains a net position (i.e. equity) of $11.3 billion with a cash and investment portfolio totaling $21.6 billion. Based on the	Audits submitted with Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: *Sustainability*.	

| | | | | official records of the UC, UC Merced share of total cash and investments totaled $171 million with a positive net position balance of $56 million as of June 2014. The UC, on a consolidated basis, received an unqualified opinion for the fiscal year then ended June 30, 2014 from its independent accounting firm KPMG. | | |

| 3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes.
X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 | The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture. | 3 | A:U | UCM lacks sufficient or dedicated staffing and staff skill availability to support faculty in online course development, classroom use of technology and the use of a research cyberinfrastructure. As well, the content production and data delivery infrastructure is dated and lacks robustness, performance reliability, and standards-based installation and lifecycle. However, a new cloud-based LMS was launched in Jan 2015 that provides a solid foundation for the delivery of online course content. For spring semester 2015, approximately 376 faculty have activated an LMS course account as all grade submissions occur via this tool. At present five faculty are designing online courses per the UCOP ITLI funding and are using resources from other UC campus' for course and content development.

Funding is in place to launch a multiyear upgrade of the campus network beginning April 2015. The IT Strategic Workforce Plan includes a request for a Director of Academic and Emerging Technology (Phase 1, launched in February 2015), along with a request for 10 staff lines to support content and course development and classroom technology support (Phase 2). The following 2 Goals are specified in the IT Strategic plan and scheduled to launch with the conclusion of Phase 1 of the IT workforce plan and the hiring of a Director of Academic and Emerging Technology: (2.1.5) Build and execute a classroom technology roadmap and (3.1.) Define vision for technology for teaching and learning. A Cyberinfrastructure external review occurred in March 2015 and we are waiting for final recommendations. Two proposals were submitted on 22 March, 2015 to NSF Solicitation 14-521 CC*DNI (Campus Infrastructure - Data, Networking, and Innovation) for funding to support faculty research computing needs. | Evaluated during comprehensive review. | |

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes						
3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	C	The institution has assembled a leadership team that is committed to high performance goals and aspirations as evidenced by the launch of the Academic Focusing Initiative, workforce planning and the 2020 Project.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.	2	A:OA	The institution has well defined organizational structures to facilitate shared governance as evidenced by the establishment of the Periodic Annual Review Committee (PROC). PROC is a committee, co-chaired by the Provost and the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, includes faculty and administrative representation. It was established to consolidate Academic and Administrative Reviews to reaffirm the shared governance concept. Under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the university's administration has undertaken a comprehensive workforce planning process to ensure the organizational structure facilitates efficient service and effective decision support structures. One area of potential improvement concerns the duties and responsibilities of Bylaw Unit chairs. Currently, unit chairs have responsibility for many duties outlined in APM 245, but the final authority for decision-making in those areas rests with the school deans. Over the next several years, the university could evolve to better align responsibility with authority for functions that reside respectively with the deans and unit chairs.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: *Sustainability*.	
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		1	C	The institution has assembled a solid leadership team who display the ability to provide effective educational leadership and management. The Chancellor serves as the full-time chief executive officer and Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget serves as the chief financial officer. Both are accountable to the campus and serve as part of the Senior Management Group of the University of California.	Position Descriptions for CEO, CFO.	

3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7	The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	1	0	The University is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." There is an annual review of the CEO by conducted by the President.	University of California Board of Regents, membership and biographies. Board of Regents Standing Committees and Membership Bylaws of the Board of Regents Academic Senate Policy on Review of Chancellors
3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4	The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.	1	C	The institution has established governance structures through the Standing Orders of the Regents that outline the responsibilities clearly. In addition, the structures are also outlined in the Bylaws of the UCM Academic Senate.	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority: Standing Orders of the Regents of the UC Bylaws of the UC Academic Senate UC Merced Academic Senate

