

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



## DIVISION MEETING OF THE MERCED ACADEMIC SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 12, 2012

2:00-3:30 p.m.

Chancellor's Conference Room

232 Kolligian Library

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

- I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
  - A. Division Chair Susan Amussen
  - B. Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley
  - C. Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson (will participate by phone)
  
- II. CONSENT CALENDAR pp. 5
  - A. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the December 1, 2011 Meeting
  
- III. APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED UC MERCED REGULATIONS REVISION pp. 24

PART I.55.B

[The Multiple Major Policy](#) was approved by UGC in Fall 2010, as a result CRE is proposing the addition of the Multiple Major Policy to the UC Merced Regulations in section 55 "Normal Progress to Degree".
  
- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS pp. 35
  - A. Memorial to the Regents
  - B. Shared Governance in the Schools
  
- V. SENATE AWARDS
  
- VI. CHAIR, VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE DIVISION FOR 2012-2013
  
- VII. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
  - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Chair Nella Van Dyke (oral)
  - Committee on Academic Personnel, Chair Jan Wallander (oral)
  - Committee on Committees, Chair Jeff Yoshimi (oral)
  - Faculty Welfare, Chair Sean Malloy (oral)
  - Graduate and Research Council, Chair Will Shadish (oral)
  - Undergraduate Council, Chair Gregg Camfield (oral)
  - Committee on Rules and Elections, Chair Rick Dale (oral)

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (NONE)

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (NONE)

X. 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)  
Jeff Yoshimi, CoC Chair (SSHA)  
Mike Colvin, CAP Vice Chair (SNS)  
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)  
Gary Jacobson (UC San Diego)  
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, Interim  
VP Undergraduate Education  
Jane Lawrence, VC for Student Affairs  
*Liaisons:* Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA), UCOPE  
Cristian Ricci (SSHA), UCIE  
Michael Beman (SNS), BOARS

### 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)  
Ignacio López-Calvo (SSHA)  
Sayantani Ghosh (SNS)  
Roummel Marcia (SNS)  
*Ex Officio:* Sam Traina, VC for Research,  
Dean of the 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  
DECEMBER 1, 2011  
MINUTES OF MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, December 1, 2011 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Susan Amussen presiding. Chair Amussen welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

**II. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

*Senate Chair Susan Amussen*

The newly appointed Secretary/Parliamentarian, Rick Dale was unable to attend the meeting today. Vice Chair of the Division and former Secretary/Parliamentarian Peggy O'Day will act as the parliamentarian provided there are no objections. Hearing no objections, Vice Chair Peggy O'Day will preside as the Secretary/Parliamentarian for today's Meeting of the Division.

Welcome to the Meeting of the Division. This year the Division is interested in how the campus is growing as a research university, in particular growing the graduate programs and the development of planning processes that fit all of the pieces together. The Division is also working on the ongoing issue of encouraging Senate service.

I have the great pleasure of introducing Robert Anderson, who is the systemwide Senate Chair.

*Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson*

I am delighted to be here at Merced. This is my second visit, and I am very excited to see what is going on and glad to see that the signs are up for the new Science and Engineering Building. I think it is very exciting to see a university develop from scratch, and Merced has many things going for it. The portion of Merced students that are first generation is exciting. I always get goose bumps from seeing first generation families at UC Berkeley's graduation. Merced has many more of these students and Pell Grant recipients, a very diverse and energized student body. Merced has a faculty that is quite young, and though we have talked about the difficulties that brings for running the Senate, it is a huge advantage for the campus, even if it means faculty are pressed into Senate service early.

