

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**March 21, 2007**  
**3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to call, the Merced Division met on Thursday, March 21, 2007 in Room 232 of the Library, Senate Chair Shawn Kantor presided. Chair Kantor welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. Chair Kantor acknowledge the presence of system-wide Senate Chair John Oakley, Professor of Law at UC Davis, and thanked Chancellor Kang, with three weeks on the job, for providing an update on the state of the campus.

**II. COMMENTS BY THE CHANCELLOR**

• **Sung-Mo “Steve” Kang**

Chancellor Kang reported briefly on the recent death [from an accidental fall] of freshman student Hector Hugh Barrera-Barraza (18). Hector’s family was very touched by the campus outpouring of support. More than 600 UC Merced students and faculty members attended the recent memorial ceremony.

On March 16<sup>th</sup> staff from the Army Corps of Engineers were here as part of the ongoing 404 Permit process. They visited various campus sites and also met with Congressman Dennis Cardoza (18<sup>th</sup> Congressional District of California), and UC President Robert Dynes. We believe that the visit went well.

Also on March 16<sup>th</sup>, President Dynes and Congressman Cardoza joined many faculty and staff at the reception honoring acting-Chancellor Park and his wife Kathy for their contributions to UC Merced. My wife and I were also warmly welcomed.

For the next 100 days Vice Chancellor University Relations John Garamendi and his team have arranged for me to meet with community leaders, educators, parents and students. We are scheduled to start in Merced. In parallel, internally I would like the opportunity to visit the individual schools and meet with the faculty. I want to learn more about your research programs and the challenges and difficulties you face.

The rescheduled WASC visit will take place April 4-6. They are in receipt of our supplement report to the Educational Effectiveness Review and we trust that this meeting will go well. As you know accreditation is very important for many reasons but especially for our students transferring to other accredited institutions.

You have received a letter, signed by myself and Provost Alley, regarding our decision to go forward in favor of the Redirect Program. While this program presents various challenges we are hopeful that many good students may choose to stay at Merced in appreciation of our education.

A brief question and answer period followed.

Q With regard to enrollment concerns, have you given any thought to what else can be done?

A Yes. Outreach is very important. The reputation of our academic program is also very important. Having individual faculty websites would be helpful. [This comment resulted in laughter and comments from several faculty indicating that they have been trying to do this for years.] One thought is to work with the School of Engineering and to consider having a class project in an Engineering course to develop websites. With current staffing limitations we have to find creative ways to solve some of our problems.

Q Are we considering enrollment strategies within the rules of the UC system? Specifically, ways to capture those students who may be getting early admissions from other universities?

A I will look into this but I do encourage all faculty to participate in yield activities. Although administrators and staff contact the students, it is contact with the faculty that is most important.

Q What is the status of the Dean search for SSHA?

A I am most grateful to Dean Hans Bjornsson for his leadership. Although the exact timing is not yet known, there will be a search for a new dean.

In closing, the Chancellor indicated that he was very excited and enthusiastic to be working with the faculty. Noting that his door would always be open, he invited the faculty to visit him.

### **III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR**

#### **• Shawn Kantor**

Chair Kantor commented briefly on the Chancellor's and Provost's letter and their decision for Merced to participate in the Shared Experience Program. The Senate's input in this process has been significant. For several months Merced's Undergraduate Council (UGC) was engaged in a dialog with Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Jane Lawrence as well as UCOP's Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur regarding the *Proposal for the UC Merced "Shared Experience" Pilot Program Redirecting UC Freshman Applicants to UC Merced for the Lower Division*. UGC's *Summary of Discussions on Dual Admissions/Redirect Pilot Program* was forwarded to the Division Council, and then to the School Faculties to weigh in on this issue. The School responses noted an overall approval rate of 61%, although accompanying comments indicated support was less than enthusiastic. In the end, the potential to bring needed resources to the campus outweighed the concerns. The Senate will monitor this program.

#### IV. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- **Minutes of the November 2, 2006, Meeting of the Division**

**ACTION:** The Minutes of the November 2, 2006 Meeting of the Division were approved as noticed.

- **Proposed Modification of Senate Bylaws:**

- A. Change “days of instruction” to “calendar days” Part I.5.A and B; Part II.3.C.3, C.4, and C.51.
- B. Committee on Academic Personnel, Part II.3.B. (1) change effective start date for CAP members, (2) set the normal service period for CAP members at 3 years, (3) as needed, CAP members may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- C. Expand Guidelines for Senate Student Representatives, Part II.2.C.b. 2 through 5.