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

   - While UC Merced has outlined clear roles and responsibilities for its administration and administrative structures, there is a need to further define the academic administrative structure. UCM has strategically decided to establish a multi-disciplinary structure; however, there is need to have some clear lines of responsibility in the context of the traditional departmental structure while still preserving the unique nature and synergistic benefits of a multi-disciplinary organization.
   - The institution has deployed several strategic initiatives for mapping out the future of UCM through its Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative, the Workforce Planning initiative and the 2020 Project (Physical Planning initiative). The development of the Campus Financial plan consolidates the work of the aforementioned plans into a financial viability and sustainability plan.
   - Given that UC Merced prides itself on being the first university of the 21st century, the need for additional support of IT infrastructure and workforce plan was highlighted as critical area for improvement. UCM lacks sufficient/dedicated staff with the skills to support faculty in online course development, classroom use of technology and the use of a research cyberinfrastructure. As well, the content production and data delivery infrastructure is dated and lacks robustness, performance reliability, and standards-based installation and lifecycle. While funding is in place to launch a multiyear upgrade of the campus network beginning April 2015, there is still a need to address the workforce needs for IT.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

   An area of strength, showcased in this process, is that the institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. Through its hiring practices, and commitment to excellence in teaching, the institution employs a diverse faculty and staff and it provides for continued professional development. Also the institution has launched a several long range planning initiatives to ensure that the campus is able to deliver its mission of teaching and research through excellence in academia, workforce and physical resources. While these plans are still in development, the institution plans to integrate the plans for a comprehensive deployment in the near future.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

   One area that is both a high priority for the institution, and needs significant development, is the provision and access to information and technology resources. This important focus area is linked to our institutional needs to enhance the institution's ability to utilize data gathered to improve programmatic success. As mentioned in the review Standards 2, and 4, the UC Merced generally has effective data gathering processes; however, data resides in a significant number of data systems, which makes the process of enabling cross-referenced data analytics challenging. Therefore, the consolidation of data systems to enable effective development of the institution's data warehousing capabilities are also important.

Review under WSCUC Standards

Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.
 	
Self-Review Rating
1= We do this well; area of strength for us
2= Aspects of this need our attention
 	
3= This item needs significant development
0= Does not apply
	Importance to address at this time
	A:U= High priority – Urgent
	A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth.
	B= Medium priority
	C= Lower priority
	0= Does not apply
		Institutional Information
		
		Institution: University of California, Merced
		
		Type of Review:
		    ® Comprehensive for Reaffirmation
		
		Date of Submission: ____/_____/_____
		              Mo Day Year
		
		Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement
The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Quality Assurance Processes						
4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10		2	A:OA	UC Merced employs a set of quality assurance process. Examples include new curriculum approval process, new program approval process, periodic program review, teaching evaluation by students, etc. However, the dissemination of information is limited. Additionally, how to meet the academic services and curriculum development needs to reflect our students or our growth, is an area for improvement.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10		2	B	In 2014, Institutional Research and Decision Support underwent periodic review with a focus on the development of a collaborative service. There is a sense that data are generated, but data need to be made available to all faculty and staff in a timely manner, and clear pathways to acquire data need to be developed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
Institutional Learning and Improvement						
4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6	The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.	2	A:U	Improvements as a result of inquiry, evidence and evaluation are not readily implemented, as more focus is placed on research, it takes precedent over assessment of teaching. Better evidence of co-curricular effectiveness needs to be developed beyond satisfaction and participation data.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* Component 6: *Quality Assurance,* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6	Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.	1	A:OA	UCM has a strong, faculty-owned, academic assessment infrastructure, growing understanding of practice and use of results to inform teaching and curriculum. The teaching evaluation performed by students is a good process for faculty to sustain or improve their teaching quality. Curriculum committees, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council together play good roles in keeping our courses in high quality. Evaluation of programs is achieved through two processes: (1) student evaluations, in which student feedback provides a basis for change in the classroom regarding improvements in curriculum and pedagogy; (2) coupled annual program learning outcomes assessment and program review processes that focus on student learning results in support of program improvement.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	
4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7		2	A:OA	The School of Engineering has appointed Board of Advisors comprised of professionals that provide guidance to the educational programs. UCM's alumni population is now sufficiently large and advanced to contribute to advisory boards and they should be added as a means of connecting UCM"s growing campus community to external stakeholders. Plans to develop other advisory boards are underway. Both graduate and undergraduate students have voiced concern that their request for courses and program topics go unheard.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3		2	B	Continued growth of the university requires the institution to continually reconsider its direction, which requires input from faculty, staff, and administrators. While the rapid growth and pace of decision making often limits the frequency of engaging all these constituencies, improvement in campus-wide engagement in planning is needed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	
4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.		2	A:OA	This process needs to occur throughout the continued rapid growth of the university. For example, the recent curtailment of undergraduate admissions was a smart response given the space and financial restrictions given the current growth rate.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

