



**DIVISION MEETING OF THE MERCED ACADEMIC SENATE  
THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2011  
2:00-3:30 p.m.  
Chancellor's Conference Room  
232 Kolligian Library**

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- A. Division Council Chair Susan Amussen
- B. Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson
- C. Systemwide Academic Vice Chair Robert Powell
- D. Chancellor Dorothy Leland
- E. Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost Keith Alley

**II. CONSENT CALENDAR**

- A. Approval of the draft Minutes of the April 14, 2011 Meeting of the Merced Division 5-18
- B. Approval of minor grammatical edits to the UC Merced Bylaws
- C. Approval of Proposed Change to Bylaw II.IV.B.3.  
Language was removed that gave CAPRA the capacity to advise CAP on staff allocations,  
as the language does not pertain to processes on the Merced campus.
- D. Annual Committee Reports (2010-2011) 19-22
  - [Division Council](#) 23-32
  - [Committee on Academic Personnel](#) 33-38
  - [Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#) 39-46
  - [Graduate and Research Council](#) 47-52
  - [Committee on Rules and Elections](#) 53-58
  - [Undergraduate Council](#)

**III. APPROVAL OF UC MERCED BYLAWS – Former CRE Chair Nella Van Dyke 59**

CRE has proposed the following revisions to the Bylaws:

- Bylaws I.III.1.A, I.III.2.A, I.III.3.A, I.IV.2.E, II.I.2.A, II.III.2.B, and II.III.3.A.2
- Bylaws I.IV.3.D and II.IV.3.B.3
- Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14
- Bylaw II.III.3.A.5
- Bylaws II.III.3.A.6, II.III.3.C.1, and II.III.3.C.2
- Bylaw II.IV.B.3

**IV. DISCUSSION ITEM**

A. Senate service

**V. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- Committee on Academic Personnel, Chair Jan Wallander (oral)
- Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Chair Nella Van Dyke (oral)
- Committee on Committees, Chair Jeff Yoshimi (oral)
- Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair Sean Malloy (oral)
- Graduate and Research Council, Vice Chair David Kelley (oral)
- Undergraduate Council, Chair Gregg Camfield (oral)
- Committee on Rules and Elections, Chair Rick Dale (oral)

**VI. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (NONE)**

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (NONE)**

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

---

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

Rick Dale  
Secretary/Parliamentarian

---

## Glossary of Senate Acronyms

BOARS	Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
CCGA	Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
UCAF	University Committee on Academic Freedom
UCAP	University Committee on Academic Personnel
UCAAD	University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
UCCC	University Committee on Computing and Communications
UCEP	University Committee on Educational Policy
UCOC	University Committee on Committees
UCFW	University Committee on Faculty Welfare
UCIE	University Committee on International Education
UCOLASC	University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
UCPB	University Committee on Planning and Budget
UCOPE	University Committee on Preparatory Education
UCPT	University Committee on Privilege and Tenure
UCRJ	University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

## SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS, 2011-2012

### DIVISION COUNCIL

Susan Amussen, COUNCIL Chair (SSHA)  
Peggy O'Day, Vice Chair (SNS)  
Rick Dale, CRE Chair, Secretary/Parliamentarian (SSHA)  
Gregg Camfield, UGC Chair (SSHA)  
Linda Hirst, CoC Representative (SNS)  
Jian-Qiao Sun, CAP Vice Chair (SOE)  
Will Shadish, GRC Chair (SSHA)  
Nella Van Dyke, CAPRA Chair (SSHA)  
Wolfgang Rogge, At-Large (SOE)  
Robin DeLugan, At-Large (SSHA)  
*Liaisons:* Robert Hillman, (UC Davis), UCPT  
Erik Menke (SNS), UCAF  
Sean Malloy (SSHA), UCFW  
Cristian Ricci (SSHA), UCAAD

### COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Jan Wallander, Chair (SSHA), UCAP  
Jian-Qiao Sun, Vice Chair (SOE)  
Ruzena Bajcsy (UC Berkeley)  
Michael Colvin (SNS)  
C. Fred Driscoll (UC San Diego)  
Hung Fan (UC Irvine)  
Raymond Gibbs (UC Santa Cruz)  
Richard Regosin (UC Irvine)  
Michelle Yeh (UC Davis)

### COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Nella Van Dyke, Chair (SSHA), UCPB  
Matthew Meyer, Vice Chair (SNS)  
Paul Brown (SSHA)  
Marcelo Kallmann (SOE)  
David Kelley (SNS)  
Peggy O'Day (SNS)

### COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS

Rick Dale, Chair (SSHA)  
Peter Berck, Vice Chair (UC Berkeley)  
Paul Almeida (SSHA)

### FACULTY WELFARE

Sean Malloy, Chair (SSHA), UCFW  
Anna Song, Vice Chair (SSHA)  
Lilian Davila (SOE)  
Marcos Garcia-Ojeda (SNS)

### PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Robert Hillman, Chair (UC Davis), UCPT  
Jeannie Darby (UC Davis)  
Jodie Holt (UC Riverside)  
Tom Joo (UC Davis)

### UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Gregg Camfield, Chair (SSHA), UCEP  
Paul Brown, Vice Chair (SSHA)  
Wei-Chun Chin (SOE)  
Teamrat Ghezzehei (SNS)  
Jan Goggans (SSHA)  
Robert Ochsner (SSHA)  
Sholeh Quinn (SSHA)  
Florin Rusu (SOE)  
Christopher Viney (SOE)  
Lei, Yue (SNS)  
*Ex Officio:* Linda Cameron, VP Undergraduate Education  
Jane Lawrence, VC for Student Affairs  
*Liaisons:* Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA), UCOPE  
Cristian Ricci (SSHA), UCIE

### GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL

Will Shadish, Chair (SSHA), CCGA  
David Kelley, Vice Chair (SNS)  
Stefano Carpin (SOE)  
Ariel Escobar (SOE)  
Robert Innes (SSHA)  
Erin Johnson (SNS)  
Chris Kello (SSHA)  
Roummel Marcia (SNS)  
*Ex Officio:* Sam Traina, VC Research/Dean Graduate Division  
*Liaisons:* Mike Cleary (SNS) UCORP  
Maurizio Forte (SSHA), UCCC  
Sholeh Quinn (SSHA) UCOLASC

### COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Jeff Yoshimi, Chair (SSHA)  
Martha Conklin, Vice Chair (SOE), UCOC  
Gerardo Diaz (SOE)  
Henry Forman (SNS)  
Linda Hirst (SNS)  
Kathleen Hull (SSHA)  
Teenie Matlock (SSHA)

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION  
APRIL 14, 2011  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, April 14, 2011 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Evan Heit presiding. Chair Heit welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 12:30 pm.

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Senate Chair Evan Heit*

The Senate Chair thanked everyone for attending the meeting and introduced the systemwide Senate Chair, Daniel Simmons, Chancellor Steve Kang and Vice Chancellor Mary Miller. One of the purposes of this meeting is to provide information on what the Senate is doing on the behalf of the membership; this is a meeting about accountability. The following is a summary of general topics addressed by the Senate; more specifics will be discussed in the committee reports.

- **Chancellor Search**- The Chancellor search is one of the most important tasks for the University this year. UC Merced faculty on the search committee include Evan Heit, Martha Conklin and Mike Colvin; Daniel Simmons is another faculty member on the committee. The outcome will be formally announced at the May Regents meeting. The most interesting part of being on the search committee and being Chair of the Division over the past year has been learning how much support there is for UC Merced from the Office of the President and from the Regents. It has been clear in the way that they are approaching the chancellor search and the high standards they are setting for the position; specifically, that they will not compromise or settle. The single best highlight of the year was the two-day interviews of the semi-finalists for the chancellor position. During those two days, President Yudof and Board of Regents Vice Chair Sherry Lansing noted how much they support UC Merced, how they want us to be a fully fledged UC campus and how they want us to thrive as a research university. They also reiterated they want to make it financially possible to attain these goals.
- **Budget Information/Funding** - The Office of the President is committed to the UC Merced budget. UC Merced was not affected by the \$500 million cut from the UC system and there is intention to protect the campus if there are more cuts in the near future. It is remarkable how the campus is being supported by the system considering what is happening in the State. Merced has had several great meetings with the Office of the President and it is clear they appreciate what the campus is doing: our accomplishments on a shoe-string budget in terms of our operating budget and in terms of space per faculty member and per student.  
The State budget has not been passed. UC Merced is in a republican state senatorial district and our Senator does not want to sign a budget that extends taxes. The UC Office of the President and the Regents are behind the campus.
- **Senate Work**- Divisional Council has accomplished a number of things and there is still work that is being addressed by the current Divisional Council. Some business will continue to be pursued next year.

**Accomplishments**

#### Accreditation-

The campus is on track for WASC accreditation which reflects the work of everyone in the room and all faculty. Undergraduate program review has been underway which is necessary to be a fully established university. This reflects hard work by the faculty and Senate office, particularly Fatima Paul. Most of the people in the room have been involved in assessment at some point. When the WASC team was here, the committee commended the campus profusely; the faculty, the Senate and the way the Senate works with the Administration. The campus is expecting a positive result from the visit.

#### Graduate Groups-

Three new Graduate Groups have been approved by CCGA which is very important in establishing ourselves as a research university. The three approved programs include Cognitive and Information Sciences (CIS), Qualitative Systems Biology (QSB) and Psychological Sciences.

#### Bylaw 55 Units-

The Senate reviewed faculty-written Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals to split the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) into four (4) personnel units; these were approved by the Administration. The Senate is now reviewing similar proposals for the School of Natural Sciences (SNS).

#### Untenured Faculty Support-

The Senate has shined a spotlight on the success of untenured faculty at Divisional Council and with the Administration. The campus is in a special circumstance with a high percentage of assistant professors. The campus is focusing on creating a good foundation for success for assistant professors.

#### Shared Governance-

Shared governance has been successful this year. The Divisional Council and Senate have worked cooperatively with the Administration on this campus and have had several visits from administrators from the Office of the President. A lot of common ground was found with built trust and sense of common purpose. It is also important to foster shared governance at the School level. How is shared governance working in each School; are faculty in charge of all academic decisions and are the administration and faculty consulting each other on decisions made by the administration?

#### **Topics in process**

##### Academic Personnel Processes-

The Senate is concerned about the AP processes. Top issues include:

Not all policies are in writing but are based on oral history. The campus would work more efficiently if all policies were written.

Academic Personnel needs to be a cooperative process between faculty and different academic units, faculty on the Committee for Academic Personnel and with various administrative offices such as the Senate Office, School Dean's offices and the Academic Personnel Office. There needs to be more collaboration among these constituencies.

Divisional Council is pursuing ways to work more efficiently and more collaboratively.

##### Graduate Student Appointment Processes-

Divisional Council has met with graduate students, who help define us as a research university. The students have valid complaints about late appointments and late or last minute notification of support for the year; sometimes not hearing until after the beginning of the term. These issues are related to unwritten policies and different administrative units on campus not working together or as well as they can. The campus is making progress and has invited experts from other UC campuses to help tune up the appointment processes.

#### Classroom scheduling-

Clearly the campus is challenged for space and will not be getting much more space in the near future. It is important to use the existing space as wisely and efficiently as possible. Ultimately the scheduling of the classrooms falls within the purview of the Registrar. This is an example where there must be a shared governance process and the Administration must consult the Senate about how to do this in a pedagogically sound way. There was a bit of an unraveling of this process where the Registrar issued a well-intentioned scheduling system but had failed to consult with teaching faculty. The Senate has since been in communication with the Registrar's Office. The new scheduling system treated graduate teaching as an exception. Faculty would have to request a waiver if the course deviated from the block scheduling program which was built around teaching undergraduates. This is not appropriate for a research university.

#### UCM San Joaquin Valley PRIME Program-

The UC Merced San Joaquin Valley Program in Medical Education (PRIME) is a program where six students per year will be taught medicine at UC Davis. The students will be given opportunity to research or do field clinical work in the Merced area. The program has been launched in the name of UC Merced without prior Senate consultation. The Senate should be leading the way in terms of curriculum and admissions. One of the Senate goals is to have a written document that is agreed upon by all parties involved with PRIME by this summer.

#### University Relations-

The Senate has met with University Relations which includes Communications, Development and Governmental Relations more often this year than in previous years. It is appreciated that University Relations has made an effort to work together by inquiring about Senate interests. Yet at the same time, University Relations still tends to be disconnected from academic and budget issues on campus. The University Relations Office needs to have more information on the campus budgetary priorities and academic priorities. The Senate will continue to facilitate discussions with the University Relations Office as there has been improvement this year. It is hoped that emphasizing these issues is a goal for the incoming Chancellor. The campus needs to build strong relations with the state government and the campus needs to do a substantial amount of fundraising; which needs to be aligned with the campus academic mission and budgetary needs.

Chair Heit thanked the faculty who served on Senate committees this year. Nominating petitions are available for anyone who would like to run for a position on the Committee on Committees or as an At-Large Member of the Divisional Council. Nominations are due by the end of business tomorrow. Being the Division Chair has been a great experience and has showed me how to appreciate the people we work with. This

Divisional Council has been a great team and has been very collegial and likewise the Senate Office has been fantastic.

*Vice Chancellor Mary Miller*

I was asked to speak about budget and capital and am happy to address questions on any other topic. I know you are all aware of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Office of the President; it is still in effect where UC Merced will receive \$6 million per year for three (3) years beginning in the year that we are in, 2010-2011. This will allow us to have funding for a net of 600 new students per year for three (3) years. This year the State actually provided the \$6 million in enrollment growth. Therefore, the campus has asked UCOP to extend the MOU agreement for another year. UCOP seems amenable to this request and the EVC is working on modifying the MOU to add another year. If the State provides enrollment growth funding for another year, the campus intends to request another extension of the MOU which would provide a guarantee of five (5) years of revenue for UC Merced growth. A pro forma budget has been created. If the campus receives the guarantee from UCOP and continues on track with enrollment, the campus will be able to balance its budget when the student population reaches 7500 which is projected to be in AY2015-2016 or AY2016-2017. Then the campus will not have to worry as much about requesting funding however; the pro forma is still a bare bones budget. With the current economic climate, the campus does not expect to have a budget that enables us to do everything we need. Faculty hires are planned at a rate of approximately seventeen (17) faculty per year; which the campus knows is not enough to attain the ratios we want.

Next year, student fees are increasing by eight percent (8%) in Fall 2011. There is no mention of raising fees more than that. Currently the UC knows it has a \$500 million cut in State funding, none of which is being passed on to UC Merced. UCLA is being cut by approximately \$100 million. President Yudof has said that if the State is unable to extend taxes and the cut is more than \$500 million, then the UC will look at significant additional increases for student fees. Additional fee increases will be problematic for the campus because a high percentage of Merced students are from low-income families and the amount of financial aid needed will rise.

Next year, with a combination of the \$6 million from the State, student fees from additional students and the increase in fees; the campus will have approximately \$13 million to \$14 million in new funding. That is a little less than this year because last year between the Fall and the mid-year increases student fees went up by thirty-two percent (32%) which provided a considerable increase in campus funding.