The last three weeks have been difficult for the University of California. As you know, we have been getting national attention in a way that we don't really like to get attention. But it is a period when the Senate plays one of its most essential roles, which is to try to protect the institution. The individual faculty, faculty associations

and individual departments will make statements in response to the Police incidents at UC Berkeley and UC Davis which is understandable in the sense that what we've seen on the videos was quite outrageous and upsetting to the vast majority of faculty across campuses. But on the other hand, there could be a rush to judgment which is inappropriate. The Senate acts to protect the institution, to serve as the basis for keeping the faculty together so that even if they have somewhat different viewpoints on the particular circumstance, they can feel there is a process that will proceed in a judicious and fair way. I think that the Division Chairs at UC Davis and UC Berkeley have done an outstanding job. There was a meeting earlier this week at UC Berkeley which adopted four motions that were quite critical of the Chancellor and other senior Administrators. The motions did not proceed to the point of expressing "no confidence" and were adopted by approximately 90% of the vote in a meeting of approximately four hundred people. There was a clear expression of opinion that I think does reflect the general feeling of faculty at UC Berkeley. I think the process by which the motions were arrived at was fair. People knew what was on the table and chose to go to the meeting and they took an action.

At UC Davis, I do not think we know nearly enough to be able to reach any conclusions. The Academic Senate has been acting as a balancing and restraining force but is also pushing to determine what actually happened. That process is proceeding very well. I believe that by the end of January we will know what happened at Davis and then we will be able to assess the adequate consequences. At this point, I am not sure what will happen in terms of going forward with the two Chancellors. I do think the process is evolving the way it should and that despite the unpleasant and difficult circumstances and frankly harmful circumstances to the University, that the Senate will play a role in achieving the best outcome. In a crisis like this the role of the Division Chair is absolutely critical and both UC Berkeley and UC Davis are lucky to have particularly good Division Chairs. I hope that Merced doesn't have an incident this year, but if it does it is also extremely well equipped to handle it. The Senate tries to be there in the good times to help things develop and grow and prosper but also needs to be there during difficult times to protect the institution. I think the Senate has done a good job this year.

***Systemwide Academic Senate Vice Chair Robert Powell***

This is my first visit here and I am very impressed and happy to be here. I have to say, I really didn't know quite what to expect. I have had many friends over the years that have served on committees related to starting up the campus, and they have told me some wonderful things. They have always been really happy when they have worked with UC Merced, and I can see why. I am very pleased to be here and am really enjoying the day. Thank you very much.

*Chancellor Dorothy Leland*

First I want to join Robert and Robert in really congratulating the faculty who have taken time out of their incredibly busy schedules to be a part of the governance process at this university. It is incredibly important. I think it is one of the strongest faculty governance systems around. It takes members of the faculty who care and give up their time to really make it work. I want to thank you and congratulate you.

Announcements

As you know, this year we have added the Chair of the Division Council to the Chancellor's Cabinet. I can say it has improved the communication between the Division Council and the Cabinet. I think it is working out well. I am grateful for the Chair's participation and for the new channels of communication that have opened up.

The Provost/EVC search is underway. The ads are now out in the national media. We expect to have a robust pool of applicants in January. I am making a plea for all of you to think of the best candidates that you know and nominate them on the search committee home page. All you have to do is state "I hereby nominate this person, here is their contact information." The consultants will do the background work on each candidate. Of course, if you would like to write a detailed letter for your nomination, you are also welcome to do so. I encourage you to submit nominations and to ask your colleagues to submit nominations for this very critical search.

Budget

The spending plan for the next fiscal year was approved by the Board of Regents at its last meeting. That plan is one of the initial steps in the budget process in the state of California. The plan doesn't state what it will spend but what it hopes to spend in the next fiscal year. It is a way of putting on the table what the University of California needs. The spending plan is for a total of \$2.7 billion which is up from the current base of \$2.3 billion. It is still \$500 million short of where the budget base was four years ago. Although it might seem that the University of California is asking for a significant budget increase, in fact if we were to get all the funding requested, we would still be below where we were four years ago. The plan includes funding for modest enrollment growth but more importantly the push during this legislative session will be to convince the State to fulfill its part of the pension plan funding obligations. The State fulfills its obligation for the California State University system and the Community College system but it has not fulfilled its obligation to the University of California for a number of years. As every UC campus makes budget projections for the next ten years, we see an increasingly large percentage going toward the pension plans. It would be quite a victory if the University could convince the State to step up and treat us the same way it does California State University and the Community Colleges.