   - Effectively using the data collected to inform decisions, from course improvements, to program updates, to campus planning.
   - Engaging the multiple constituency groups to both provide valuable data points on the institution and to help inform strategic planning.
   - Rapid growth and development of the campus requires thoughtful, data informed planning to best direct new programs and growth of current efforts.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

   - The structures are in place to engage various constituency groups.
   - The tools exist and data are collected on all levels of the campus experience.
   - The processes to perform annual assessment review and periodic program review are in place and help ensure on-going quality review of academic programs, student services, and administrative operations.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

   - The paths to access institutional data points are not apparent.
   - The lack of transparency on data informed decision-making generates skepticism that such activity occurs.
   - The engagement of campus constituents in planning needs to be broadened and deepened.

Academic Senate Faculty Research Grants Call For Proposals

Deadline For Submission: April 15, 2015

PURPOSE

Faculty research grants are designed to support the research activities of UC Merced faculty and provide seed funds to assist in the development of extramural proposals to support research at UC Merced.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

1. Each full-time member of the UC Merced Division of the Academic Senate, including emeritus members, is eligible to submit one grant proposal in response to this call.

2. Each faculty member may request up to $5000 in research funding. Funds may be requested for most research costs, with some exceptions. (See Allowable and Unallowable Expenses, below.)

3. Faculty members may collaborate to submit a joint proposal, in which case the collaborators may not also submit individual proposals. Each faculty member may participate in only one proposal. Joint proposals may request funding up to an amount which is a multiple of $5000, with the multiple being the number of collaborators contributing to the proposal. Regardless of the number of participating faculty, awards may not exceed $20000, however.

4. Faculty on sabbatical leave or leave of absence (in residence or elsewhere) may apply for research funds. Grants will not be awarded, however, without assurance that the awardee will return to UC Merced after the absence.

5. Undergraduate students, graduate students, and postdoctoral researchers are not eligible to submit proposals, but faculty members may request funds to support student research activities under the supervision of the faculty member, provided that such activities are integral to a program of research being pursued by the

faculty member. Funds may not be applied to the support of postdoctoral researchers or of other research staff, however.

6. Non-tenured faculty members without extramural support are particularly encouraged to apply.

PROPOSAL CONTENT AND FORMAT

Each proposal must include all of the following:

1. **Completed Application Form:** The application form requests some basic information about the proposal and its author(s), including: a proposal title, the name(s) of the participating faculty member(s), academic title(s), school affiliation(s), graduate group affiliation(s), electronic mail address(es), the identification of one school (SNS, SOE, or SSHA) to act as the proposal's originating school, and the award date(s) of the most recently received Academic Senate research grant(s) for each faculty participant.

2. **Proposal Abstract:** The abstract must not exceed 350 words.

3. **Description of Proposed Research:** This section should explain the research to be conducted with the requested funds, providing adequate background information and context to allow for a clear understanding of the proposal by an academic but non-expert reader. This description should be as specific and detailed as possible, given space limitations and the need to remain accessible to non-experts. This section should explain the potential impact that funding will have on the research program(s) of the proposing faculty member(s), as well as how this funding could assist in the development of research group(s) and faculty career trajectories. All requests for equipment, or other forms of infrastructure, must include an equipment management plan in this section. *The contents of this section may not exceed 3 single-spaced pages, with margins no smaller than 1 inch and fonts no smaller than 11 point.*

4. **Reference List:** This section should provide a bibliography of work referenced elsewhere in the proposal document. *This section may not exceed 1 single-spaced page, with margins no smaller than 1 inch and fonts no smaller than 11 point.*

5. **Budget:** How provided funds are to be used should be presented in a tabular format, listing the amount required for each line item.