This year off the top of the additional funding the campus has to pay for seventeen (17) to nineteen (19) new faculty salaries and start-ups, additional lecturers to accommodate the increase in students, the university portion of the retirement increase at seven percent (7%) up from four percent (4%) last year, increases in benefits, mandatory salary increases for faculty and all represented employees, perhaps an increase for unrepresented employees (it has been four (4) years since they have had an increase), support of research centers, Office of Technology Transfer charges from UCOP because the campus has not yet realized any royalties for technology transfer increases (although royalties are expected next year) however the legal fees are increasing in order to set the



infrastructure, General Counsel charges costs to the campuses, start-up costs for a new Chancellor, traffic mitigation to improve roads in the community, new Dean in the School of Natural Sciences, graduate student financial aid. The Social Sciences and Management (SSM) building is opening this summer and for the foreseeable future the campus will have no new funding for operations and maintenance of plant for new facilities. The funding from the State stopped in AY 2010-2011. Funding for utilities, custodial services, other maintenance costs associated with any new buildings will have to come from the existing campus budget. All of the above expenses must be taken care of before any departmental requests for new funds such as staffing or new non-academic programs are considered.

Budgets will be confirmed prior to July 1, 2011. Budget presentations will be in mid-April and decisions will be made in May based on the agreed funding with UCOP.

Capital and space continues to be the biggest issue for the campus. The Social Sciences and Management (SSM) building will open in the fall. There is an issue with the building funding as all of it is dependence on the State's sale of bonds and the State is not selling bonds. If State bonds are not sold, UCOP has agreed to try to sell bonds using the UC bonding capacity which is better than the State's. Some of the campus' capital projects are at the very top of the systemwide priority list. Approximately \$4 million is needed to furnish the SSM building. The campus has an agreement with Steelcase to begin ordering furniture even though purchase orders cannot be issued until July 1, 2011 because of fiscal year restrictions. This will help ensure delivery dates in August prior to the Fall semester. If Steelcase is the only company the campus can make special arrangements with then the following will be open in the Fall: the sixty (60) seat classroom, two (2) class labs, one (1) seminar/video-conference room, forty-one (41) faculty offices, furnishings in the scholarly activity spaces. Areas that may not open in the fall include: the faculty labs, the audio-visual fit-outs in the conference rooms, three (3) computer labs, computers for the computer labs and the second seminar/video-conference room.

The Science and Engineering II building is on track to open in 2014. The process used for furnishing SE II will be similar to the one for the SSM building, UCOP will sell bonds if it has to. It is essential that S&E II open in 2014.

The Classroom and Academic Office Building (CAOB) is problematic. About one year ago the UCOP Finance Office found \$20 million and suggested the campus use the funds to build a classroom and office building. The UCOP Budget Office stated the campus should not use money to build something that the State is supposed to fund, save the \$20 million for something else, and ask for a \$40 million building funded by the State. The plan for the \$20 million building included a modular unit that could be erected quickly. The plan for the \$40 million building was for a permanent structure. The \$40 million was not included in the State budget; which was part of the bonds that were supposed to be sold in fall 2010 and spring 2011 but were not sold. The latest approach to constructing the CAOB includes using the system fund for a \$20 million modular building that can be built quickly. The campus would continue to lobby the State for the \$40 million building. It is still undecided how the campus will proceed. If the campus builds the smaller building, it will include classrooms and some tutoring space.

CAPRA Chair Shawn Kantor reported that recently at UCPB it has been expressed that the \$40 million request will be back in the queue after the May Budget Revise. Systemwide CAOB is a very high priority but is just delayed. VC Miller responded that the original desire was to open the \$20 million building in fall 2013 as a “surge” building with continual use while other buildings come on line. Because of the \$40 million building size, it will take longer to construct with an opening date pushed back from 2014 to 2015. The VC has been working with the campus architect and Physical Planning, Design and Construction to expedite construction once the funding is available.

*Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons*

Chair Heit invited me to talk to you about issues discussed at the Assembly meeting yesterday. President Yudof is highly supportive of the Merced campus. Regarding the Chancellor’s search, the group of candidates interviewed was highly enthusiastic about the future of Merced. Evan Heit did a fabulous job chairing the faculty steering committee and produced superb candidates for interviews.

The State budget news is not good. The Governor is visiting districts in California, particularly Republican districts, to discuss his hopes for tax extensions and the damage of the so called “all cuts” budget where the full \$24 billion problem would be solved by budget cuts only. The Democratic caucus in the Assembly says they will not approve additional cuts and the Senate is discussing more cuts. The minority party’s stance is to not approve tax extensions. This creates a stalemate situation that will likely last quite a while. The next discussions will be about the May Revise of the budget and subsequent negotiations. Part of the budget has been passed and the bill and trailer bills are awaiting the Governor’s signature. President Yudof is talking about a five year plan for stability based on the fluctuations of State funding for the University. As VC Miller pointed out, the University is moving toward an 8% increase in fees for next year. The five year scenario starts with a \$2.5 billion base budget as proposed by the State and contemplates State funding increases of 8% per year for the next five years, which will start in 2012-2013. President Yudof has stated that the campuses have done well dealing with the \$500 million cut in AY 2011-2012. The President is looking to the 8% increase in State funds in conjunction with the 8% student fee increase to solve a \$1.5 billion shortfall in the University’s budget over five years, which contemplates a lot of internal savings. If the State support drops below this model, the President has said the only solution is to raise fees and possibly move up the five year plan to begin in 2011-2012. There has been a change in rhetoric where the President is starting with this five year plan but UCOP also has a table that projects what is needed with less State support. This table is available on the systemwide Academic Senate website. There is a recognition that as State support decreases the only alternative is to increase student fees. There is talk about changing the financial aid model to possibly expand the Blue and Gold plan to help those in the \$90k-\$120k family income range. This will be based on the Federal need assessment.

UCOP will present additional plans for funding options at the next Regents meeting. Reducing enrollment seems off the table. In the work that the Senate is doing, Merced is in a different situation than all other campuses. The steps that the University takes to solve its problem will have to be independent of goals for UC Merced. Overall strategy can’t be built around building and protecting UC Merced and the campus’ budgetary issues are those of UCOP rather than issues of how UCOP allocates state money amongst

the other campuses. UCOP is reducing its budget by approximately \$80 million and shifting funds back to the campuses as relief from the \$500 million cut. \$30 million comes from reductions in programs funded by the State through UCOP. AIDS research will be eliminated, a \$10 million item. Yet overall there is \$270 million in the university in research. The \$10 million goes back to the early 80's when nobody was funding this research and it was important for the University to take a lead in AIDS research. However, the \$10 million doesn't influence the direction of research programs. California Labor Institutes will also be reduced. There is \$50 million in the funding streams. Funding streams is a new paradigm for operating the office of the President. UCOP will determine its budget and central funds, approximately \$500 million; the campuses will be taxed on an amount necessary to fund the office. The campuses will have a transparent budget from the Office of the President and will be taxed between 1.4% and 1.6% of the campus operating expenses to fund the budget. UC Merced's \$6 million is part of the funding streams money that will be retained by UCOP and given to the campuses from a general pot. \$50 million will be cut out of funding streams money, most of which is academic affairs and some are for efficiencies and an 8% reduction in UCOP operations.

Rebenching is a discussion about resourcing and/or reallocating all of the State money that flows through UCOP to the campuses. In referring to the Choices report put out last year by UCPB, there is a wide variation on a per student basis on how much money goes to each campus, which is historic. The Senate has an implementation task force based on a report written by some of the faculty involved in the Commission on the Future. They are focusing on reallocation based on undergraduate enrollment.

A member of the Senate asked: based on conversations about the budget, is the idea of differential fees by campus absolutely off the table for discussion?

Chair Simmons responded: Differential fees are on and off the table. At the last Regents meeting, UC Berkeley Chancellor Birgeneau stated they need absolute flexibility in fees, salaries and enrollment. Chancellor Drake from UC Irvine and Chancellor Blumenthal from UC Santa Cruz did not mention this. The Chair of the Board of Regents is opposed to differential fees, and President Yudof is not in favor of the idea but doesn't say it is impossible. The President has said the University should set one fee level and allow the campuses to vary by discounting fees.

Another member of the Senate asked: Is the administration aware that by increasing fees they are jeopardizing the diversity of the University of California especially when it comes to low income families which tend to be minorities?

Chair Simmons responded: The administration is very sensitive to this problem. But when the University raises fees the University covers low income families. However, there is still a sticker shock.

A second Senate member stated: You bring up an important point. The University tries to accommodate the increase in cost but there will be an increase in loans. What will we do for our campus when we are absorbing the largest percentage of low income first generation students? 56% of applicants this year are first generation low income. This is

who is coming to this campus today. If that is eliminated as the campus is still maturing and becoming more popular it could have challenges for the campus.

Chair Simmons responded: There are three real priorities at the University of California: access, affordability and quality. We are keeping access in terms of numbers because we are addicted to fees. Affordability; if the State wakes up to the need to provide low cost public higher education it can be fixed even if the University is at a high fee model today. If people and the State want low fee education, it is a switch that can be turned on. However, if the University loses the quality in the faculty because of decisions that we are making in the next year or two, we will never get it back. The priority of the Senate needs to be to maintain the research excellence of the University of California across the system at all campuses. The goal has to remain nine AAU campuses in the University. We cannot do anything that jeopardizes the excellence at UC Berkeley, UCLA and UC San Diego. The only way we may be able to protect that for a period of time is high fees until the State realizes the absolute critical need to fund access.

### **III. CONSENT CALENDAR**

The December 2, 2010 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

### **IV. APPROVAL OF UC MERCED REGULATIONS**

CRE Chair Van Dyke is removing this item from the agenda. The committees are not done reviewing the Regulations. This topic will be discussed next fall.

### **V. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **A) Support for Success of Untenured Faculty- *UGC Chair Amussen***

There is a memo in your packet from the Divisional Council to the Provost that was led by Susan Amussen.

This year the issue of support for untenured faculty came up repeatedly in conversations between DivCo and the EVC and the Chancellor and the Senate Administration Council. There is concern that the campus does everything possible to make sure untenured faculty have the opportunity to do the work that will give them tenure. As you know, approximately 80% of tenure candidates receive tenure across the system. During candidate interviews the campus states we hire to tenure, our expectation is for the candidate to reach tenure. There are two kinds of support that the campus has reviewed and is developing: those within Schools and Bylaw Units and those on a campus-wide basis.

Mentoring support: The campus is looking at different kinds of support as each individual will need different support such as professional development or teacher/scholar development. Part of the consideration is the importance of making it possible for faculty to have a mentor that is not making judgments about their tenure. If a new faculty member needs to discuss a difficult situation, they would not be talking to someone voting on their tenure. The only minimal cost will be to provide support from a mentor that is off campus from somewhere else in the system. Natural Sciences has a mentor policy and the Senate hopes SSHA and SOE will develop one in the next year as a way of helping junior colleagues grow into their role as faculty members.

A member stated that SSHA used to have a mentoring program approximately four or five years ago.

Communication: Other campus AP websites have a one-page guide to the whole Academic Personnel Process to help faculty understand policy. Currently the APM and the MAPP are not exactly self-explanatory. The Senate is also recommending Academic Personnel provide a central source of information and an area for advice, especially for families.

Paid leave for junior faculty: The final recommendation is to fund junior faculty research leave, preferably in the fourth year rather than the fifth year. The Senate believes the campus can raise money for this purpose which may initially be competitive. There are universities that guarantee junior faculty a year of leave in their fourth year. UC Merced cannot guarantee a year, but leave for a semester would be an important contribution to the success of untenured faculty. Some of this can be done through flexible teaching schedules however this kind of leave should also be formal.

UGC Chair Amussen invited the audience to share ideas or suggestions.

A Senate member stated: it's great to encourage assistant professors to go on sabbatical on the fourth year. Most faculty have taken their leave during the fifth year right before going up for tenure and it doesn't help you at all. Even if you intend to publish three things, those get published after your tenure review. I encourage you to continue to push for the fourth year. In regard to the phrase "we hire to tenure", I am not sure if this is common to other places. Regardless of the 80% rate of faculty becoming tenured in the UC system, I would not use that phrase for incoming assistant professors. It could get us into trouble. The response: The phrase "hire to tenure" is the way it is usually phrased. The UC hires with the expectation that faculty meet the criteria for tenure. We are not saying we will hire you because we know you will get tenure. UC is not interested in having faculty for a few years only to move somewhere else.

Another Senate member stated: As we have more people retiring perhaps we can consider those people as mentors.

A Senate member stated: The fourth year is great but perhaps there can be an option for third or fourth year. In Political Science and Economics, you may have to wait six to nine months to get a review back for an article that has been submitted. Having the time earlier on the clock is valuable because you can lose a year having an article sit at a journal. In particular, top journals can take a really long time and that is where we want our junior people to be sending their work. I recommend you build in some flexibility. The response: One approach discussed for an early sabbatical is to allow faculty to borrow semester credits toward sabbatical. For example; a faculty member could borrow two semester credits so the fifth year sabbatical can be done in the fourth year. The down side is faculty will still have to pay the credits back.

Chair Heit commented that this topic has been introduced as a discussion item to start a campus conversation. The Senate hopes faculty go back to their Schools and talk with their colleagues, Executive Committees and Deans. The Divisional Council will continue to talk about this with the Provost but the Provost doesn't set School policies.

**B) Building Merced as a Center for Graduate Education- GRC Chair Chris Kello**

GRC is in the midst of reviewing ninety (90) proposals for Graduate Summer Fellowships, as well as thirty (30) to forty (40) applications for other graduate fellowships. For UC Merced to become a Center for Graduate Education the campus needs to support the graduate students that are here. We need more good graduate students and more graduate programs. The short answer is we need more faculty as the ratio of graduate students to faculty is not elastic in the same way that it is for undergraduates. The campus needs to state up front that we need more money for more faculty. In the mean time, given the funding and factoring in the faculty, the best approach is to get more support, more students and more programs.

Graduate Programs: The Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs (CCGA) is very supportive of helping Merced build graduate programs. While this is a lot of work, and many of the campus programs are not in a position to move forward for CCGA review, this is not an onerous process. It is not something to be afraid of as CCGA is quite supportive and the campus hopes to see more proposals moving forward. There will likely not be any proposals this coming year since we had three groups last year.

Support for current students: Graduate students are a small group at approximately 5-6% relative to undergraduate students. GRC has received feedback from graduate students. Administratively, graduate students seem to be treated as an exception to the administrative processes since there are so few of them. As the campus grows, this should change. The EVC/Provost has made \$500k per year available for graduate student research and education for the last two years. The rough model used thus far includes approximately half of the funds going directly to graduate programs and divided into need-based measures and numbers of students. That proportion for graduate programs has been for recruiting and covering travel, stipends and various things for students to be distributed by the programs. The other half of the funding is for the Summer Fellowship competition. With one more year of funding and the introduction of a new Chancellor, the current method of distributing funds will be up for discussion. The Graduate Division will hopefully have data on whether the current method of support has been effective. Along these lines, GRC is currently working with the Vice Chancellor for Research and Executive Vice Chancellor to craft a more general funding model for research support on campus. Organized Research Units (ORUs) are helping drive this topic to the top of the list. In consulting with the Administration for a more general funding model, GRC is pushing to keep graduate students needs front and center. It is important that student funding continues while the campus discusses ORUs and individual faculty research programs. To support the graduate students on campus, it takes a lot of work on the part of the faculty. This year GRC is reaching out to help with the current workload and moving forward GRC will need to create better mechanisms to handle the workload rather than take care of business on an ad-hoc basis. The splitting of GRC into two separate committees will help, but there are issues surrounding a split that prevent GRC from splitting now.