There continues to be serious negotiation with the Governor and the Department of Finance in trying to achieve a multi-year funding plan for the University of California. If the State lives up to its obligations under that plan, the University of California would live up to certain promises about the level at which tuition would be raised. The University doesn't know what will happen to this plan. Clearly its viability will require some kind of tax increase. If the University does reach an agreement with the Governor, the Department of Finance and political leadership and there is a move for a tax increase to help bring new revenue to the California budget, then it will be a very important time for faculty across the system to help lobby for the tax increase. The dollar amount associated with the spending plan falls woefully short of what the State will have available to spend for the University of California without some significant new sources of revenue for California. As you have no doubt seen, there is no appetite on anybody's part for continued massive tuition increases to our students. We will keep you informed as new developments occur.

Re-benching is partially an exercise in what the University would do if it received additional funding from the state of California and how those dollars are allocated to the campuses. There are some huge historically created inequities among the campuses. I am withholding judgment on the plan until we receive modeling and am able to look at the plan's impact. The most recent plan that was presented is a strategy set in an eight to ten year period and will take care of some of the inequities by not depending on new funding from the state of California but by increasing the tax to the campuses. As soon as I have more details on the plan, I will share it with Chair Amussen as I've shared information in the past. If you would like to advise me on reactions to that plan, I will be glad to listen to your advice.

#### Capital Space Development

The bad news is that the \$40 million building that was in the top three funding priorities for the University of California in the upcoming legislative session may not be funded. The Governor is choosing to only recommend very few capital projects that are perceived as continuation projects. Do not give up hope yet, but it is going to be a fight. The campus has been on a rapid growth trajectory and we are flat out of space. The most critical factor to the future growth and development of this campus is resolving the space challenge.

In the Spring semester, I am bringing in a group called Urban Land Institute. It is a non-profit group that has some of the best minds in campus and real estate development across the country. They are going to take a fresh new look at our campus master plan. I have asked them to think outside of the box in ways that we probably need to start addressing now. For example, it has always been the thought that our campus will all be on land that we own, the land with the fairy shrimp. It



will cost millions of dollars to expand the required infrastructure and the campus can't get funding. It may be the case that we need to think more aggressively about a distributed presence. If that is the case, which of our functions might we place in downtown Merced and create synergies that would help the economic redevelopment of the downtown area? What are we going to do with Castle? Should we make a long-term investment in Castle? The Urban Land Institute will consider these questions and explore alternative ways of financing capital development and a series of other things from a totally fresh perspective.

I have been working with Nathan Brostrom, UC Office of the President Executive Vice President. I have asked him to help me identify a wizard who knows creative ways to finance capital development. This person would work for the campus at 40%-60% of their time for the next couple of years. This is expertise that we do not have on this campus. We really need some of the most creative minds out there to help us. You hear about public/private partnerships and wonder why this campus cannot do this. These public/private partnerships are easy in circumstances where you have a revenue stream. This typically works by leasing campus land to a group that builds the building who in turn leases it back to the campus. The payment on the lease pays the debt on the construction of the building. When the debt is paid off, the building reverts back to the campus. However, it does require a revenue stream to pay the debt. So it is an easy model to use if you are building a food services facility, student union or residence halls. It is not an easy model if you are building an academic or research building because the campus cannot afford to use operating funds to pay down the debt. The campus will need to look at other ways of packaging these deals and taking maximum availability of tax credits and other options that are open to us. This is kind of "invisible" work, but I am working on this because I realize the campus was at a breaking point when I arrived. I know that it is affecting your decisions even about what hires to move forward with because you are always asking the question, how can we recruit for that position, we don't have space. We don't have lab space, and we don't have space needed to successfully recruit in that particular area. And that is not the way to build a world class campus of the University of California.

*Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Keith Alley*

Budget

When the state budget was passed this year, there was a metric put into place in terms of what the state budget would be and any additional cuts that may impact the University of California. It currently looks like the state budget is in the neighborhood of \$3 billion in the red. Clearly, the trigger is going to be pulled on the additional \$100 million cut to the University of California. My understanding is that at least on a one time basis, the Office of the President will pull \$100 million out of its reserves to pay for the lack of funding.

Meeting of the UC Merced Division  
 December 1, 2011

In terms of capital development, as the Chancellor mentioned, the Governor is pushing back against any additional lease revenue bonds. Evidently, the Office of the President is making some headway with the Department of Finance about the possibility of putting a General Obligation (GO) bond on the ballot in November 2012. That is clearly the way the campus will need to fund its next set of buildings and infrastructure because the lease revenue option doesn't pay for any of the infrastructure work.

The projections for next year are equally startling for the state budget. The curve projection is in the neighborhood of a \$10 billion hole next year. The total would be a \$13 billion gap. There is a will on the Governor's part and maybe on the Democratic side of the Senate and Assembly to get a tax bill on the November 2012 ballot. However, there is some potential that the State won't even be able to meet the full \$13 billion debt.

Chancellor Leland stated that the Office of the President seems to be optimistic with the negotiations with the Governor. The level would partially depend on where the Governor stands on the amount of tuition increases that he would sanction in the deal.

Campus Applications Fall 2011 versus Fall 2010

A total of over 160k applications were submitted to the University of California this Fall for AY 2012-2013.

<u>University-wide</u>	<u>UC Merced</u>
Applications:	
Increased 13.1%	Increased 9.1%
(University-wide figures include a 59% increase in non-resident undergraduates)	
First year California residents	
Increased 9.8%	Increased 9.1%
California Transfer Students	
Increased 4.5%	
Non-Resident Transfer Students	
Increased 8.3%	

A couple of years ago the campus completed a modeling exercise that indicated the campus could accommodate approximately 5800 students with the current campus plan. This is based on seat capacity not including the implications around instructional laboratories which are already totally impacted. Approximately 5200 students are currently enrolled on campus. This coming year, the intent is to slightly reduce enrollment growth to 5600 as opposed to 5800. Part of this strategy is to send the message that the campus is space constrained and buildings are needed in order

to move forward with the campus plan. UC Merced will likely become a totally selective institution at a very early stage of the campus development. The campus could have actually been totally selective last year, admitting only the native population of applicants without going into the referral pool.

#### Faculty Full-Time Employment (FTE)

I presume the Schools are all working on their strategic plans. The campus has started to ramp up the number of FTEs that are allocated. Although the 32% increase in tuition was very problematic for students, it helped UC Merced because in contrast to other campuses, Merced did not have to backfill cuts from the state budget. The current model is to hire fifty FTEs over a three-year period. In the coming years the number will increase by three additional faculty lines per year until the campus is hiring sixty-six faculty over a three-year period. The rationale was simple, at fifty FTEs Merced continues to diverge from its sister campuses in terms of the student to ladder-rank faculty ratio. With twenty-two additional FTEs, Merced becomes more parallel to sister campuses. Eventually moving to seventy-five FTEs in a three-year period will start to close the ratio gap. The goal is to make inroads on the gap that exists between UC Merced and all other UC campuses.

#### Capital Development

The campus will see a lot of development over the next couple of years. Construction crews have begun closing the area behind the dorms on Scholars Lane and will begin work shortly. The next phase of the Gallo Recreation Center has begun. In April, there will be a groundbreaking for the Student Services Building across from Social Sciences and Management in the triangle that is now a courtyard. Science and Engineering II will break ground in the spring. Construction will be underway around the entire outskirts of the campus. There will be traffic issues, although the campus is doing everything possible to keep the impact to a minimum.