6. **Budget Justification:** Each line item in the budget should be explained and justified, particularly with regard to constraints on allowable expenses (see below).

7. **Extramural Funding:** This section must list all pending and awarded extramural grants and contracts received by the proposing faculty member(s) for at least the last five years. For each award, the project title, funding amount, start date, and duration should be specified.

8. **Internal Funding:** This section must list all pending and awarded funds received by the proposing faculty member(s) from UC Merced sources, including Academic Senate funding programs, covering at least the last five years. For each award, the project title, funding amount, start date, and duration should be specified. For each award granted by an Academic Senate program, a single-paragraph report on the results of the award should be included.

9. **Alternative Funding:** A brief justification of the proposed request for funding when alternative sources of extramural funding for the budgeted items are currently available to the proposing faculty member(s) should be provided in this section. If no such alternative sources of extramural funding are available, that fact should be clearly stated and justified. *This section may not exceed 1 single-spaced page, with margins no smaller than 1 inch and fonts no smaller than 11 point.*

10. **Seed Funding:** If the requested funds will support the preparation of one or more proposals for extramural funding, details concerning the extramural funding programs to which such proposals are to be submitted should be provided in this section. If recent attempts to secure extramural funding for the proposed budget items have been made, details concerning those submissions should be itemized, with a special emphasis on any feedback received as a result of those attempts. If the requested funds are not to be used as seed funding to assist in the preparation of extramural funding proposals, then that fact should be clearly stated. If extramural funds have not and will not be pursued for the proposed work due to the lack of an appropriate existing extramural funding program, this section should provide evidence that no such programs exist, describing efforts that have been made to identify possible funding sources.

11. **Human Subjects Approval:** If the proposal involves research on human subjects, information concerning institutional ethical review and approval of the proposed work should be presented in this section.

12. **Animal Subjects Approval:** If the proposal involves research on non-human animals, information concerning institutional ethical review and approval of the proposed work should be presented in this section.

13. **Curriculum Vitae:** This section must contain a CV for each faculty member participating in the proposal.

These sections should be assembled into a single document file in Adobe's *Portable Document Format* (PDF). While sections should appear in the order shown above, each section does *not* need to begin on a fresh page, but each section must be clearly labeled. The proposal file should have a name that begins with "COR_2015", followed by the last names of all participating faculty, separated by underscore characters. For example, a proposal submitted by faculty members Smith and Jones should be named "COR_2015_Smith_Jones.pdf".

ALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Categories of allowable expenses include the following:

- **Research Assistance:** Proposals requesting support for assistants must include a statement of each assistant's exact duties, budgeted hours of labor, and rate of pay. For graduate student support, the student to be supported must be identified. This information is to be included in the Budget Justification section of the proposal document.

- **Supplies and Equipment:** Awarded funds may be used to purchase research equipment and supplies. The purchase of such items is subject to the policies outlined in *UC Business and Finance Bulletin BUS 29*. Equipment purchased with awarded funds will be the property of the University of California. Books, reports, journals, video or audio recordings, and similar research materials may be purchased with awarded funds, but these should be itemized and their purchase justified in the Budget Justification section of the proposal. Similarly, budget line items for computer equipment or computer software are allowed, but they should be explicitly justified as essential for the research activities proposed, providing capabilities not present in the computer equipment currently available to the proposing faculty member(s). Miscellaneous supply and service costs (e.g., telephone, fax, copying, postage) must be justified as essential for the proposed work.

- **Recharge Fees:** Awarded funds may be applied to recharge fees associated with the use of core research facilities or other shared or institutional research resources. The Budget Justification section should explain how each requested recharge payment is required by the proposed work.