**ACTION: Proposed modifications to Merced Senate Bylaws approved as noticed.**

- **Proposed Modification of Senate Regulations:**

- A. Regulation 50 – Add S/U to Grading System
- B. Regulation 65 – Amend Language
- C. Regulation 75 – New Policy: Honors at Graduation

**ACTION:** Members approved the proposed modifications to Merced Senate Regulations, with correction of a minor typographical error (of to or) in 50.F.

#### V. SENATE COMMITTEE REPORTS

- **Committee on Committees, Mike Colvin**

Professor Colvin invited faculty to take an active role in shaping our new campus via participation on a Senate committee. Faculty is encouraged to contact CoC Chair Colvin, or other Senate Chairs, if they have an interest in being on a particular Senate committee.

- **Graduate and Research Council, David Kelley**

The **Environmental Systems Proposal** has gone forward to the system-wide Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) where it will be assigned reviewers. The **Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics Proposal** has been placed on the CCGA Consent Calendar.

The Senate is currently reviewing the establishment of the **Sierra Nevada Research Institute** as an ORU (Organized Research Unit). GRC has named a subcommittee, Professors Meyer, Hansford and Noelle, to oversee the process which includes external review.

Under the Interim-Individual Graduate Program umbrella, CCGA approved the **Biological Engineering and Small-scale Technologies** (BEST) program in 2003. Continuation of the program was recently approved.

GRC has a small pot of money that we will distribute. A request for proposals has already gone out.

The committee has also been active in the review and approval of numerous graduate Course Requests, and review of the *Graduate Advisor's Handbook*.

- **Undergraduate Council, Evan Heit**

The larger committee is served by three subcommittees: Admissions, Courses, and Policy. So far this year the Admissions Subcommittee (Peggy O'Day, Carlos Coimbra, Robert Ochsner) reviewed various admissions policies, Regents scholarships, and analyzed the dual admission (Shared Experience) proposal. The Courses subcommittee (Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Gerardo Diaz, Marcos Garcia-Ojeda) were responsible for the review of more than 300 Course Request Forms. The Policy subcommittee (Anne Kelley, Carlos Coimbra, Kara McCloskey, Katie Winder) prepared policies on double majors, minors, course repetition, honors at graduation, and out-of-class exams.

Other UGC business included the approval of the following majors: Economics, History, Literatures and Cultures, Political Science. Approved minors: Anthropology, Management, Natural Sciences Education, Political Science, and Sociology. UGC also reviewed the minimum class size policy and offered substantive comments on the role of the UC Merced website in undergraduate admissions.

Future issues include general admissions strategies, delivery of general education, Honors programs, and student retention.

- **Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Roger Bales**

Professor Bales explained that CAPRA is the Senate committee that advises the Chancellor on policy regarding academic and physical planning, budget and resource allocation, both annual and long range. CAPRA meets regularly with the EVC/Provost. Recent discussion items included space, UCM financing model, 2007-2008 faculty hires, strategic plans, making recommendations on undergraduate majors, graduate groups and sub-groups, and developing Institutes at UCM.

With regard to **UCM's financing model**, Professor Bales distributed a document that he prepared and presented to the systemwide University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). In the two-page document Bales highlighted the high fraction of temporary or one-time funds in the current budget; the flawed undergraduate enrollment-based-funding model; the lack

of infrastructure and the low fraction of full professors that jeopardizes investments made to date and the careers of the non-tenured faculty; the need to open too many majors with too few faculty; and the under-investment in UCM by the State.

At UCPB's request, a follow-up document detailing budget needs was prepared by Bales and Senate Chair Kantor and indicated an estimated structural deficit of approximately \$30M. UCPB acknowledged that the small base funding from the legislature is not enough and apparently expressed concern about UC Merced succeeding. Bales said that this issue will be forwarded to the system-wide Academic Senate.

**Long-range Strategic Planning.** Provost Alley came to the Council asking for faculty input into the long-range planning of the campus and the need to grow the university strategically. The Council passed this item on to CAPRA. CAPRA first sought the input of the various Graduate Chairs. A preliminary report was passed back to the Council and it was hoped that it would then be passed back to Provost. Our original intent was that the Provost would forward the document to the general faculty for comments.

Chair Kantor interjected that the faculty were appropriately critical of the information gathering process and that they raised questions as to the purpose and how the results would be used. CAPRA was sent into this quagmire without any marching orders, policy or procedures, or how to ultimately formulate a Strategic Plan. After discussions with the Provost it was decided to hold off for now and to approach the process at a later date. When this item comes forward again the appropriate policies and procedures will be in place and faculty will be informed as to the process.