A question was asked of EVC/Provost Alley:

You gave us an overall enrollment target for students, can you comment on the proportion of undergraduates to graduate students? Is there a sub-target in the enrollment total?

VCR Traina's goal is to admit one hundred graduate students for 2012-2013. Out of the four hundred students admitted, one hundred will be graduate students and will depend on the strength of the applicant pool. The campus is beginning to put significant resources into graduate student support. I am hopeful the campus will move well above three hundred for graduate student enrollment in the coming year.

The Chancellor feels that graduate enrollment will ramp up for 2013-2014 as the campus creates recruitment strategies this spring, including better public relations regarding graduate programs.

### III. CONSENT CALENDAR

A. The April 14, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

B. Approval of minor grammatical edits to the UC Merced Bylaws – Chair Amussen  
The Division is asked to approve minor grammatical edits to the Bylaws. There are substantive issues with the Bylaws that we will discuss soon. But there are also a few minor issues such as capitalizing the word Bylaws and adding the word “of” to a phrase. These are minor stylistic edits.

The edit that removes language giving CAPRA the capacity to advise CAP on staff allocations was considered minor because it has no impact on how the Senate does its work. CAP does not make recommendations related to staff allocations; therefore removing CAPRA’s ability to advise CAP was not considered a substantive change. This is a change to the Bylaws that reflects the Senate’s practice.

C. Annual Committee Reports (2010-2011)

Everyone is encouraged to read the annual committee reports which detail all of the marvelous work that the committees have been doing.

### IV. APPROVAL OF UC MERCED BYLAWS-

Nella Van Dyke, who is the former Chair of the Committee on Rules and Elections, will present the changes.

*Nella Van Dyke- former Chair, Committee on Rules and Elections*

#### **Summary of Bylaw Substantive Changes-**

The agenda states “approval of the Bylaws”. However, we can’t approve the Bylaws without a quorum which would be two thirds of the faculty. So this is more of a discussion item moving us toward approval. Hearing no objections we will solicit comments in this meeting and the Senate will distribute the revised Bylaws to the faculty and hold an electronic vote assuming that we don’t revise them further based on this discussion.

A summary of the changes is appended to the meeting packet. The changes are minor. There were some places where the Bylaws gave two committees authority for the same thing. However, we are going to amend some of these changes slightly, as issues have arisen since preparing today’s meeting packet.

#### **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 service for every Senate committee member used to be referred as “the first day of instruction in the Fall”. That is being changed to “the first day of the

semester” which is a week before the first day of instruction. Committees need to begin work prior to the start of classes.

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

The previous version of the Bylaws had given the Divisional Council and the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) the authority to approve new programs. The Senate wanted to resolve that so it was clear which committee had authority. The Division Council has recommended the change that UGC have the authority to approve undergraduate programs and GRC approves graduate programs on behalf of the Division.

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

The former Bylaws assigned authority to both the Division Council and GRC to approve Organized Research Units (ORUs). The Division Council decided to clarify this partly because of GRC’s workload. Authority was given to the Division Council.

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

The normal term of a member on the Committee on Committees (CoC) is two years. Because of faculty needing to end their term early for reasons such as sabbaticals, the Division now has a very unbalanced number of members elected each year. Last year CoC had five new members elected to CoC and next year the committee will need three members. The Division Council thought it made sense to add language in the Bylaws that would give CoC the option to even out the number of elected members by reducing the term of one member to one year. This is a place where it is recommended to change the wording slightly. The proposed wording is in the addendum.

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

*“If, because of vacancies or other circumstances, the number of members that needs to be elected each year gets out of balance (e.g., 5 members due to be elected one year, 3 the next), the Committee may reduce one member’s term by one year.”*

It was pointed out that the wording is somewhat ambiguous in terms of which member’s term gets reduced. The proposed change is the same but with slightly refined wording.