- **Travel for Research Purposes:** Expenses incurred for investigative travel and field work may be allowed if such travel is important for the proposed research. For example, such travel may be necessary to collect data or to inspect materials that cannot be procured by other means. Travel expenses for both the participating faculty member(s) and supervised graduate students may be budgeted. The Budget Justification section should explain the need for the proposed travel, and the Budget should break down such expenses into standard travel categories (e.g., flight costs, ground travel costs, housing costs, food costs, etc.).

- **Dissemination of Research Findings:** Expenses incurred for travel to academic conferences or other meetings to present research results arising from the proposed work are allowed. Travel expenses for both the participating faculty member(s) and supervised graduate students may be budgeted. The Budget Justification section should specify and describe intended forums for presenting research findings, and the Budget should break down such expenses into standard travel categories (e.g., flight costs, ground travel costs, housing costs, food costs, etc.). Research findings may also be disseminated through publication, and reasonable required publication fees may also be included in the Budget section.

Other kinds of expenses may be considered, but they will require special justification in the proposal document.

UNALLOWABLE EXPENSES

Categories of expenses that are *not* allowed to be covered by awarded funds include:

- **Research Assistance:** Awarded funds may *not* be used for faculty salary support, salary support for postdoctoral fellows, or salary support for other research staff. These funds may *not* be used to support curricular, administrative, or teaching aids.

- **Supplies and Equipment:** In general, awarded funds may *not* be used to purchase equipment that serves routine productivity purposes (e.g., printers, scanners, mobile telephones, mobile telephone service, calculators). Similarly excluded are standard office and computer supplies (e.g., paper, pens, pencils, flash drives), office furniture, and costs associated with the maintenance, operation, or repair of standard office equipment. Individual subscriptions to periodicals and professional society dues are also considered inappropriate budget items.

- **Travel:** If a participating faculty member will be on sabbatical leave or a leave of absence during the period of an award, then, except under special circumstances, awarded funds may *not* be used for travel between the Merced campus and the locale of leave. Also, subsistence during the period of leave is not fundable.

HUMAN AND ANIMAL SUBJECTS

- **Human Subjects:** Proposed research involving the use of human subjects must be approved by the Institutional Review Board before funds will be allocated. A copy of the approval or protocol number and applicable dates must be provided prior to the awarding of funds.

- **Animal Subjects:** Proposed research involving the use of non-human animals must be approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. A copy of the approval or protocol number and applicable dates must be provided prior to the awarding of funds.

USE OF FUNDS

- **Budget Adaptation Post-Award:** Each line item in the proposal Budget must be justified in terms of the specific research activities being proposed. Expenditures of awarded funds are expected to generally conform to budgeted allocations by category and purpose. Faculty who receive awards must request approval from the Committee on Research (COR) prior to any change in the use for which funds were allocated. Reasonable requests within the scope of the proposed research activities will typically be granted.

- **Award Period:** Grants awarded by this program have a period of a single year. All award monies must be spent before June 1, 2016. Funds will not be provided for expenses incurred prior to the date upon which a grant is awarded. Faculty awardees are responsible for the administration of their grants, including the covering of overdrafts. Faculty awardees are expected to promptly return any funds that will not be spent before their grants expire. Any unexpended funds remaining on the grant expiration date will automatically revert to the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor for redistribution.

- **Equipment:** Any equipment purchased with awarded funds will be the property of the University of California, and possession is retained by the University of California beyond the completion of the period of the grant.

- **Compliance:** All expenditures are subject to applicable University of California regulations.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Proposals that are incomplete or do not meet minimum conformance standards with regard to the requirements outlined in this document will not undergo further review.