A Senate member commented: I am encouraged by the emphasis on graduate education which is long overdue. Yes we need more resources. UC Merced must sustain a campus-wide focus to evolve into a credible research university. How can we help the students become as successful as possible with the budget limitations we have on campus?

Chair Heit responded: When Divisional Council meets with the Communications Office, Communications is told that it can continue to put out press releases that focus on the annual increase in enrollment of undergraduates but that shouldn't be the primary metric by which the campus judges success. The campus needs to focus on our research success and success of graduate groups. The Division has made some progress and will continue to emphasize this point.

Senate Member: In terms of spending the funding that we have we also need better ideas. However, the question is how the campus generates ideas to spend the money as effectively as possible.

GRC Chair Kello responded: GRC has left the distribution of funds up to the individual graduate groups as they are the best judge of how to spend the funding. It is the group's choice to use the funds for a competition or however it sees fit. If the GRC splits into a separate Research Council and Graduate Council, it will facilitate more idea exchange from the groups as GRC is suggesting the Research Council be comprised of the Graduate Group Chairs. This would give the Groups a forum to discuss best practices and exchange ideas.

Chancellor Kang interjected: VCR Traina just sent out a communication soliciting applications for Associate Dean for Graduate Studies.

**C) Ad-hoc Committee on Course Evaluations- *Ad-hoc Committee Chair, Nella Van Dyke***

When WASC visited for their Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) they expressed dismay that the three Schools use different course evaluation forms. The committee also asked that the campus evaluate learning outcomes as part of the teaching evaluations. The third WASC driven request is a requirement to evaluate the institution's learning objectives. The ad-hoc committee worked with the three School Curriculum Committees and created a common course evaluation form which is similar to the three forms used by the Schools. The committee also created two optional forms for the Schools to choose from to evaluate the institution's learning objectives through course evaluations.

Each course will not address all of the institution's learning outcomes. The Schools will need to provide instruction for faculty on how to complete the form. Each class will be told to complete the specific questions that pertain to institutional learning outcomes as it relates to the course. It was difficult to create an evaluation that was general, as customizing a form for each individual course would be extremely cumbersome. Therefore, there is one set of questions addressing each of the eight University learning outcomes. These new forms will be used this Spring. If anyone has questions, please contact me after the meeting.

**VI. SENATE AWARDS- *Senate Chair Evan Heit***

The Senate Awards are selected by our peers to celebrate faculty successes and teaching, research and service. These awards come with a \$1000 cash award and the recipient's names will be on a perpetual plaque outside the Senate office.

The first award I am pleased to announce is being presented for the first time in recognition of Excellence in Graduate Teaching and Mentoring. I am pleased to announce the winner is Ignacio López-Calvo from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

Recognition of Outstanding Early Career Research is awarded to Ming-Hsuan Yang from the School of Engineering

Recognition of Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and Mentorship is awarded to Sean Malloy from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

Recognition of Research that has had a major impact on the field through a sustained record of contributions is awarded to Will Shadish from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

The Dr. Fred Spiess Award for Distinguished Senate Service is presented to Senate Chair Evan Heit from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts.

#### **VII. CHAIR, VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE DIVISION FOR 2011-2012**

The Bylaws state: *“The Committee on Committees appoints the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Division. The appointments shall be reported for confirmation by the Division at the regular spring meeting of the Division. Unless objection is made and an election called for by a majority vote of those present, the appointments shall stand.”*

This is the first time the campus is going through this process.

CoC Chair Tom Hansford announced the committee appointments.

- Susan Amussen has been appointed as Chair of the Division
- Peggy O’Day has been appointed as Vice Chair of the Division
- Manuel Martin-Rodriguez has been appointed as Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Division

There being no objections, the Committee on Committee appointments stand.

#### **VIII. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

##### **Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)- *Chair Shawn Kantor***

Thank you VC Mary Miller for reviewing the budget information. The campus does not have any new academic planning given the MOU agreement. The MOU dictates the number of positions open. The committee assigned the Schools the job of prioritizing the number of FTE the Provost has allocated to them. CAPRA cross-checked and inquired where needed but for the most part the Schools are doing the hard work. There is no longer a need to argue with the Administration on the point that growth won’t happen with limited space. The current Administration understands the importance for space in terms of growth. The campus is in a budgetary steady state, not a very good state but steady.

##### **Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)- *Vice Chair Tom Harmon***



This is the busy part of the academic year. CAP will be meeting at least three times per month through July with special meetings for appointments as needed.

**Committee on Committees (CoC)- *Chair Tom Hansford***

Senate Chair Heit introduced Tom Hansford and thanked him for stepping in to the role of CoC Chair.

The committee is making good progress on the complete Senate slate for academic year 2011-2012. The committee is encountering some difficulty in identifying people willing to serve in Senate committees. Please encourage your colleagues to say yes, if they hear from us.

**Graduate and Research Council (GRC)- *Chair Chris Kello***

Senate Chair Heit noted that the earlier discussion about graduate education was good information. He acknowledged Chair Kello for his work as the Chair of GRC for the past two years and contributions to the Senate. Chair Heit stated he always hears great things about Chair Kello when he is in Oakland at UCOP.

Systemwide Chair Simmons stated Chair Kello does a very nice job as the Merced representative on the Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs (CCGA).

The Health Science Research Institute (HSRI) has submitted its proposal to GRC. This will be an important review process for HSRI and more generally establishing support for Centers on campus.

Non-Resident Tuition (NRT) and how to fund graduate students is a perennial issue. With the new funding streams model, the Graduate Deans will be discussing a potential for the campus to no longer have to worry about NRTs at least for TAs. This would be wonderful for many programs across the campus. Essentially the campus is charging itself for NRT. With the funding streams model it may be possible for NRT to automatically come with a TAship.

**Undergraduate Council (UGC)- *Chair Susan Amussen***

Senate Chair Heit thanked Chair Amussen for serving as UGC Chair for the past two years.

It was mentioned earlier that the campus had its first program review last year. This year UGC is conducting three reviews with site visits in the next couple of weeks. As part of being a research university, all academic programs will be reviewed over the course of the next six years. Program Review is another place we ask for campus faculty involvement, not just for external committee members. The internal faculty role is important to help each other build strong academic programs. The campus is currently conducting review at the undergraduate level and has simplified the process for the graduate program review. The intent is to coordinate the undergraduate and graduate program reviews whenever possible. Additionally UGC reviews course requests and admissions policies.

**Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)- *Chair Nella Van Dyke***

The CRE has reviewed and commented on several policies this year. Most significantly, the four SSHA Bylaw 55 Units were reviewed and approved. The committee has just completed its first review of the four SNS Bylaw 55 Unit proposals and will be requesting revisions.

CRE will make a few minor changes to the campus Bylaws such as moving the start dates to new committee chairs from the first day of instruction to the first day of the semester.

**IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS**

There were no student petitions.

**X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

There is no unfinished business.

**XI. NEW BUSINESS**

Chancellor Kang thanked Chair Evan Heit for his great leadership and all the committee Chairs for their great dedication and hard work. This academic year has been very successful. Congratulations to the incoming Chairs of DivCo. Collaboration between DivCo and the Cabinet has improved and we look forward to continued success for this campus.

Chair Heit thanked Chancellor Kang for attending the meeting and for his contributions.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 2:08pm.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:  
Kymm Carlson

**Divisional Council (DivCo)**  
**Merced Division of the Academic Senate**  
**Annual Report 2010-2011**

The Divisional Council (DivCo) held a total of 16 regularly scheduled 2 hour, in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaws [Divisional Council | Academic Senate](#). In addition the Council held a preliminary meeting to establish goals for the year and a meeting with Chancellor Designate Dorothy Leland when she visited the Merced campus.

**2010 – 2011 Accomplishments**

The unofficial theme of DivCo this year was building a research university. Issues and concerns falling under this theme include: having sufficient numbers of ladder-rank faculty relative to student numbers, bringing in resources (capital and operating) to allow increases in ladder-rank faculty, supporting untenured faculty, retaining faculty in general, increasing graduate student numbers and providing an excellent environment for graduate students.

At the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year DivCo held a planning meeting and identified six issues that were priorities for the upcoming year.

**Resources:** Enhance faculty and staff numbers, improve short- and long-term space planning, focus on S&E II building, advocate for the upcoming year.

**Budget:** Improve budgeted processes at the campus and school level. Increase communication, coordination, transparency. Encourage solutions to bring in more revenue.

**Leadership:** Seek clearer decisions and more responsiveness to communications from Administration.

**Administrative Units:** Seek reviews of administrative units that have the potential to slow the work . Focus on improving academic personnel processes.

**Strategic Planning:** Focus on structure of the administration and succession management.

**Graduate Education:** Focus on ways to improve graduate student numbers (related to faculty numbers and space issues). Improve coordination across campus for issues related to graduate student support.

**2010 – 2011 List of Activities**

The following summarizes Divisional Council and Division activities and actions for 2010-2011. Please refer to the Divisional Council approved minutes and communications for details.

**DivCo made recommendations to the administration on the following issues**

- Paid Outside Consultants (9.14.10) – Memo to the Chancellor and EVC/Provost voicing concern that the Senate be consulted on the Strategic Planning Process from the beginning, before an outside firm is hired.
- UC Merced – UC Davis PRIME Medical Program (9.29.10) – Forwarded comments to the Chancellor about the process for establishing a partnership with UC Davis, and voicing concern over resources for the program.
- Academic Calendars 2011 – 2103 (10.18.10) – Endorsed academic calendars for 2011 – 2013.
- Academic Personnel Office Issues and Recommendations (10.25.10) – Forwarded comments on the importance of having clearly written Academic Personnel policies and procedures.
- SSHA Bylaw 55 Units (12.7.10) – Unanimously endorsed four Bylaw 55 Unit proposals and recommended approval by the Administration.
- Academic Calendars 2013 – 2016 (1.13.11) – Endorsed future academic calendars with the condition that graduate student employment start dates be aligned with the calendars.
- General Assignment Classroom Scheduling Guidelines (1.20.11) – Forwarded DivCo’s concerns to Registrar regarding the differences in the pedagogy of undergraduate and graduate courses and how that affects their scheduling.
- Teaching Relief for Untenured Faculty (3.4.11) – Forwarded comments to the EVC/Provost on how to best support junior faculty.
- Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP) (3.15.11) – Forwarded DivCo’s concerns to the EVC/Provost regarding changes to the MAPP.
- Background Check Policy (4.19.11) – Memo to Vice Chancellor of Administration requesting clarification of the Background Check Policy.
- Report from Dr. Park & Dr. Young (5.3.11) – Memo to the Chancellor requesting that DivCo’s comments on strengthening UCM’s research capacity be appended to the report.
- DivCo comments on Codicil to MOU with UCOP (5.6.11) – Memo to the EVC/Provost with DivCo’s suggested changes to the Codicil to the MOU with UCOP.
- General Assignment Classroom Scheduling Guidelines (5.12.11) – Memo to Registrar on the importance of giving the same priority to scheduling graduate courses/seminars as is given to undergraduate courses.
- SNS Bylaw 55 Units (8.9.11) – Unanimously endorsed four Bylaw 55 Unit proposals and recommended approval by the Administration.
- UC Merced Bylaw Revisions (8.9.11) – DivCo approved minor changes to the Merced Division Bylaws including; service start date for Senate members, GRC to have final authority over approval of ORU’s, and leveling the number of CoC candidates to be elected each year to four members.
- Academic Personnel Processes (8.9.11) – DivCo disapproved a Pilot Program for testing the use of a Routine Merit Short Form.

### **DivCo reviewed and responded to the following campus items**

- Program Review
- WASC EER report drafts
- Positioning Statement from the Office of Communications
- Administrative Periodic Review Schedule
- Undergraduate CRF Policy
- Budget Call
- Faculty Honors and Prizes
- Academic Degree Policy Revisions
- UC Merced Regulations
- School of Engineering Academic Personnel Change
- Academic Honesty Policy
- Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award for Lecturers
- Proposal to split the Graduate Council
- Policy for Public Sharing of Data on Student Learning Outcomes
- Proposal for Library Committee

### **DivCo opined on the following systemwide items**

- Forwarded comments regarding the Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition to the Academic Council. (10.20.11) – Memo from DivCo concurring with the favorable opinion put forward by the Academic Council and supporting the proposal.
- Forwarded comments on Post Employment Benefits to the Academic Council. (10.22.10) – Memo from DivCo voicing strong objection to the financing proposal that would raise employer contributions to 20% of payroll until at least 2029.
- Forwarded a response regarding the UCLA Statement on the Future of the University to the Academic Council (11.10.10) – Memo from DivCo highlighting the fact that UC Merced is “pre-downsized” and therefore would be devastated by cutting faculty numbers or ceasing to plan future buildings.
- Forwarded response to the Academic Council regarding APM 010, 015. (1.14.11) – Memo from DivCo supporting the proposed changes.
- Forwarded comments to the Academic Council regarding the Funding Streams Proposal. (2.17.11) – Memo from DivCo expressing strong concerns over what the funding streams proposal will do to the budgets of smaller campuses and urging the delay of implementation until rebenching is in place.

### **Website and Document Management**

During summer 2010 in consultation with IT, the first phase of a two-phase upgrade to the Senate website was initiated. The first phase was completed when the previous website was migrated to a more recent version, the format was redesigned and Senate staff were trained on how to use new features. With the development of a more nimble website the Senate Office has been able to create links to relevant campus issues (e.g. budgets and new buildings) and has begun the process of readying current documents for a data base/document management

system. It is anticipated that phase two in the development of a campus document management system will bring with it controlled layers of access and capacity to grow as we add more committees.

### **Senate Office**

The Academic Senate office workload has increased significantly as we have responded to campus requirements for program review as well as WASC requirements. 2010-2011 saw the addition of two new sub-committees of the Undergraduate Council; the General Education Committee and the Program Review Committee. The WASC Review Steering Committee, ongoing since 2009-2010 combined their continuing activities with the Senate Administration Council on Assessment (SACA) after the WASC visit was completed in March. The demands of ongoing program and administrative reviews will continue to be a part of the SACA committee's oversight.

It is anticipated that with the maturing of the Divisional Council, the growth of the Faculty, and the growing needs of program reviews, some of the committees will divide and new ones will be added. For 2011-2012 the Senate will be adding one new standing committee to its roster: the Faculty Welfare Committee. There is currently a proposal that the Graduate and Research Council split into two councils: the Graduate Council and the Council on Research which we anticipate will occur during 2012-2013. It is also likely that in the near future, the Undergraduate Council will evolve into a Council on Educational Policy (overseeing curriculum, program review, and policy) with a separate Admissions Committee.