*“The committee may reduce the term of a member to be elected from two years to one year as needed to maintain a balance of newly elected members each year.”*

**Bylaw II.IV.3.B.3**

The Bylaw states that GRC refers new graduate programs to CCGA at the systemwide level. The first proposed change is to remove the section, “*subject to approval by the Merced Division*” which means if the Administration and the Senate approves the program it would then be forwarded to CCGA. Vice Chair O’Day

pointed out that the Compendium says that nothing can be forwarded to CCGA unless the Administration also approves the program.

Vice Chair O'Day clarified this is in terms of a proposal for review at the systemwide level for a new graduate program.

The Division Council proposed removing the section "*subject to approval by the Merced Division*" but now rescinds its recommendation based on the Compendium.  
Bylaw II.IV.3.B.3

The current wording; "*GRC makes recommendations to the Senate Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, subject to approval by the Merced Division, concerning new programs for existing degrees higher than the Bachelors degree and the establishment of new degrees higher than the Bachelors degree.*"

Vice Chair O'Day stated "the motion is to delete the Bylaw change to II.IV.3.B.3 and leave the language as stated."

The EVC added the only reason the Administration approval is needed is simply for resources.

#### **Bylaw I.IV.3.D**

The Division Council recommends removing "or programs". We want to make sure it is clear that GRC has authority to approve graduate programs. We are making sure it is clear that the Merced Division, which includes the Administration and Senate, must approve the proposal before submitting it for systemwide review.

Bylaw I.IV.3.D

*"With the advice of the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, the Graduate and Research Council, and the Undergraduate Council, makes recommendations to the Chancellor on the establishment and disestablishment of academic units on the Merced campus, including colleges, schools, or departments, or programs."*

#### **Discussion of Bylaw Substantive Changes**

##### **Bylaw II.IV.2.B.6**

*UGC "Defines the goals and establishes criteria for use in reviewing the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate teaching programs and/or majors and is responsible for program review."*

UGC Chair Camfield asked for clarification. There is an addition to UGC duties stating that it is responsible for Program Review; however the same addition is not made to GRC.

Chair Van Dyke stated the past UGC Chair requested the language be added to the UGC section of the Bylaws. The GRC Chair did not make the same request.

With this change, it makes it seem that all Program Reviews are handled by UGC regardless of level which is not the way our Program Review documents are written. It was clarified that the UGC request was made prior to a GRC Program Review Policy was drafted.

**ACTION:** The language in Bylaw II.IV.2.B.6 should clearly state that UGC oversees undergraduate Program Review.

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

*GRC "Represents the Division in all matters relating to the review of Organized and Centralized Research Units, centers and institutes, including proposals for and reviews of such units."*

Vice Chair O'Day questioned revising Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14- clarification made on which body, the Division Council or the GRC, has final authority on the establishment of Organized Research Units (ORUs). The CRE is proposing to strike wording under GRC. It was questioned whether there is duplication in the Bylaws that also gives the Division Council authority.

Former CRE Chair Van Dyke confirmed that there was a duplication, the previous version of the Bylaws stated that Division Council and GRC has that power.

Vice Chair O'Day is curious about the wording, as the intent was to make it clear that GRC has purview over proposals related to ORUs.

GRC did not want the authority over ORUs because it is overloaded with work and preferred to keep it with the Division Council.

It was asked what authority was given to the Division Council in terms of oversight. Keeping in mind there may be a request in the future to split the GRC. Vice Chair O'Day is concerned about taking the authority away from GRC in terms of a Bylaw change.

Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14:

*GRC "Represents the Division in all matters relating to the review of Organized and Centralized Research Units, centers and institutes, including proposals for and reviews of such units."*

However, it was noted that the following Bylaw also gives authority to the Division Council.