Complete and properly formatted proposals will be evaluated based on their fit to the goals of this funding program, as well as the quality of the proposed research and the case made by the proposal. In order to provide quality assessments informed by relevant expertise, proposals will undergo an initial evaluation managed by the Executive Committee of the school (SNS, SOE, SSHA) specified by the authors as the originating school for the proposal. The originating school is specified on the application form, and at least one author of the proposal must have an appointment in the selected originating school. The Executive Committee of each school will be asked to leverage the expertise of their faculty in order to identify and rank the highest quality proposals, selecting the top proposals whose aggregated budgets do not exceed $82000. *(Please note that this is the first year in which this program has involved a school-level competition and ranking of proposals.)* These ranked, high quality, proposals selected by the schools will then be examined by the members of the Committee on Research (COR) of the Academic Senate and assessed for fit to the goals of this funding program, based on the following criteria:

1. *Evidence of funding need:* Proposals that demonstrate a lack of alternative available extramural funds for the proposed research activities will be preferred over those for which other extramural funds appear to be available. Current funding should be reported with a statement of why this is not appropriate or sufficient to support the proposed project.

2. *Targeted extramural funding programs and efforts to secure extramural funding:* Proposals that request seed funds to support the preparation of one or more extramural applications should explicitly specify the targeted extramural sources. In addition, proposals showing past efforts to secure extramural funding that have resulted in positive feedback or review without a positive funding decision will be ranked highly. In such cases, applicants should include reviewer comments or

communications indicating the assessed strengths of the proposed research and the reasons for a lack of funding at this time. Proposals that make a convincing case that no appropriate extramural funding programs exist will be ranked highly, along with those for which previous extramural proposals have received positive feedback.

3. *Juniority:* All other factors being equal, junior tenure track faculty will be preferred over more senior tenure track faculty, and tenure track faculty will be preferred over other members of the Academic Senate. For proposals involving multiple faculty members, the rank of the most junior participant will be used to assess the joint proposal.

4. *Time since the receipt of a research award from the Academic Senate:* In general, proposals from faculty members who have not recently received support through this program (or its predecessor) will be preferred over those from faculty who have recently received such support.

Based on these criteria, as well as the quality rankings provided by the originating schools, the members of COR will deliberate and make final funding decisions. Given currently available financial resources, it is anticipated that approximately half of the proposals recommended by the schools will be funded. In general, COR will rank the recommended proposals, and funds will be allocated to these proposals in the order in which they have been ranked, until available funds are exhausted. In some situations, however, COR may, based on a majority vote, reduce the size of some awards below requested amounts so as to increase the number of awards granted. Also, in an effort to produce an award portfolio that reflects the range of research being conducted at UC Merced, COR reserves the right to adjust rankings, using an approach that is regularly employed by federal funding agencies.

The award recommendations produced by COR will be communicated to the Academic Senate Divisional Council, and they will be provided to the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, as well as to the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, to guide the administration in the delivery of award funds. Once an award is made, funds will become immediately available to the participating faculty member(s).

APPLICATION PROCESS

Each proposal must consist of a single PDF file, formatted and named according to the instructions provided above. Completed proposal documents should be delivered to the Academic Senate Office c/o Simrin Takhar: stakhar@ucmerced.edu. Proposals must be received by the end of the day (i.e., before midnight) on April 15, 2015.

If an award is made, funds will become available immediately. All award monies must be spent before June 1, 2016.

Academic Senate Faculty Research Grants
Application Form

Proposal Title:_____

Originating School:_____

Participating Faculty 1:

    Name:_____

    Academic Title:_____ Email Address:_____

    School and Graduate Group Affiliation(s):_____

    _____

    Award Date of Most Recent Academic Senate Funding:_____

Participating Faculty 2:

    Name:_____

    Academic Title:_____ Email Address:_____

    School and Graduate Group Affiliation(s):_____

    _____

    Award Date of Most Recent Academic Senate Funding:_____

Participating Faculty 3:

    Name:_____

    Academic Title:_____ Email Address:_____

    School and Graduate Group Affiliation(s):_____

    _____

    Award Date of Most Recent Academic Senate Funding:_____

Participating Faculty 4:

    Name:_____

    Academic Title:_____ Email Address:_____

    School and Graduate Group Affiliation(s):_____

    _____

    Award Date of Most Recent Academic Senate Funding:_____