Respectfully Submitted:

#### ***UCM Faculty***

Evan Heit, Chair (SSHA)

Anne Kelley, Vice-Chair (Natural Sciences)

Shawn Kantor, CAPRA Chair (SSHA)

Susan Amussen, UGC Chair (SSHA)

Chris Kello, GRC Chair (SSHA)

Tom Hansford, CoC Chair (SSHA)

Tom Harmon, CAP Chair (School of Engineering)

Nella Van Dyke, Parliamentarian/Secretary (SSHA)

Ignacio Lopez-Calvo, At-Large Member (SSHA)

David Noelle, At-Large Member (SSHA)

#### ***Senate Staff***

Susan Sims, Executive Director

Fatima Paul, Principal Analyst & Manager of Program Review

Mary Ann Coughlin, Senior Analyst

Kymm Carlson, Analyst

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL 2010-2011 ANNUAL REPORT**

### **TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2010-2011.

#### **I. CAP Membership**

This year the CAP membership included five members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were Raymond Chiao (Engineering and Natural Sciences, Fall 2010 term); Michael Colvin (Natural Sciences, Fall 2010 term); Thomas Harmon, CAP Vice Chair (Engineering); Jian-Qiao Sun (Engineering); and Jan Wallander (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts). The external members were Joseph Cerny, CAP Chair (UCB, Chemistry); Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB, Computer Science, Fall 2010 term); Robert Deacon (UCSB, Economics, Spring 2011 term); C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD, Physics, Spring 2011 term); Hung Fan (UCI, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages). Susan Sims (Fall 2010) and Mary Ann Coughlin (Spring 2011) served as the CAP Analysts.

#### **II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases**

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

##### **Policies and Procedures**

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

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and Academic Personnel Committee (APC) Chairs. As the MAPP is an evolving resource, CAP presents occasional suggestions for revision to the Academic Personnel Office and/or the Divisional Council.

##### **Review Process**

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

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

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. If disagreement prevails at any level of review, the file is returned to the School for reconsideration and/or a request for more information before being resubmitted to CAP. The EVC/Provost communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Throughout the UC system certain categories of academic personnel cases, for example, appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. This *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate and its report is included in the materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate. At the older campuses, these *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit. Due to the limited number of tenured faculty at UCM, CAP frequently serves "as its own *ad hoc*"; however, when there is inadequate expertise within CAP to review a particular case, an *ad hoc* committee of expert faculty from other UC campuses is appointed by the EVC/Provost.

### **Recommendations**

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2010-2011 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 96 cases during the year; this represents a 52 percent increase in caseload over the prior year. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 80 percent of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). Tables 1A – 1D detail caseloads and their respective outcomes according to the proposed personnel actions. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendations by the academic units.

CAP recommendations are transmitted to the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost for a final level of review. Both the Chancellor and the EVC/Provost are deeply involved in the academic personnel process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels. Their final decisions give significant weight to CAP's recommendations, all of which were accepted this year.

### **III. Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases**

CAP has general comments regarding the Schools' submission of Personnel cases. These pertain mainly to Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) and case materials.

#### **Mid-Career Appraisal**

A timely submission of the MCA can be crucial to the career of an Assistant Professor, who should have a punctual evaluation on his/her progress toward tenure. Long delays in receiving this review leave less time for "corrective actions" when they are needed prior to the end of the



tenure clock. The deadline in 2010-2011 for submission of MCA cases to APO was November 12, 2010. CAP had meetings scheduled in late November and December to focus on reviewing these cases; however, only two of the nine (22 percent) MCAs that were submitted for review during the year were submitted by this date.

CAP urges the Schools' Academic Personnel Chairs and the Deans to establish and enforce early deadlines for review materials, particularly for external letters, so that MCA cases for 2011-2012 are submitted in final form to APO by this fall's deadline of November 18, 2011. This is also the deadline for the seventh year final appraisals for some of the assistant Professors.

### **Case Materials**

A well-written and comprehensive case file is critical to maintaining the integrity of the personnel review. Case materials should adequately and appropriately reflect a candidate's research, teaching, and service performance. With regard to research, the case analysis from the Schools should thoroughly evaluate the quality and the significance of candidates' scholarship. Impact factors and related indices cannot substitute for an in-depth evaluation. Below CAP reiterates text from its 2009-2010 annual report:

"Research. A description of a candidate's research should highlight and analyze [and not merely enumerate] the nature, significance, and intellectual impact of the main components of the work. The description need not be long, since CAP reads the same dossier. However, especially in areas unlikely to be understood by outsiders, a brief lay description of the research area is [also] very useful. The report should include summaries, without long or numerous quotations of the opinions of the outside reviewers, since they are best able to judge the impact of the work in the field.

"Publication Venue. One measure of quality (albeit imperfect) is the venue of publication. It would be helpful to give an honest assessment of the publication's recognition in the discipline. Here are some examples: one of the top three general journals in the discipline; the primary journal in the field (where a discipline might be divided into about 6 rather than 30 fields); a well-recognized journal in the subfield; and the major publisher of books on the topic. No adjectives need be applied to journals that do not garner prestige in the discipline."

With regard to teaching, [APM 210-1](#) states, "It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file." The manual follows this with an enumerated listing of acceptable forms of evidence. This does not include faculty members' teaching self-statements, as they do not provide the desired objective evaluations of candidates' teaching efforts.

With regard to service, CAP stresses the importance of properly documenting university, campus, and school committee efforts. As [expected] levels of commitment vary from committee to committee and from member to member, committee workload descriptions and evaluations should be adequately detailed. They should include an appraisal of the quality of the candidate's contributions and of the extent of their efforts in committee assignments.

## **IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost**

CAP reviewed various cases during the year that prompted the committee to make recommendations to the EVC/Provost on academic personnel procedures and policy. CAP transmitted administrative comments to the EVC/Provost regarding the following topics: composition and role of the Schools' Academic Personnel Committees, Adjunct Professor Series, normal time in service at step, delayed reviews of promotion to tenure, and faculty periods of leave. The substance of the administrative comments is detailed in Appendix B.

For the most part, the cases specifically discussed in these administrative comments have returned to CAP with the requested corrections; however, some of the referenced problems have since appeared in new cases. CAP is unable to find clear evidence that new written policy or procedures have resulted from its formal recommendations.

## **V. Academic Personnel Meetings**

### **Fall Meeting**

As is becoming an annual tradition at the UCM campus, the EVC/Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, scheduled on Sept. 9, 2010, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny, five internal members, and two external members. The committee led two discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. This was followed by extensive discussion between the Assistant Professors and CAP. A second session, which was held over lunch and continued into the afternoon, was open to all faculty members, School APC Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Brief minutes from both sessions are available in the Academic Personnel Office.

### **Semester Meetings**

Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School APCs convened once per semester to discuss the academic review process, as well as academic personnel policies and procedures. At the first meeting, held on November 18, 2010, CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny and four internal members. Discussion items focused on the preparation of AP cases and specifically addressed MCA, promotion to tenure, merit increase, and Senate lecturer cases. Formal meeting minutes are available upon request in the Academic Personnel Office.

The second meeting convened on May 20, 2011. CAP was represented by Chair Joseph Cerny, two internal members, and one external member. Attendees discussed MCA; merit review, including the Merit Short Form; delayed tenure review cases; and Bio-Bibliography content. Additional items were discussed in some detail, as was the desire to see more written policy and procedures in the MAPP. While formal minutes are not available in the Academic Personnel Office, the CAP Analyst maintains the informal minutes.

## **VI. Academic Senate Review Items**

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including the Proposed Revisions to the MAPP, the School of Engineering's Proposed Changes for

Engineering Academic Personnel Chair Conduct, and various voting unit proposals from the Schools.

## **VII. Acknowledgments**

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The Chair and all other CAP members wish to thank Susan Sims and Mary Ann Coughlin for their dedicated support during the academic year.

Finally, CAP would like to gratefully acknowledge the past and present contributions of its outgoing Chair, Joseph Cerny. Professor Cerny has ably served as the UCM CAP Chair for the past three years. Prior to this he served as CAP member for an additional five years. The time and effort that he has sacrificed to help ensure that the University of California standards of scholarship are always upheld at the UCM campus will not be forgotten.

Respectfully,

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UCB)  
Tom Harmon, Vice Chair  
Raymond Chiao  
Michael Colvin  
Jian-Qiao Sun  
Jan Wallander  
Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)  
Robert Deacon (UCSB)  
C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD)  
Hung Fan (UCI)  
Richard Regosin (UCI)  
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

**Appendix A**

**2010-2011 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
<b>TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>96</b>

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (4 Acting)	14	4	0	0	<b>18</b>
Associate Professor (1 Acting)	5	2	0	0	<b>7</b>
Professor	3	3	1	0	<b>7</b>
Lecturer Series (1 LPSOE)	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
Chairs	1	0	0	0	<b>1</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>34</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>71%</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>97%</b>

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	10	2	0	0	<b>12</b>
Professor	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>
Professor VI	2	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Above Scale	1	0	1	0	<b>2</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>76%</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>88%</b>

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	3	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
Assistant	16	4	0	0	<b>20</b>
Associate Professor (2 Adjunct)	7	0	0	1	<b>8</b>
Professor	6	0	1	1	<b>8</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>39</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>86%*</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>97%*</b>

\*Calculated without pending cases.

<b>TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS</b>	<b>CAP Recommendation</b>				<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>Agreed</b>	<b>Modification</b>	<b>Disagreed</b>	<b>Pending</b>	
Assistant (3 Adjunct)	6	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
Associate	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Professor	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					<b>100%</b>
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					<b>100%</b>

**TABLE 2  
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS  
2010-2011**

<b>School</b>	<b>Number Proposed</b>	<b>CAP Recommendation</b>				<b>% CAP agreed w/unit without modification</b>	<b>% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down</b>
		<b>Agree</b>	<b>Modify-Up</b>	<b>Modify-Down</b>	<b>Disagree</b>		
<b>Engineering</b>	<b>18</b>	13	3	--	2	72%	89%
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>(2)</b>						
<b>Natural Sciences</b>	<b>39</b>	34	1	3	1	87%	97%
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>(5)</b>						
<b>Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts</b>	<b>39</b>	30	4	4	1	77%	97%
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>(2)</b>						
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>77*</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>96%</b>
<b>(MCA)</b>	<b>(9)</b>						

\*The two pending merit increases in Table 1C have been counted as agree in this table.

**TABLE 3**  
**CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2011**

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

	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Total Appointments</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Total Promotions</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Total Merit Increases</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Total Other</b>		<b>6</b>

## Appendix B

### *School Academic Personnel Committees – Composition and Role* (December 3, 2010)

The Committee believes each UC Merced School should have an Academic Personnel Committee, comprised of at least three members, to evaluate each case from a broad intellectual perspective and to provide a case analysis with multiple signatures. Understandably in large units, all Academic Personnel Committee members may not be able to evaluate the research contributions in a given case, but other elements of the case analysis are general enough that all members can provide appropriate input.

### *Adjunct Professor Series* (February 11, 2011)

Adjunct Professor Series appointment and advancement cases must clearly state the assigned duties and responsibilities (as determined at the time of appointment, if possible) for review at all levels of the academic personnel process (see [APM 280-4](#) and [280-10](#)). The case analysis must address the performance of the candidate with respect to the relevant criteria for the case. The same is expected of a dean's review. At the time of an appointment, an adjunct faculty member must be apprised of the nature of the appointment, relevant duties and responsibilities, and the faculty evaluation process and criteria used for the Adjunct Professor Series and for the candidate's specific appointment.

An appointment in the Adjunct Professor Series must be made at a certain percentage, whether for pay or not. The Case Analysis is expected to analyze the adjunct faculty member's performance relative to both the agreed upon duties and responsibilities and the appointment percentage. When appropriate, a discussion of the candidate's performance at her/his primary institution may also be relevant to demonstrate its value to UC Merced.

Finally, the Case Analysis should be supervised, if not written, by an APC Chair.

### *Normal Time in Service at Step* (March 15, 2011)

In cases where a recommended personnel action falls outside the normal time in service at a particular step (see [APM 220-18](#)), CAP requests that the review agencies preparing the case provide an accompanying explanation in terms of the relevant APM criteria. Clarification and guidance will be particularly valuable in cases involving the overlapping steps in the Assistant and Associate Professor series, where service at those steps count as service toward the next rank.

### *Delayed Reviews of Promotion to Tenure* (April 8, 2011)

CAP believes that a consistent policy is needed with respect to the timeline for review of promotion to tenure. Until the UC Merced Administration and the Senate have the time to discuss and agree upon a permanent policy to be put in MAPP, CAP proposes the following interim policy, taken from the Irvine campus and modified by agreement at the May 20, 2011 meeting:

“In the latter half of an assistant professor's fifth year (under the eight-year rule), the department should determine whether the tenure review should take place, as normal, in the sixth year or whether circumstances exist which justify postponement of the tenure review until the seventh year. Postponement of the tenure review will be justified if the candidate has significant work in progress, the evaluation of which will occur within a year but not in time to be included in a sixth-year review.

To request postponement, the assistant professor should provide tangible evidence to the department that the record will change significantly in the sixth year. The department

should discuss the evidence and vote for or against postponement of the tenure review.

The postponement file must be accompanied by the candidate's full merit or reappointment file, which will normally be required for continuation beyond the sixth year. Form UCI-AP-38 (to be obtained) itemizes the documentation required for the postponement of the tenure review. The postponement file, accompanied by the merit or reappointment file, is forwarded to the appropriate dean's office for recommendation, for further review by the [Committee] on Academic Personnel and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel."

CAP explicitly communicated to the EVC/Provost that this interim policy should become effective July 1, 2011 and continue until a more permanent policy has been agreed upon. CAP also requested that all sixth-year merit review cases in the current pipeline through June 30, 2011, which by default are postponing a tenure review, should be accompanied by a letter from the cognizant dean justifying this postponement.

*Faculty Periods of Leave (June 20, 2011)*

When candidates for advancement or promotion have been granted a leave of absence by the University for personal or medical reasons, the Academic Personnel Office should properly document the leave on the candidate's appointment history card. Discussions of such leaves of absence should not appear in the case analysis or in other parts of the dossier, except in the context of correctly documenting the review period.



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2010-2011**

**TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) met 13 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw II.IV.1.B. The issues that CAPRA considered this year are described briefly as follows:

**Systemwide Budget:**

*State Funding Reductions*

2010-2011 proved to be a challenging year for the University of California with regard to budgetary matters. In an effort to close a \$26.6 billion budget gap, the State Legislature approved a \$650 million funding reduction to the University for 2011-2012. This represents a 21.3 percent decrease in state support. In addition, the University anticipates having to absorb \$362.5 million of unfunded cost increases for 2011-2012. This will include expenses associated with pension contributions, employee health benefits, merit increases, utility increases, other salary increases, non-salary cost increases, etc. Consequently, the University has commenced preparations for this substantial decrease in its funding. The Office of the President reviewed and trimmed its operational budget. The remainder of the funding cuts will be allocated to the campuses, and a portion will be mitigated through an increase in mandatory systemwide charges, effective Fall 2011. UCM was spared funding decreases attributable to the \$650 million funding reduction.