#### Questions and Answers

- Q A chill went through my spine when I read the comment that this campus may not succeed. Do I need to look elsewhere?
- A Chair Kantor asked to respond to the faculty member's concern. He indicated that this is basically a conversation about shared governance. With the previous administration the Senate had no input. The current Provost reformulated the campus Budget Committee and, for the first time, we were able to see budget numbers. Prior to this we have not been made aware of the situation. So that's why you are seeing it in such stark perspective now. Now, how we overcome these challenges is the question.
- A Professor Bales commented that as a research university there is opportunity for most or all faculty to be individually successful.

## VI. ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR

- **John Oakley**

Academic Council Chair Oakley addressed the faculty and stressed that this is a critical time for the life of this campus and the UC. He said that part of how UC has evolved to date, sort of “on the fly,” is also a part of its success story. But you can’t build a great research university that way. You have to invest money up front. He added that there was no invisible hand that will give the campus what it needs.

Putting the campus financial situation in historical terms, Oakley acknowledged that things were pretty grim but that the campus could still “win the war.” “You have a new leader, Chancellor Kang, who will, with your support, lobby hard so that he can borrow from other sources. No one from UC is enhanced if UC Merced struggles or fails. But all of UC succeeds if UC Merced succeeds.” He added that the campus cannot succeed with the current enrollment growth model.

The Senate’s pivotal governance role within the UC will come into play. He added that the Senate is not just a guild but has important responsibilities assigned to it by the Regents. He added that it is important that the campus act in an aggregated not a disaggregated way to figure out what the campus priorities are and to empower Chancellor Kang to go after the means to support those priorities. Oakley acknowledged that Chancellor Kang has not been dealt a winning hand but added that there was still time to reshuffle that hand.

Oakley then urged the campus to realize that the best strategy is to appeal to the common good. He encouraged the faculty to unite in a collegial way. Faculty should put aside personal priorities and develop institutional priorities, which will lead to the campus’ success.

### Questions and Answers

Q Your call for unity – where does that come from?

A When I first made it my business to get involved with Merced was during the search committee process for your new Chancellor. The campus that I got to know a year ago was one that I understood to have some factions within it that were destructive to its welfare. I have no reason to think that this has gotten worse as opposed to getting better. I didn’t mean to make any veiled references. With new leadership and new faculty, things should get better. Let’s face it, you are all overstretched. You are on multiple committees and turf wars could easily develop. There is some evidence that there was some division among the faculty in the recent past and it would be unfortunate if those crevices were to continue or deepen.

Q Some people on the Regents may favor a *liaise fare* capitalist approach but there must also be some that understand capitalization.

- A Yes, but they may be the same people. Oakley provided a brief overview of the issues being considered by the Regents which include student fees, salaries, strategic long-term financial planning and the management structure at UCOP. The Senate has been very active, and will continue to be active in these decisions.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

### **• TALX**

Chair Kantor explained that this item came to the Academic Council's attention by way of a UC Davis Divisional Resolution regarding W2 data that was transmitted to TALX Corporation. The UC Davis faculty considered this a violation of privacy and objected to the requirement to "opt out." The W2s of all faculty and staff (on all the UC campuses) who did not take the time to "opt out" were automatically enrolled. The Davis Resolution called for "*all [TALX] files to be expunged immediately and any subsequent request be on an opt-in basis only, after appropriate Senate consultation.*" This item has since been reviewed by UCOP and there are assurances that in the future faculty will have to "opt in."

### **• Regents' RE-89**

Noting that it was past adjournment, Chair Kantor briefly explained that a formal vote on accepting or rejecting the Regents' policy restricting University acceptance of funding from the tobacco industry will take place in May. Distributed at this meeting and posted on the Senate website (<https://senate.ucmerced.edu>) are documents that fully explain this item. With the strong support of the Divisional Council, Professor Arnold Kim (Merced's representative to the Assembly) and I stand firm on the side of academic freedom and will vote against the Regents' proposal. That being said, Professor Kim and I welcome a deeper discussion and will make ourselves available to meet with faculty either individually or in groups. A campus response has been requested by the Academic Council by April 13<sup>th</sup> so between now and then we have an opportunity to engage in a dialogue.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Attest: Shawn Kantor, Chair

Minutes prepared by Nancy Clarke, Senate Director