Bylaw I.IV.3.E.

*Division Council "Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on the establishment or disestablishment of Organized Research Units, centers, institutes, bureaus, and the like."*

Division Council makes recommendations to the Chancellor but GRC represents the Division. Therefore, Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14 gives GRC the authority to have oversight of all ORUs. GRC would then report their recommendations to the Division Council which in turn would make recommendations to the Administration. Maybe there needs to be clarification of duties rather than simply taking away the authority from GRC.

Chair Amussen stated that in the Bylaw revision discussions, the Division Council noted that it can always delegate the authority over ORUs to GRC but if GRC is overloaded, Division Council could delegate the review to an ad-hoc committee. Last year, GRC requested to divide into two committees. GRC handles the business typically assigned to two or three committees on other UC campuses. So, the revision was not saying that GRC would not review ORUs rather the revision was intended to give the Division Council more flexibility.

Vice Chair O'Day agreed with allowing the Division Council more flexibility but contested removing Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14 because if the statement is removed from the Bylaws it de-authorizes GRC to explicitly have the duty of reviewing ORUs.

It was argued that removing Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14 would actually give the Division Council more flexibility. If the Bylaws state that GRC reviews ORUs then the Division Council doesn't have the ability to assign ORUs to another committee.

Vice Chair O'Day objects to removing Bylaw II.IV.3.B.14.

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

**Bylaws: II.III.3.A.6**

*"Notice of Election. The Secretary must mail each voting member of the Division a Notice of the Election no fewer than 21 calendar days prior to the election."*

**II.III.3.C.1**

*"At least 7 calendar days before the Election, the Secretary must provide to each voter, either by mail or electronically, a list of all nominees, stating their nominators and school affiliation."*

**II.III.3.C.2**

*"The list of nominees must be accompanied by a ballot listing the nominees alphabetically. In the case of mail ballots, each voter must receive a plain envelope in which to enclose the marked ballot, and an additional envelope addressed to the Secretary to be used for return of the sealed ballot. The envelope addressed to the Secretary must have a space for the signature of the voter. For electronic voting, the Secretary must use a system that verifies each voter's identity and maintains security. Each voter must be provided access to this system at least 7 calendar days before the Election."*

The Senate began using electronic ballots in Spring 2011 for elections. Because of the efficiency of the electronic ballots, CRE felt it was reasonable to reduce the number of days required for the faculty to have the list of nominees before voting. This change subsequently reduces the number of days in terms of notice of an election. The proposed timeframe for the distribution of the ballot to the final day to vote is seven days instead of fourteen. Therefore, the timeframe from notice of the election to the final vote is twenty-one days instead of thirty days.



There being no further comments or discussion regarding the proposed Bylaw revisions, the Senate will proceed with an electronic ballot.

**ACTION:** The Division Council will discuss the disputed items at its meeting on December 7 and will send the final proposed Merced Bylaw revisions to Senate Membership via an electronic ballot.

#### V. DISCUSSION ITEM

Chair Amussen had originally listed Senate Service as an item for discussion but would like to open up the discussion regarding the systemwide issues that have surfaced over the past two weeks, namely the protests on the UC Berkeley and UC Davis campuses or other topics of interest.

##### Employee Contribution Increase for the Retirement Fund

Faculty Welfare Chair Malloy stated that he was distressed to hear the Regents approved the increased employee contribution to 6.5%. Both because of the effect to employee paychecks and because it indicates the University may be on a path to increase contributions to above 7%. Retention – and space utilization - is a huge issue at UC Merced. There is concern that employees do not know about the approved increase. When the proposal to increase the contribution to 6.5% was introduced to the Faculty Welfare committee last month, the committee members did not know their contributions were going up or that they had gone up last year. The past increase may not have been truly noticeable because of the simultaneous pay increases but when 6.5% is taken out of paychecks, employees are going to notice. Our campus faces a tremendous amount of retention issues for a variety of reasons and the 6.5% is going to be devastating. What can the Senate do about this? We are not the only people in the UC system complaining about competitive remuneration, but given the campus retention issues that the contribution increase along with the other issues the campus faces is going to cause a lot of problems.