*Funding Streams Model*

The funding streams model will allow campuses to retain campus-generated funds, including student tuition. The model assesses a fee that is a uniform percentage of campus “operating expenses from all campus fund sources” to fund the activities of the Office of the President.

CAPRA discussed the funding streams model at its February 3, 2011 meeting. The Committee endorsed the notion of providing greater transparency and accountability to the manner in which the Office of the President is funded. While CAPRA generally supported the effort embodied in the funding streams model, the Committee expressed two general opinions in a formal response to the Divisional Council: (1) “rebenching” seems to be an essential component of achieving budget transparency within the University. CAPRA supported delaying the adoption of the funding streams model until a complementary “rebenching” proposal could simultaneously be implemented; (2) the size and role of the Office of the President needs to be evaluated, better defined, and appropriately reviewed.

The UC Academic Council indicated a general support for the funding streams model at its February 23, 2011 meeting, stating the model seemed to simplify University financial activity, improve transparency, and incentivize campuses to maximize revenue. Nevertheless, the

Council encouraged completing the rebenching process as soon as possible, as well as establishing enforceable central enrollment targets. Enrollment management was seen as an essential component of sustaining a UC quality education at all campuses.

#### *Post-Employment Benefits*

This year the University recognized the need to address a \$21 billion unfunded liability for its retiree health and pension programs. At a special meeting on Dec. 13, 2010, the Board of Regents adopted several measures to put the University's retirement programs on solid financial footing while still ensuring attractive post-employment benefits. In general, the plan will offer a modified pension program and modified retiree health care benefits to faculty and staff that join the University on or after July 1, 2013. It will also restructure the plan's financing through various measures.

#### **Campus Budget:**

##### *Campus Budget Transparency*

In consultation with the EVC, CAPRA expressed a concern with respect to UCM's lack of overall budget transparency, including its lack of a formal process for making investment decisions. The Committee believes this should be addressed in coordination with the implementation of the funding streams model. Having a process where the decision to fund one priority is weighed against options to fund other priorities could increase financial efficiencies and returns on campus and could also advance the academic mission of the University. The campus may benefit from having the Budget Committee not only review requests from units for increments to their previous budgets, but to also prioritize new and existing resource allocation choices.

##### *Summer Enrollment Revenue*

CAPRA requested summer revenue and revenue distribution data from the EVC. The Committee found that large sums had been allocated to the Deans to use at their discretion. CAPRA views these funds as a possible means of expanding and enriching academic and research endeavors. It also supports transparency with regard to their expenditure. Following Summer 2011 the Committee will transmit a memo to the faculty with summer revenue information.

##### *Instructional Budget (Discussion led by Hans Bjornsson, VP of Academic Planning)*

VP of Academic Planning Hans Bjornsson and CAPRA discussed the process and subsequent challenges involved in formulating the instructional budget. Similar to most universities and campuses, UCM begins with a base budget for each school and makes incremental increases or decreases every year. The budget includes allocations needed for lecturers, teaching assistants, special equipment, and other instructional resources. Lecturer FTE is included in the incremental budget because it is derived from the disproportionate amount of new student FTE over new faculty FTE. CAPRA would support an instructional budget that is based on enrollment numbers and policy.

##### *Faculty FTE Assignments*

CAPRA discussed the need to identify an appropriate way to assign faculty in the payroll system. The Schools' Bylaw 55 units, which have been proposed by the Senate and approved by the administration, may be a suitable means for faculty payroll designation. The Divisional Council, the Schools, and the faculty chairs could vet the current list of faculty according to Bylaw 55 units.

#### *Merritt Writing Program*

CAPRA supports more Senate involvement in the Merritt Writing Program with respect to both academic and resource matters.

#### *Valley PRIME MOU*

In general, the Committee believed that the Valley PRIME MOU required considerably more detail and needed to better define campus and program expectations, something that was readily acknowledged by the EVC during his consultation with the Committee. In particular, the Committee hoped that revisions to the MOU would take into account concerns regarding financial obligations, fundraising efforts, the role of campus faculty and Senate consultation, and measures of success.

#### *Young and Park Report*

Former UC Chancellors Charles Young and Roderick Park were charged with developing a report on the opportunities and challenges offered by the UCM over the next several years. The report considers the current state and future growth of student, faculty, and staff FTE; annual research expenditure from external resources; and capital expenditures. As the MOU between the campus and the Office of the President provides the ground rules for student and faculty growth over the next three plus years, Drs. Young and Park concluded that space, faculty research support, and an overall analysis of necessary campus growth for achieving stability will be the immediate problems facing the new Chancellor. Options for solving these problems should be addressed without delay.

#### *Enrollment*

President Yudof encouraged the Merced campus to admit applicants from the referral pool. UCM did so selectively and with consideration for capacity constraints.

#### *University Relations*

During the year CAPRA expressed concern to the EVC, as well as to the Vice Chancellor for University Relations, regarding the lack of Senate involvement in the establishment of campus fundraising priorities. To facilitate a larger degree of shared governance, the committee supported more communication between University Relations, the Deans, and the faculty. In general, CAPRA encourages larger and more effective fundraising goals.

#### **School Academic Plans:**

Strategic planning is an annual process that begins with faculty in all units, including schools, graduate groups, and research institutes. The faculty create plans for the development and growth of research and academic programs. The plans are then used as the basis for formal resource requests (i.e., Senate faculty FTE requests), which are developed in the Deans' offices

in collaboration with the faculty. The resource requests and strategic plans are sent to the EVC who passes them to CAPRA for formal review. CAPRA then develops recommendations based on its own Guiding Criteria to the EVC who makes the final resource decisions. This year CAPRA refined its Guiding Criteria.

In November the EVC transmitted the Call for School Academic Plans and the CAPRA Guiding Criteria to the Deans. Plans were to cover a three-year period and work under the assumption of a constant annual FTE allocation. In addition, each plan was to include four tables delineating the nature of its FTE requests: (1) prioritized FTE requests for the 2011-2012 academic year; (2) prioritized FTE requests for the following two academic years; (3) instructional obligations of the School's faculty, by majors and/or graduate groups; and (4) a table documenting proposed space needs.

Resource requests and plans were submitted to the EVC in mid-February and then forwarded to CAPRA. Upon an initial review of the requests and plans, CAPRA determined additional information was required in order to conduct a thorough evaluation. The Committee requested data from Academic Personnel on the status of open FTE searches. This was to ensure that programs were not too ambitious with regard to hiring expectations and, thus, that effective searches could be reasonably conducted. The Committee also requested points of clarification from the Deans with regard to the Schools' plans.

In June CAPRA conducted its final review of the School Academic Plans and FTE requests. The Committee was satisfied that the Schools proposed to allocate new FTE to areas that are disproportionately impacted with large numbers of students or to areas where an additional FTE would have a significant impact on delivering a course of study or research initiative. CAPRA chose to only make recommendations on the 2011-2012 FTE allocations, as much can change within a year's time. It did not offer an opinion about the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 proposals.

#### *Comments*

Academic Strategic Planning is intended to be a faculty-driven process. The Committee was not entirely convinced this was always the case and thus, makes the following recommendations for future reviews: (1) individual program plans should be made available to CAPRA; (2) when CAPRA requires clarifying information on plans, it may wish to consult with the faculty chairs rather than the deans; (3) the executive committees' plans should be brought to the faculty for approval prior to being sent to the deans.

#### **Strategic Investment Faculty Hires:**

In December the EVC and Academic Senate Chair distributed to the faculty, the Deans, and the Graduate Group Coordinators a solicitation of proposals to hire ladder-rank faculty in the five Research Themes for UC Merced's Future: (1) Environmental Sustainability; (2) Human Health; (3) Cognitive Science and Intelligent Systems; (4) Community, Culture and Identity; (5) Dynamics of Social and Economic Progress. The overarching goal of the effort was to further the development of nationally and internationally recognized research units and academic graduate programs at UC Merced, while also building excellence in the undergraduate curriculum.

Proposals were anticipated to be for hires at the rank of Professor or Associate Professor. Each disciplinary group and each graduate group could submit one primary proposal, though groups could be affiliated with any number of proposals. Submissions were due in the Academic Senate Office on February 15, 2011. The Senate Committee on Committees convened an *ad-hoc* committee to assess the proposals such that each reviewer was assigned to one of the five strategic areas. Reviewers did not have affiliations with the groups involved in proposals to their assigned area. Each review panel included at least one reviewer external to the campus with expertise in the discipline.

CAPRA was then given the proposals and the results of the *ad-hoc* committee for its review. Charged with making a new FTE recommendation to the EVC, CAPRA identified the strongest proposal in each of the five research themes by establishing how well each submitted proposal met the criteria laid out in the solicitation. One of the top five proposals met all of the criteria particularly well and was recommended for an FTE. The other four were recommended but without a rank order.

All proposal materials, including *ad-hoc* committee and CAPRA's recommendations, were forwarded to the EVC for final decisions.

#### *Comments*

CAPRA largely viewed the process for proposing and evaluating FTE through the Strategic Investment Faculty Hires initiative as experimental this year. The Committee sought to recommend proposals that promised to recruit faculty who could elevate UC Merced's curricular and research profiles through their trans-disciplinary perspectives. There was a disconnect, however, between this goal and asking existing disciplinary majors and graduate groups to propose positions. Should this process be repeated next year, both CAPRA and the EVC should agree in advance on how proposals should (or should not) relate to existing disciplinary or graduate groups' academic strategic plans. The call for proposals should be clear on the criteria for evaluation, and particularly whether priority is to be given to trans-disciplinary appointments, or appointments that would not be made eventually in existing strategic plans.

#### **Additional Review Items:**

*Addendum to the Art and Fafa Kamangar Chair Gift Agreement:* CAPRA agreed that the addendum seemed reasonable and fully appropriate to the academic mission of UC Merced.

*Bylaws of the Merced Division:* The Committee reviewed its assigned duties in the Bylaws of the Merced Division and recommended the following edits in **bold** or ~~striketrough~~ type:

3. Confers with and advises the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and Divisional administrative agencies regarding policy on academic planning, budget and resource allocations; ~~forwards recommendation on staff allocations to the Committee on Academic Personnel for their review.~~
4. Initiates and coordinates studies or reviews of existing and proposed academic schools, colleges, and degree programs as they relate to academic planning, budget, and resource

allocation, and to reports thereon to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or to the Divisional Council and Divisional Assembly as it may deem appropriate.

*Draft ORU Proposal Review Process at UC Merced:* The Graduate and Research Council (GRC) asked CAPRA to rewrite a draft ORU proposal review process for UCM. CAPRA's draft was written within the constraint that the review process is an administrative policy. It did not seek to dictate how the administration should conduct its own review. In addition, the policy recognized GRC's authority in the Senate's review of ORU proposals, which is stated in the Merced Division Bylaws. CAPRA sent its draft review process to GRC.

*MAPP:* CAPRA formed an *ad-hoc* committee to conduct an initial review of the MAPP. The committee made formal recommendations that were sent to the Divisional Council.

*NS Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals:* CAPRA expressed several concerns regarding the proposals. However, it concentrated its formal response to the Divisional Council on resource-related matters. First, CAPRA addressed the lack of consistency across schools with regard to dedicated administrative support. NS proposals suggested that some degree of staff support will be dedicated to the newly formed units; SSHA did not receive this support when its Bylaw 55 units were formalized. Second, Bylaw 55 unit chairs within SSHA are not compensated a summer ninth as the NS proposals suggested would be the policy in that school. CAPRA urged the EVC and the Deans of the three schools to establish a uniform policy for compensating faculty for extraordinary service.

*Proposal to Split the Graduate Research Council (GRC):* CAPRA supported the proposal, as it did not seem to have resource implications.

*Proposed 2011-2013 Academic Calendar:* CAPRA did not formally comment on the proposed calendar. The calendar seemed to include the same number of instructional days, and the resource implications were constant over time.

*SSHA Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals:* The Committee transmitted a memo stating that it did not see any resource implications.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Kantor (SSHA), Chair, UCPB Representative  
Wolfgang Rogge (Engineering), Vice Chair  
Susan Amussen (SSHA), UGC Chair  
Anne Kelley (NS), Senate Vice Chair  
Chris Kello (SSHA), GRC Chair  
Evan Heit (SSHA), Senate Chair, *Ex-Officio*, Non-Voting  
Beth Hernandez-Jason, Student Representative, Non-Voting

**GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2010-2011**

**TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

During the academic year 2010-2011, the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) met fifteen (15) times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw II.4.C. The issues that GRC considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

**CAMPUS  
BUSINESS****Accreditation (WASC)**

On March 9, 2011 WASC performed its final site visit for accreditation. Although graduate study was not a focus of much of their report, the WASC committee was interested in graduate studies and the future of graduate program assessment. Chair Kello informed the committee that CCGA approved the proposals for Cognitive Information Sciences and Qualitative Systems Biology with the Psychology program pending. He also discussed the establishment of graduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and the University's commitment to building the graduate program by committing \$500k annually from 2009-2012. The WASC committee was interested in resource/funding allocation and its tie to assessment. Funding is not currently attached to program assessment, however it will be a consideration once the campus begins the process of program review for graduate programs.

**Strategic Faculty Hires for UC Merced**

Five FTE's were allocated by UCM as strategic hires for the campus, linked to the five strategic areas of research. GRC was charged with the task to draft the process and criteria by which the positions are filled. GRC created a subcommittee to draft the policy and submitted it to DivCo in October 2010. It was determined that each disciplinary group and graduate group would be able to submit one primary proposal. Proposal submissions were due February 15, 2011 and were reviewed by CAPRA for recommendation to the Administration.

**2011-2013 Catalog**

All graduate groups submitted revisions for the 2011-2013 catalog. GRC agreed to include the program learning outcomes (PLOs) for all groups and add the general masters and Ph.D. learning outcomes to the Graduate Division information. GRC reviewed and approved the revisions and forwarded them to the Graduate Division and the Registrar's Office.

**POLICY****Minimum Grade Unit Requirements in Graduate Groups/Emphasis Areas**

The GRC adopted a policy to implement a minimum grade unit requirement whereby all graduate students must be enrolled in a minimum of four (4) units of either upper division or graduate-level, letter-graded coursework while enrolled in a graduate program at UC Merced. The policy was adopted to avoid the possibility of graduate students completing their degree without a grade point average.

**Masters and Doctoral Project Learning Outcomes**

The GRC amended its Project Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for both Masters and Ph.D programs to include over-arching outcomes for consistency. It was determined that individual schools could create their own PLOs so long as they are consistent with UC requirements. PLOs were updated for each graduate group and will be included on the campus website and in the 2011-2013 Course Catalog.

**Graduate Program Review Policy and Procedures**

In March the GRC streamlined its Graduate Program Review Policy to simplify the program for self study in coordination with the undergraduate program review policy. Additionally, the graduate programs will be reviewed every seven years per the WASC EER draft. It was noted that for graduate program review; it is imperative to track post-degree graduate student placement for future records.

**Academic Honesty Policy**

The GRC was asked to review the Academic Honesty Policy by Vice Chair of Student Affairs Lawrence. GRC briefly discussed the Academic Honesty Policy and determined in most cases, academic honesty applies equally for undergraduate and graduate students, although the issue tends to be more pertinent at the undergraduate level. GRC anticipates reviewing comments from UGC on this policy. However, research misconduct, such as falsification of data, falls within the purview of the Vice Chancellor of Research (VCR). Thus the draft policy should indicate that research misconduct allegations are handled by the Office of Research. UGC will constitute a subcommittee to fully research other campuses and rewrite the UC Merced policy in AY2011-12.

**Policy on Assurance of Laboratory Safety Compliance**

GRC heard two presentations from Kevin Creed, Director of Environmental Health and Safety on the draft of the campus *Policy on Assurance of Laboratory Safety Compliance*. Six major issues were identified and broken down by tasks to create a plan for a true lab safety campus culture. The policy document spells out the roles and responsibilities of all parties. It also addresses procedures for repeat offenders and how to recognize and reward the safe model behaviors. Both Mary Miller and Sam Traina have reviewed the policy. The GRC endorsed the policy in May. Director Creed will present the policy to the Chancellor's cabinet for final approval.

**Policy on Animal Use in Biological Courses**

GRC drafted a policy for animal use in biological graduate courses.

"As part of their right to academic freedom, graduate course instructors at UC Merced reserve the right to grade students on the basis of hands-on work with living organisms and biological materials, in accordance with all applicable ethical standards and laws. Students must be informed of course requirements and grading policies at the beginning of each graduate course, but graduate course instructors are not required to provide alternate assignments if students object to assignments that require hands-on work with living organisms and biological materials."

**Policy for Auditing Graduate Courses**

GRC and UGC approved course auditing policies in Fall 2010. The following is the approved policy for auditing graduate courses:

"With the consent of the instructor, registered students and interested individuals are permitted to audit classes. Arrangements are made directly with the faculty member under any rules the faculty member may establish, and those auditing ordinarily do not participate in exams, or written papers. Priority for course resources such as classroom space and laboratory supplies is given to students who are fully enrolled in the course. Audited classes are not recorded on the student's class schedule or on academic transcripts."

**Graduate Advisor Handbook**

The Graduate Division asked the GRC to review and comment on revisions made to the Advisor Handbook. The vast majority of revisions were minor or previously approved by GRC. After discussion, the GRC agreed to approve the revised handbook subject to a few minor edits.

**COMMITTEE  
BUSINESS****Separation of Graduate Research Council**

Last year CRE requested that GRC opine on the feasibility of splitting into two committees – a Graduate Council and a Research Council – similar to other UC campuses. GRC sent a memo to CRE stating that the outcomes of splitting may be beneficial, but only if more faculty were added to the committees, i.e. summing to more than the current number of faculty serving on GRC. At its meeting on March 3, 2011, GRC discussed the heavy workload of the committee and workload increases once graduate programs undergo program review. The committee felt it prohibitive to form a program review subcommittee given the current workload. Although the idea of splitting GRC into separate graduate and research councils has been rejected in the past because of lack of staffing; GRC proposed the graduate council be comprised of all Graduate Group Chairs on campus. This solution would not only solve the problem of finding people to sit on the committee, but it would also vastly improve communication between the Senate and graduate groups.



In March 2011, the standing committees of DivCo opined on the GRC request to separate. DivCo reviewed the request in April and determined that there is not enough eligible faculty to serve on an additional standing committee. DivCo also had issue with populating the Graduate Council with Graduate Chairs as the Chairs are administrative appointees. Division Bylaws state standing committees are populated by the Committee on Committees. It was suggested CoC pull from Graduate Chairs as a subset of a new committee when constituted in the future. DivCo recommended that 2011-12 subcommittees include members outside of the GRC so long as there is GRC representation. Other suggestions included; splitting GRC into two subcommittees that meet separately with the GRC Chair attending both meetings, include at least one Graduate Group Chair on GRC to improve communication between GRC and Graduate Groups.

### **Library Committee**

A proposal to create a Library Committee as part of the Division standing committees was presented to GRC on May 5, 2011. The GRC presented the proposal to DivCo to create a standing Senate Library and Information Committee (LIC), standard on most campuses, that represents the faculty on matters of library operation and policy. GRC members noted that UCM faculty currently have little or no formal lines of communication with the library, and that this has caused a misalignment between library holdings and policies, and faculty and student needs. GRC noted that the LIC committee could be small and meet only monthly, and that there is faculty in the Humanities ready and willing to serve. The idea of this being a subcommittee of GRC was considered, but not favored because faculty interested in LIC may not be inclined to serve on GRC.

DivCo recommended GRC create a subcommittee of GRC as the Bylaws state that GRC oversees library issues; constituting a standing committee is not currently possible due to lack of faculty. CoC would take the Library subcommittee into consideration when populating the GRC slate. GRC was also reminded that non-GRC members interested in improving library relations can be appointed to the subcommittee.

### **Graduate Student Representation**

In September, GRC approved the addition of UC Merced graduate student seats on the Institutional review Board (IRB) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

## **GRADUATE EDUCATION**

### **Graduate Emphasis Areas/Groups**

The proposals for Graduate Program leading to the Ph.D. in Cognitive Information Sciences, Quantitative and Systems Biology and Psychological Sciences were approved by CCGA. CCGA approved QSB with the contingency that the peer-reviewed publication as a requirement for awarding a degree is removed and replaced with an alternative measure. CCGA took a stand against this practice because, to some degree, it relinquishes the Universities degree-giving authority. CCGA also noted that allowing exceptions to such a requirement is also problematic, because it would be difficult to ensure uniformity and fairness across students. Acceptable alternatives include requiring one or more publication submissions, or publication as an optional requirement that can be substituted by one or more other requirements.

The systemwide Academic Senate made a formal recommendation to the President for the final approval of the graduate degrees. President Yudof endorsed CIS, QSB and Psychology in March. The programs went through the final WASC approval in March and April and were formally approved in July.

### **Organized Research Unit (ORU) and Centralized Research Unit (CRU) Proposals**

A proposal for the Spatial Analysis and Research Center (SpARC) CRU was presented to the GRC. The subcommittee formed for review of the proposal agreed it was well written and recommended approval from GRC. GRC approved the proposal in October 2010.

The Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI) submitted an ORU proposal in Spring 2010. GRC formed subcommittees for each, reviewed each proposal in conjunction with CAPRA, and sent a memo requesting revisions. HSRI responded to GRC and CAPRA requests and resubmitted a revised proposal in March 2011. The proposal included endorsements from all three School Deans and letters of support from HSRI members. Review of the revised proposal will continue in Fall 2011.

GRC was tasked with creating a framework for how the campus handles ORU and Indirect Costs. A committee was selected and comprised of the GRC Chair, GRC Vice Chair, VCR and EVC. A draft of a Review Process for Campus ORUs was presented to the GRC for comment. The GRC review process will continue in Fall 2011.

### **Graduate Student Funding**

EVC/Provost Alley committed \$500,000 annually to GRC for managing graduate student support from AY2009-2010 through AY2012-2013 with the agreement that funding could be carried over to the next fiscal year. In AY2010-2011, a total of \$488,008 was allocated to nine graduate groups for graduate student support and as summer fellowships for graduate students. \$40,553 was rolled over to the current academic year. In AY2010-2011 the GRC agreed to allocate \$105,500.00 to eleven graduate groups for recruiting, non-NRT GSR, purposes. The funds were distributed based on a ratio of primary faculty to graduate students in each group. An additional \$150,000 was allocated to the graduate groups for supporting current graduate students. The distribution was determined by several factors; number of recruiting faculty, number of applications, current NRT distribution, total number of faculty, out of state versus in state applications, international students, average graduate group size per faculty. Other factors considered: time to candidacy, percentage of admitted graduate students in previous years, and average acceptance.

The remaining funding was allocated to a competition for graduate students in the form of Summer Fellowships of up to \$7500 each which could be used for research stipends and other research related expenses or travel. Eighty-nine (89) proposals were received. Each proposal was assigned to one GRC member and one member of an ad-hoc committee comprised of a representative from each graduate group. The proposals were ranked from one (1) to ten (10) based on the call criteria.

AY2010-2011 was an exceptional year. It was discovered that the Graduate Division had unused USAP funding that needed to be distributed by the end of June. GRC determined a way to combine GRC and USAP funds to award a maximum number of students. The top fifty (50) students above the original GRC cut off line with a mean rank of 5.5 was given the maximum award of \$7500. All domestic students below the cut off line were sent a decline letter from GRC but told they were eligible for funding from the Graduate Division. Funding for domestic students under the cut off line was in the amount of \$7500, for a total of twenty-three (23) students. International students below the cut off line were sent a decline letter with no additional funding as USAP funds are restricted to domestic students. In total the GRC allocated \$232,500 of its funds toward Summer Fellowships leaving a roll over total of \$51,792 for AY2011-12. In total, the campus has invested \$932,455 in graduate programs over the past two years.

### **Course Request Forms (CRF)**

GRC reviewed and approved 28 courses. MEAM 260, MEAM 231, MEAM 251, MEAM 236, MEAM 254, MEAM 232, ES 237, ES 201, ES 201L, ES 236, ES 237, ES 227, MATH 223, QSB 298, POLI 200, POLI 210, POLI 211, POLI 220, POLI 230, POLI 250, EECS 284, EECS 285, EECS 207, BEST 219, BEST 224, BEST 211, , PHYS 151

Approval for conjoined courses: ES 234/ENVE 130.

Fifteen (15) new courses: Twelve (12) course modifications: One (1) conjoined course  
BEST 220 was declined approval. The committee was not in favor of giving course credit for videotaped lectures as they do not provide a level of interaction on par with on-site courses. Full opportunities for interactions between the instructor and students, and possibly among students as well, were viewed as critical for graduate education.

### **Requests from Graduate Division**

#### **Fellowships-**

For each of the following fellowships, a GRC subcommittee evaluated and ranked the nominees and forwarded their rankings to the Graduate Division for award selection.

Miguel Velez Fellowship- 3 awarded in Fall for AY2010-11, 3 awarded in Spring for AY2011-12

Fletcher Jones- 2 awarded in Fall for AY2010-11, 1 awarded in Spring for AY 2011-12

Eugene Cota-Robles- 6 were recommended for award in Spring for AY2011-12

Faculty Mentor Program- 3 were recommended for award in Spring for AY2011-12

President's Dissertation Year- 2 awarded in Spring for AY2011-12

Chancellor's Graduate Fellowships- There were 9 fellowships available. A total of 14 students were identified as potential recipients to allow the Graduate Division to extend offers if the initial recipients turned down the fellowship.

#### **Awards-**

Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award- A GRC subcommittee evaluated and ranked the nominations from each graduate group and forwarded their rankings to the Graduate Division for award selection. The Graduate Division requested GRC contribute to a cash award for each TA award. GRC agreed to a \$500 award and committed to provide half of the cash award with the other half provided by the School or Graduate Division. GRC provided a total of \$750 for the Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards.

## **FACULTY**

### **Faculty Research Grants**

The Academic Senate received funds from EVC/Provost Alley in the amount of \$120,000 to be disbursed to the faculty for the annual GRC research/travel/shared equipment grant competition and Senate Awards. GRC revised its Call for Proposals to include the review process. The Call was distributed to the faculty with a February 15, 2011 deadline for submission. Twenty-eight (28) proposals were evaluated by GRC; fourteen (14) from the School of Natural Sciences, eleven (11) from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, and three (3) from the School of Engineering. Each proposal was assigned two reviewers; both from the same School but not in the same research group. GRC extensively discussed the selection of reviewers and determined it would be mutually beneficial for the reviewers to be from the same School as the PI. This approach is different from previous years. The GRC funded twenty-two (22) proposals for a total of \$114,602. Ten (10) were distributed to the School of Natural Sciences faculty, ten (10) were distributed to faculty in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts and two (2) were distributed to faculty in the School of Engineering.

### **Senate Research Awards**

For the third year in UC Merced's Academic Senate history, faculty were recognized with Senate Awards. GRC had jurisdiction over the following awards:

- Distinction in Research

The Senate Award for Distinction in Research (for tenured faculty) is intended to encourage and recognize individuals for research and/or other creative activities that have had a major impact on the field, either through a sustained record of contributions or through a specific, highly influential contribution. Awarded to Will Shadish, Professor of Psychology

- Distinguished Early Career Research

The Senate Award for Distinguished Early Career Research (for non-tenured faculty) is intended to encourage and recognize individuals for research and/or other creative activities that have had a major impact on the field, either through a sustained record of contributions or through a specific, highly influential contribution. Awarded to Ming-Hsuan Yang, Assistant Professor in Computer Science

- Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award

The Senate Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award is intended to encourage and recognize individual excellence in teaching at the graduate level and mentorship of graduate students. Both of these are important functions of faculty at a research university. Awarded to Ignacio López-Calvo, Professor of Latin American Literature

GRC formed a review subcommittee for the three research award categories, evaluated the nominees, and selected the recipients. The Academic Senate announced all award recipients at the Meeting of the Division on April 14, 2011.

**Hellman Fellows Program**

The Hellman Foundation awarded UC Merced \$100k per year for five years with the possibility to make the funding permanent. The awards are open to support assistant professors in all fields of study at UC Merced who have served at least two years at the assistant professor rank as evidence of their promise of distinction.

Criterion for the award include: the quality of the research proposed is most important, awards are to be made without regard to the apparent timeliness or popularity of the field of study and without reference to ethnicity or gender; preference may be given to research not supported substantially by other sources and to faculty who have not previously received an award from the fund.

GRC was asked by the EVC to help develop the Call for proposals as well as create a review panel. GRC considered award amounts of different sizes (20K, 25K, 33K), and agreed with the EVC that a \$20k maximum was the best option to 1) support as many junior faculty as possible and 2) given the criterion of at least 1/3 of the awards for SSHA faculty (2 of 5 would be 40%).

GRC suggested that the review process be further specified and made explicit in the Call. GRC suggested that each proposal be reviewed by at least two (2) faculty members (to eventually include prior Hellman awardees), and rated on merit as well as need for bridge funding. In this case, "need" could be with respect to the individual, as well as the project and area of research. To better assess the former, the proposer could be asked to include internal and external fund balances at the time of submission, including future commitments. Ratings could be weighted equally and then proposals would be ranked accordingly. Given Senate workload, reviews would not include written feedback. The process proposed by the GRC mirrors the process for Faculty Research Grants and Summer Fellowships for graduate students.

GRC suggestions were sent to the EVC in April and a formal Call was sent to sixteen (16) eligible junior faculty. Twelve proposals were submitted, 75% of eligible faculty. A subcommittee of GRC members was constituted with one representative from each School. The proposals were ranked and recommendations were sent to the EVC. Awards were presented to three (3) faculty in SSHA and two (2) in SNS.

**DIVISION  
BUSINESS****Memos to DivCo**

In response to DivCo requests, GRC submitted memos to DivCo on the following issues: response to the proposed UC Merced Academic Calendars 2013-2016, establishment of a Graduate Course Auditing Policy, Funding Streams, GSA grievance letter, Academic Honesty Policy, and Hellman Award process.

**Requests from CRE**

The Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE) requested a review of the UCM Bylaws for minor edits. GRC did not identify any changes and approved the Bylaws as they stand.

**SYSTEM-  
WIDE  
BUSINESS****Systemwide Items Reviewed by GRC**

- Post Employee Benefits
- Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuition
- UCOP Funding Streams
- Systemwide Library Planning Task Force Report

**Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)**

GRC Chair Christopher Kello's reports on CCGA activities included the following:

- Budget
- Review of graduate group proposals
- Self-supporting programs and professional fees

- CCGA plans to protect graduate programs at risk for UC downsizing
- CCGA approval of the graduate program proposals for Cognitive and Information Sciences, Quantitative Systems Biology and Psychological Sciences pending minor revisions
- Re-benching and UCOP plans for Funding Streams
- Differential fees arguments pro and con

#### **University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP)**

UC Merced did not have representation on UCORP this year.

#### **University Committee on Computer Communications (UCCC)**

GRC representative Professor, Maurizio Forte reports on UCCC activities included the following:

- Pod casting and online instruction
- Supercomputing resources and resource sharing
- Wireless infrastructure
- Opti-puter: could be part of UC-wide available resources for a fee if the UC decides to create an infrastructure to allow sharing
- E-Textbooks
- Online instruction
- Private Security

GRC also benefited from consultation and reports throughout the year from VCR Traina and EVC/Provost Alley.

### **NEXT YEAR'S BUSINESS**

#### **Financial Obligations to Graduate Students**

GRC requested each graduate group identify their policy on financial obligations to graduate students. The policy was to include formal offers of TA and GSR support that extend over specified periods of time and the outline of a formalized process by which an obligation of support is terminated prior to the contract end date. This process had to specify the conditions that may be cause for early termination, and include review and voting by faculty committee members. No graduate groups had a formalized policy regarding early termination and requested that the Graduate Division and GRC create a UCM policy. VCR Traina will continue working on a policy to present to the GRC and graduate groups in Fall 2011.

#### **Health Sciences Research Institute**

Review Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI) revised Organized Research Unit (ORU) proposal

#### **Academic Honesty Policy**

GRC will join UGC as part of a subcommittee to review and rewrite the current UC Merced Academic Honesty Policy.

#### **ORU**

Approve CAPRA revisions to the ORU Proposal Review Process and send a detailed memo to DivCo.

Review the revised HSRI proposal.

Continue working on framework for how the campus handles ORU and Indirect Costs.

#### **EECS Bylaw 55 Unit**

In March 2011, GRC reviewed and commented on the draft Policies, Procedures and Bylaws for the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) graduate group. Concerns expressed revolved around the examination process and adjudication. GRC hopes to see a CCGA proposal from the group in the Fall 2011.

**Course Buy-Out Policy**

Vice Chair Shadish researched how course buy outs are handled on other UC campuses. Within the system, buyout policies are typically housed at the school level not at the university level. The amount paid for a buy out varies, however campuses usually funnel the money back in to the associated school as incentive to the deans to allow buy outs. The dean is allowed to spend buy out funds above and beyond the expense of an instructor. GRC agreed that it is important for the campus to set guidelines for course buy outs and will work on a draft to present to the EVC and Chancellor.

**Separate Graduate and Research Councils**

Continue discussions with Division Council to split the committee into two separate committees; Graduate Council and Research Council

**Library Subcommittee**

Establish new Library subcommittee with goal to become a standing Senate committee

**Respectfully submitted,**

Christopher Kello, Chair (SSHA), CCGA Representative

William Shadish, Vice Chair (SSHA)

David Kelley (NS)

Michael Spivey (SSHA)

Carolyn Frank (NS)

Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA)

Matt Meyer (NS)

Ariel Escobar (ENG)

Shawn Newsam (ENG)

Sholeh Quinn (SSHA)

***Ex-Officio***

Evan Heit, Divisional Council Chair (SSHA)

Anne Kelley, Divisional Council Vice Chair (NS)

Sam Traina, VCR/Dean of the Graduate Division (ENG)

***Student Representative***

Katie Amrine (NS)

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2010-2011**

**TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:**

**I. GENERAL PROCEDURES**

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

In academic year 2010-2011, the CRE conducted business via teleconference, e-mail and in person.

**II. FORMAL LEGISLATIVE RULINGS ISSUED**

None.

**III. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS AND REGULATIONS**

**UC Merced Bylaw Revisions 2009-2010-**

After extensive revisions and feedback through the course of the 2009-2010 Academic Year, the proposed revisions to the Bylaws were approved by a two-thirds majority of voting Senate members in May 2010. Following standard procedure, the revised Bylaws were electronically submitted to the University Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction (UCR&J) for approval. The Senate's request for Bylaw approval was not placed on the Fall R&J agenda therefore, the expected implementation date of January 1, 2011 was not met. All Senate appointments and standing Senate committees remained as constituted during AY 2010-2011, with the regular transition to new members occurring on the first day of classes, Fall 2010. Multiple-year committee appointments stood until terms are completed as stated in the current Bylaws. The new Bylaws were approved by UCR&J on March 3, 2011 and took effect March 15, 2011.

**UC Merced Bylaw Revisions 2011**

In 2010-11 CRE took on the task of cleaning up language and making some minor edits to the UCM Bylaws. Each committee was asked to review their sections and submit edits. The following substantive changes were made: the start date for Senate committee members was changed from the first day of instruction in the fall term to the first day of the fall semester; language was clarified giving GRC authority over approving graduate programs; DivCo was given authority over ORU approval; we added a statement that the COC can change the term of a member in order to even out the number of COC members elected each year (right now the elections are unbalanced with 5 members elected this year, 3 next); and we changed the lead time for the notice of election in the spring (from 30 days to 21), and the time required for voters to have the list of nominees before the election (from 14 days to 7). Suggested edits were approved by the Division Council in August. The next step is for the changes to be put before the faculty at the fall 2011 meeting of the Division.

**Regulations-**

In the Fall of 2010, CRE followed up on a request made in Spring 2010 and solicited each School's undergraduate policies to add to the UCM Regulations. The School of Natural Sciences, School of Engineering and School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts submitted their revised undergraduate policies. The School revisions were reviewed by CRE and sent to the Divisional Council for approval. After additional review, CRE rescinded its recommendation to adding that further review was needed. Currently one minor issue with the Regulations remains unresolved and therefore is on the agenda for 2011-12.

**School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts Bylaws and Executive Committee**

In response to a request from SSHA faculty to clarify who is allowed membership on the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA)'s Executive Committee, it was determined that the School's method of constituting its Executive Committee is inconsistent with systemwide bylaws. Chairs appointed by the Dean cannot serve on the Executive Committee; voting members of the Executive Committee must be elected by the faculty. SSHA's current Executive Committee is in essence a hybrid Executive Committee / Chairs Council. CRE issued a memo with DivCo endorsement stating that the SSHA Bylaws must be revised. CRE advised that SSHA faculty decide on the number and rank of faculty to elect to an Executive Committee and revise its Bylaws accordingly. CRE noted that there is nothing to prevent a Chairs Council and Executive Committee from meeting in tandem. The memo was sent to the Dean and Faculty Chair of SSHA.

**School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts Bylaw 55 Units**

The School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) voted by a two-thirds majority on June 16, 2010 to develop four (4) separate Bylaw 55 Units including: Cognitive and Information Sciences, Psychological Sciences, History and World Cultures, and Social Sciences and Management. The CRE discussed each proposal and submitted feedback for minimal modifications to each Unit. The groups revised and resubmitted their proposals, and on November 30, 2010, CRE sent a memo to Divisional Council stating that all four Bylaw Units had made the requested changes. The proposals were fully consistent with UC Merced and UC systemwide policies, and therefore CRE recommended approval. The Chancellor endorsed the formation of the four (4) Bylaw 55 Units on February 17, 2011.

**School of Natural Sciences Bylaw 55 Units**

In March, the School of Natural Sciences submitted proposals to create four (4) new Bylaw 55 units in Chemistry, Physics, Applied Mathematics, and Molecular Cell Biology. All remaining faculty would function as a separate unit under the current School of Natural Sciences Bylaws until the group opts to create a formal proposal or new unit. The Bylaw proposals were disseminated to the standing committees of the Academic Senate for review.

In May, CRE suggested minor edits for the Applied Math and Chemistry Bylaw Unit proposals for items not in accordance with UC policy. Faculty revised the proposals and resubmitted them to the Divisional Council in May.

CRE requested a major revision to the Physics proposal as it did not follow the guidelines described in UC Merced's Policy on the Establishment or Revision of Academic Units. Specifically, the document must include Unit bylaws, an organizational chart, and a discussion of the Unit's administrative structure. The revised proposal had to be voted on by the Unit faculty before resubmitting to Executive Committee members and the Dean.



The Molecular Cell Biology Unit was asked to revise their proposal in April. CRE was concerned that the proposal did not lay out a plan for how the biologists in two separate Bylaw Units would manage the biology major. The proposal suggested that one group be given control over the upper division classes in the major, however, all faculty involved in delivering the biology major must be allowed to vote on all matters concerning the major. Per UC Bylaw 55: “No department shall be organized in a way that would deny to any of its non-emeritae/i faculty who are voting members of the Academic Senate, as specified in Standing Order 105.1(a), the right to vote on substantial departmental questions...” Thus, control over the major cannot be divided with one group controlling upper division courses and the other lower division, or one group controlling certain tracks within the major and the other controlling other tracks. The Unit was charged with developing an agreement regarding management and delivery of the major, and required to remove any references to dividing control of particular parts of the Biology major within the proposal. CRE requested that the group submit a document along with their revised proposal providing details on how the undergraduate Biology major would be managed.

The Molecular Cell Biology faculty submitted a revised proposal in June. Although they had made most of the requested changes, the biology faculty failed to approve the proposed plan for administering the major (with a vote of 9 against, 8 for). While the faculty’s failure to come to an agreement does not violate a specific UC policy or bylaw, CRE still viewed it as cause for concern and therefore recommended that the School of Natural Sciences hold authority over governing the Biology major until the involved faculty have reached an agreement. CRE sent this suggestion back to the School along with requests for two minor changes that were previously requested but unchanged. The SNS Dean’s Office agreed that the School would oversee the Molecular Cell Biology major, and a final proposal was submitted in July.

In June, the Divisional Council received the revised Physics Bylaw 55 Unit proposal. The proposal still did not include all required information and was not well organized, therefore CRE requested additional specific revisions from the School. Another faculty vote was required before resubmitting the Physics proposal to the Senate. Physics faculty submitted a final proposal in late June.

CRE reviewed the final revisions for Applied Mathematics, Chemistry, Molecular Cell Biology and Physics and in August recommended approval from Divisional Council. The Council reviewed and approved the final versions of the four (4) SNS Bylaw 55 Unit proposals at the August 9 meeting.

#### **IV. OTHER BUSINESS**

##### **A. GRC request to divide into two separate councils**

In early March 2011, the GRC requested to split into two separate committees; Graduate Council and Research Council where the current GRC would populate the Research Council and the Graduate Council would be comprised of the School Graduate Chairs. The CRE did not see any issues with the formation of a separate Graduate Council and Research Council. However, the Committee did find that the suggestion to populate the committee with Graduate Chairs was counter to UCM Bylaws and inconsistent with practice across the system, because Graduate Chairs are appointed by unit Chairs rather than the Committee on Committees. The CRE felt strongly that the CoC should populate Senate committees. It was noted that splitting GRC would need to be approved by DivCo and would require changes to the Bylaws, which in turn would need approval by the faculty with a two-thirds majority vote.

B. Merritt Writing Program Transfer from School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts to College One

The Writing Program requested the General Education courses; Writing 01, 10 and Core One, be transferred to College One. The Writing Minor would stay housed under SSHA. CRE determined this to be an administrative request that should be reviewed by SSHA faculty before being addressed by the Senate. CRE recommended the Writing Program refer to the current policy for establishing/disestablishing academic degree programs. Senate Chair Heit wrote a memorandum to Writing Program director Robert Ochsner stating that the proposal request mainly encompassed administrative issues, while having some academic implications. Although Merced does not have an exact written policy to address this request, the situation arguably falls within the scope of the policy on Establishment of Academic Programs (which includes transfer of programs). Under this policy, there must be written consultation with affected faculty and Dean(s) before it is considered by the Academic Senate. In addition, there should be a written recommendation from the Dean(s) involved.

In response, Merritt Writing Program Director Robert Ochsner stated that he would submit a proposal to transfer WRI 1, 10 and Core One after the Writing Program's academic program review in Spring 2011. Director Ochsner noted the proposed transfer might also need to undergo Substantive Change review by WASC. If the external review is required, and if the proposed change is approved internally as well as externally, the change would probably not be implemented until Academic Year 2012-13.

C. General Education and College One

DivCo requested UGC create a standing committee on General Education, specifically to review Core 100 in its current structure. The Writing Program teaches a revised version of Core 100 which does not include many of the original course principals. UGC created a subcommittee to explore ways to fulfill the intention of the original Core 100 course and formally voted to remove the course as a requirement for upper division General Education beginning with the 2009 catalog year. The long term issue is the role of College One in the delivery of General Education; College One needs to be established or a different structure for General Education delivery needs to be put in place. CRE discussed establishing procedures for evaluating College One, recognizing that it cannot perform self-governance. The Committee decided to postpone any further action until UGC finishes its review.

D. Academic Degree Program Policy

As a result of discussion by Divisional Council in AY2009-2010, CRE revised the flowchart and procedure for establishing or revising Academic Degree Programs. The UCM Divisional Council continued discussions with the Administration regarding revisions throughout the summer, 2010. CRE edited content to ensure consistency and revised the flowchart. The revised policy was presented to the Division Council and sent to the Administration for inclusion in the UCM Policy and Procedure Manual.

E. Campus Naming Policy

The CRE reviewed the Draft Policy on Naming University Properties, Academic and Non-Academic Programs, and Facilities. CRE found the proposal was consistent with UC system policy (specifically the December 2002 Policy on Naming), but the proposed UCM additions to the systemwide policy had implications for Senate involvement.

Because the Standing Orders of the Regents assign authority over academic programs to the Senate faculty, the CRE recommended that the Senate and appropriate Senate subcommittees be given the opportunity to review proposals for naming academic programs. Second, the precedent for naming at UC Merced had thus far involved Senate consultation that was not outlined in the draft proposal. Thus, CRE suggested point 3.b.i. be further modified to explicitly mention Senate involvement beyond that of the Senate Chair. In April, the Campus Physical Planning Committee agreed to change their revised naming policy to exclude the naming of academic programs and to include further Senate consultation.

F. Technical Revisions to the APM.

UCOP circulated a systemwide review for proposed technical revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual, all of which were suggested to correct improper references or typographical errors, or to ensure uniformity between existing policies. CRE opined on the request and found no issues.

G. School Of Engineering Academic Personnel Chair Change

The School Of Engineering requested to change the conduct for their Academic Personnel Committee to streamline its process. The proposed changes were two-fold:

1) Every faculty member is required to update his/her digital measures (DM) database each year and will meet with the Dean to discuss his/her performance during the previous year.

2) When deemed appropriate by the Dean and in concurrence with the Candidate, the Dean will ask the APC to prepare a merit case analysis based on DM material and the annual Dean's evaluations, and will be posted on the web for comments from eligible faculty. The finalized case analysis plus one prepared by the Dean would then be submitted to CAP. In case of disagreement between faculty member and Dean, the faculty member would retain the right to carry his/her case to the APC, which will then form an evaluation committee to prepare the case analysis, which would then be voted on by eligible faculty.

The Committee on Rules and Elections reviewed the changes proposed by the School of Engineering regarding APC Conduct, and determined that the proposed changes are in opposition to systemwide policy. Bylaw 55 of the Academic Senate Bylaws assigns all personnel matters to the faculty in the Unit. Therefore, it would be a violation of UC policy to have the Dean perform annual faculty evaluations and to have the Dean initiate merit reviews. The APM specifically assigns initiation of merit reviews to the Unit Chairs.

## V. ELECTIONS

The call for nominations for five (5) positions on the Committee on Committees and one (1) At-large member of the Divisional Council was distributed to the Senate membership on March 28, 2011. All positions for both committees were for two (2) year terms. Nominating petitions required five (5) signatures including the signature of the candidate showing willingness to serve and were due to the Senate office on April 11, 2011. An electronic election ballot was created on UCM CROPS and sent to all Senate members on April 15. The last day of the election was April 29. The ballot included three (3) nominees for CoC and no nominees for the DivCo At-Large vacancy. The electorate was asked to submit write-in candidates for both committees. All three CoC candidates were voted into office. Once write-in nominees were confirmed as willing to serve, an electronic ballot was created for a Special Election. Ballots were open for voting from May 5 through May 13, 2011. Both committees had two write-in candidates. Both candidates for

CoC were elected. After the Special Election ballot was distributed, the remaining DivCo At-Large member resigned due to a sabbatical in AY2011-12. Therefore, rather than electing just one at large member of DivCo, the two (2) candidates on the ballot were elected. The candidate receiving the most votes will hold the two (2) year term and the other candidate will hold a one (1) year term to replace the resigned DivCo member.

#### **VI. NEXT YEAR'S BUSINESS**

- A. Add revised School Regulations to the UC Merced Regulations.
- B. Add Multiple Major Policy to the UC Merced Regulations.
- C. Present revised UCM Bylaws at the December Meeting of Division for faculty vote.
- D. Anticipate formal request for the Merritt Writing Program transfer to College One - through the Establishment of Academic Unit process.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nella Van Dyke, Chair (SSHA)  
Ruth Mostern, Vice Chair (SSHA)  
Arnold Kim (NS)  
Jean Olson (UC San Francisco)  
Peter Berck (UC Berkeley)

***Ex-Officio:***

Evan Heit, Divisional Chair (SSHA)  
Anne Kelley Divisional Vice Chair (NS)

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)  
ANNUAL REPORT  
2010-2011**

**To The Merced Division of the Academic Senate:**

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its standing subcommittees held a total of 15 regularly scheduled 90-minutes in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.4.B](#). Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate subcommittee(s), followed by full Council review. The issues that UGC considered this year are described briefly below.

**Undergraduate Council Organization**

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

- Courses/Undergraduate Academic Programs  
*Professors Jay Sharping, Elliott Campbell and Linda-Anne Rebhun*
- Admissions/Financial Aid  
*UGC Chair Susan Amussen, Professors Stefano Carpin and Wei-Chun Chin*
- General Education  
*Professors Jack Vevea, Benoit Dayrat and external members Professors Holley Moyes, Henry Forman and Virginia Adan-Lifante*
- Program Review  
*Professor Gregg Camfield (Chair), Professors Peter Vanderschraaf, Sholeh Quinn and Roland Winston*

In addition, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed for the Regents Scholarships and the Undergraduate Distinguished Teaching Award recipients.

**Academic Program Reviews**

This academic year UGC accepted the Applied Mathematics Program Review Report. The Undergraduate Program Review guidelines were accepted for AY2010-2011. UGC revised the existing guidelines in the purpose of clarity and to customize the guidelines for the campus. In cooperation with the Program Review Committee, UGC participated in the academic program reviews of the following programs:

- Environmental Engineering
- Merritt Writing Program
- Physics

The Economics program requested, and was granted, an extension.

**Admissions**

UGC received regular reports from Vice Chancellor Student Affairs Jane Lawrence. Items discussed included admissions and enrollment data, events, recruiting, university extension,

scholarships. The UGC Admissions subcommittee collaborated with the UCM Office of Admissions to set policies to make UC Merced a selective campus. Priorities of this subcommittee changed as the admissions process became more selective and with the impact of the referral pool.

### **Catalog**

Six UGC members reviewed the Schools sections of the Catalog. The revised Catalog was approved in April 2011.

### **Courses**

According to the UCM Bylaws, UGC is charged on behalf of the Division to review and approve all new undergraduate courses and modifications to existing undergraduate courses, including withdrawal, conduct, credit valuation, description, and classification of existing courses. The UGC analyst transmitted CRFs to UGC via the web-based system. UGC reviewed and approved over 100 courses, changes to existing courses and discontinuations of courses. UGC also asked the Schools to include program learning outcomes and objectives for all CRFs (new and revised).

### **General Education (Core 100)**

In February 2010, the General Education subcommittee was asked to seek a resolution for the upper division General Education requirement (Core 100). Core 100 courses have not been taught for several years. In October, the subcommittee developed a potential solution and presented it to the School Curriculum Committees. After compiling all the feedback, the subcommittee concluded the following: 1) Faculty were predominantly in favor of removing Core 100 from the campus requirement for graduation; 2) Faculty in each School valued different aspects of the Core 100 experience; if a similar requirement were maintained, each School must have a certain degree of independence to determine which courses can be given a Core 100 stamp based on the School's goals for the requirement.

A report was written by the subcommittee to UGC with recommendations based on the feedback.

In April 2011, UGC recommended the removal of the Core 100 requirement (elimination retroactive to the 2009 Catalog). There will no longer be an upper division General Education requirement for anyone admitted for Fall 2009 and beyond. The Schools were encouraged to revisit their majors and consider the impact of eliminating the requirement will have on the degree requirements. Schools have been asked not to designate the credits for Core 100 for any other purpose until the consultation on upper division General Education next year is complete.

During AY 2011-2012, UGC, its General Education subcommittee and the VPUE will use College One to orchestrate a campus wide discussion of what upper division General Education should be.

### Policies and Procedures Approved/Revised by UGC

- **Policy for Approving New Minors** - Revised on September 8, 2010 to include “All proposals for minors should include program learning outcomes and an assessment plan”.
- **Undergraduate Academic Program Review Policy** – Revised on September 8, 2010 and further amended on March 2, 2011. The initial revision sought to simplify and clarify the Program Review process; the second added a provision for delay in cases when a program review has been formally initiated but a delay would be called for.
- **Course Auditing Policy** – Approved on October 6, 2010
- **Policy on Animal Subjects** – Approved on November 3, 2010
- **Policies and Procedures for Approval of New and Revised Undergraduate Courses** – Revised on January 19, 2011 to require that any revised course include course learning outcomes.

### Requests from the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE)

- **Review of the UGC Bylaws** – UGC comments sent to CRE on April 25, 2011
- **Revised UCM Regulations (April 27)** - CRE asked UGC to examine the revised UCM Regulations, specifically the following issues:
  - The different schools require different numbers of General Education credits (SSHA 48, SNS 46)
  - Enrollment limits for students on academic probation – SNS and SSHA limit students to 16 units if they are on probation.

UGC expressed no concern with the School Regulations being inconsistent with the Merced Regulations and noted that it was in the best interest of students to let the Schools have latitude with regard to General Education. With regard to the subject of SSHA’s policy on coursework from other institutions, UGC deferred the matter until CRE receives a response from the School.

### Requests from the Division Council (DivCo)

- **Proposed 2011-2013 Academic Calendar** - UGC reviewed the proposed calendars and provided comments to DivCo on October 5, 2010.
- **Proposed 2013-2016 Academic Calendars** – UGC provided comments in December 2010.
- **SSHA Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals** – UGC voted in favor of establishing the Cognitive and Information Sciences, Humanities and World Culture, Psychological Sciences and the Social Sciences and Management Bylaw 55 Unit proposals.
- **Review of the WASC EER Report** – Comments sent to DivCo in September 2010.
- **New Classroom Scheduling Guidelines** – UGC expressed overall concern that given the current classroom capacity, classroom scheduling will become increasingly difficult over the next few years, to the point that another solution may have to be reached.
- **SNS Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals** – In April 2011, UGC reviewed proposals for the following:
  - Applied Mathematics
  - Chemistry and Chemical Biology

- Molecular Cell Biology
- Physics

UGC was mainly concerned about the need to develop and implement adequate procedures to manage the Biology major and emphasized that all faculty associated with a major are responsible for the management and delivery of the major.

- **Proposal to Split GRC into separate Graduate and Research Councils** – UGC voted in favor of the proposal on March 30, 2011.
- **Award for Teaching by Lecturers** – UGC developed criteria for Teaching Award for Lecturers as part of the annual Senate Awards. DivCo transmitted the approved product to the EVC on May 20, 2011.

### **Requests from the Schools**

#### *School of Engineering*

- Core 100 Course Substitution – Environmental Science and Policy and Writing for Engineering were proposed as substitutions for Core 100 in the spring. Proposed substitutions were approved by UGC (10/20/10) through the end of academic year 2010-2011.
- Transfer Admissions Policy – Approved on February 16, 2011.

#### *School of Natural Sciences*

- Revised Chemical Sciences B.S. Program. SNS proposed the removal of the requirement for research, and the substitution of two additional laboratory sections. The change was due to the shortage of faculty and lab space. Revisions approved on November 17, 2010, effective Fall 2011.
- Revised SSHA Lower Division General Education Requirement. SNS requested a revision to the SSHA Lower Division General Education Requirement such that students are not required to take a lab course to satisfy their NS requirement, to reduce the pressure on the NS lab courses. Approved on November 3, 2010.
- Proposed Changes to the Applied Mathematics Major Coursework Requirements. Approved on November 17, 2010, effective Fall 2011.
- Revised Admissions Process for Transfer Students – Approved March 30, 2011.

#### *School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts*

- Proposed Changes in the SSHA General Education pattern to remove the science with a lab requirement (effective Fall 2011).
- SSHA request to use ANTH/WRI 141 as a Core 100 substitute. Approved on May 11, 2011.
- Transfer Admission Policy – Approved on May 11, 2011 and effective Fall 2012.

### **Senate Awards**

The Senate office received nominations for the *Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award*. A UGC ad-hoc subcommittee with balanced representation from different academic areas reviewed the nominations and made recommendations to the Senate office.

Recipient of the Award was made during the April 14 Meeting of Merced Division.



### **Systemwide Review Items**

UGC reviewed and provided comments on the following system wide senate items:

- Proposal to Rename Fees as Tuitions
- Report of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force – Memo sent to DivCo on October 22, 2010
- Academic Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University – Memo sent to DivCo on November 3, 2010
- Funding Streams Proposals – Memo sent to DivCo on February 4, 2011

### **UGC Guests**

1. Diana Ralls, Director of Financial Aid and Scholarships attended the November 17, 2010 UGC meeting to solicit guidance on choosing awardees of the Regents Scholarships and to request comments on the scoring sheets (November 17, 2010).
2. Linda Zubke, Director of SOE Student Services, to discuss the SOE transfer admissions process for transfer students (February 16, 2011).
3. Interim NS Dean Mike Colvin and NS Academic Coordinator Masa Watanabe to present data about the success of the current SNS transfer students and describe how the proposed transfer student policy would affect this group of students (March 30, 2011).

### **Systemwide Representation**

BOARS: Professor Susan Amussen (SSHA)

UCEP: Professor Gregg Camfield (SSHA)

UCIE: Professor Cristian Ricci\* (SSHA)

UCOPE: Professor Virginia Adan-Lifante\* (SSHA)

*\*Liaison*

Regular reports on the activities of BOARS and UCEP were provided at the UGC meetings.

Respectfully Submitted:

#### ***UCM Faculty***

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA) –Admissions Subcommittee

Gregg Camfield, Vice chair (SSHA) –Program Review subcommittee

Stefano Carpin, (ENG) – Admissions Subcommittee

Elliott Campbell (ENG) – CRFs/Undergraduate Academic Programs subcommittee

Wei-Chun Chin (ENG) – Admissions subcommittee

Benoit Dayrat (NS) – GenEd subcommittee

Linda-Anne Rebhun (SSHA) – CRFs/Undergraduate Academic Programs subcommittee

Jay Sharping (NS) – CRFs/Undergraduate Academic Programs subcommittee

Peter Vanderschraaf (SSHA) – Program Review subcommittee

#### ***Ex officio, Non-voting members***

Evan Heit, Divisional Council Chair (SSHA)

Anne Kelley, Division Council Vice chair (SNS)  
Jane Lawrence, Vice Chancellor Student Affairs  
Jack Vevea, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

***Student Representative***

William Hamilton

***Staff***

Fatima Paul

## **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UC MERCED BYLAWS:**

### **Bylaws I.III.1.A, I.III.2.A, I.III.3.A, I.IV.2.E, II.I.2.A, II.III.2.B, and II.III.3.A.2**

The first day of Senate service for incoming members was moved from the first day of instruction to the first day of the semester.

**Rationale:** This will align the Academic Senate's year with the campus' instructional academic year.

### **Bylaws I.IV.3.D and II.IV.3.B.3**

Statements were removed that granted the Division Council authority to make recommendations to relevant officers and committees regarding the establishment or disestablishment of academic programs. In this regard, the UGC has final authority over undergraduate programs and the GRC has final authority over graduate programs.

**Rationale:** The change aligns the academic authorities of the UGC and the GRC, providing additional clarity and uniformity in the Bylaws.

### **Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14**

Clarification was made on which body, the Division Council or the GRC, has final approval on the establishment of ORUs.

**Rationale:** The existing text assigns final approval to both the Division Council and the GRC. The proposed change gives final authority to the Division Council, as this option allows more flexibility in the ORU review process. The Division Council can always defer its decision to the GRC or to an ad hoc committee.

### **Bylaw II.III.3.A.5**

A normal term on the CoC is two years. Membership staggers, so that half of the committee's members are appointed one year and the second half are appointed the following year. A statement was added to the Bylaws, so that if the number of vacancies becomes unbalanced (e.g., five members due to be elected one year and three the next), the committee could reduce one member's term by one year.

**Rationale:** This improves continuity and ensures that annual elections are more equitable.

### **Bylaws II.III.3.A.6, II.III.3.C.1, and II.III.3.C.2**

The timeframe between the distribution of the ballot and the final day to vote decreased from 14 days to 7 days, and the lead time for the notice of election in the spring decreased from 30 days to 21 days.

**Rationale:** The shortened timeframe increases the process' efficiency while maintaining its integrity.