Systemwide Chair Robert Anderson stated that the Senate inserted a statement of objection into the Regents item and anticipated there would be discussion in the Regents meeting particularly to set the stage for what will happen a year from now, however that was not the case. I do not think that a 6.5% employee contribution is in the abstract unreasonable, the problem is that salaries are so far below market. UC salaries lag in the market below 12%-13%, which may be better with the 3% increase we just received. However, the 3% increases are not going to do much more than tread water in relation to the competition. Given the circumstances of the Regents meeting it was clear that nothing was going to be discussed and the Regents adopted everything without discussion. This was due in part because the meeting was about an hour behind schedule and also because, although there weren't any protesters in the room at UC San Francisco, protesters could have easily come into the room if they had understood that the meeting was going on elsewhere. The employee

contribution issue will likely be fought out a year from now when the Regents go beyond the 7% that the Senate has set as the upper limit.

EVC/Provost Alley agreed that a 6.5% contribution is not unreasonable. The issue to offset the 6.5% contribution is around the University's contribution. If you look at the UC Merced model out to 2017, contributions become approximately 10% of the operating budget which is somewhere in the \$80 million range off the top. According to the Vice President of Budget and Capital Resources, Patrick Lenz, there have been positive interactions with the Department of Finance regarding the State picking up its obligation in terms of paying the University portion of the retirement funds. Funding will be freed up for increases in salaries to the staff and faculty if the State commits to its obligation.

Faculty Welfare Chair Malloy responded that the caveat to Systemwide Chair Anderson's statement that the 6.5% employee contribution is reasonable is that it is reasonable if the salaries are competitive.

EVC/Provost Alley stated that the only way salaries will increase is to offset the University's portion.

Chancellor Leland stated that unfortunately, the contribution increase was passed and the campus doesn't know if we will be able to make the offset which is creating tension and anxiety.

Faculty Welfare Chair Malloy is concerned that it is demoralizing for employees to see a reduction in their pay checks. It will make it much harder to retain people. Systemwide Chair Anderson noted that not only will it be difficult for young employees struggling to pay a mortgage and raise children but this increase will be a big factor for retention of employees in their sixties because salary is subject to Social Security and Medicare tax but the pension is not. There could be a situation where employees with relatively long service in their sixties realize their take-home pay for their pension is actually higher than their take-home pay as an employee. The University of California is already setting incentives to retain employees sixty and older, who find an attractive job elsewhere.

Undergraduate Council Chair Camfield stated there are upsides to early retirement. Hiring new faculty gives the system the ability to place all the Ph.Ds that are graduating. New faculty are less expensive. The University is shifting the budget from yearly operating costs to the pension fund. You may recall the budget crisis in the late 80s, when the Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Programs (VERIP) was created to encourage retirement.

Faculty Welfare Chair Malloy stated that the effect of the Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program in the UC Berkeley History Department was not good and several

strong professors were lost. It is hard to lose people who have thirty years of experience and are at the top of their game as scholars and have experience in how to run committees.

Systemwide Senate Chair Anderson commented that whether or not assistant professors are in steady state, they will be paid less than full professors. However, it may not be the case that newly hired full professors are paid substantially less than more senior full professors. Departments are experiencing an inversion of salaries. We have people who have performed well and progressed up through the merit track, they may be a step nine or above scale but they are paid less than a full professor new hire.

Vice Chair O'Day mentioned that the systemwide Senate has been discussing the revision of the salary scales. Where is the systemwide Senate regarding the salary scales?

Systemwide Chair Anderson stated there is a task force between the Senate and Administration which has been proceeding slowly. The task force spent the period up until late spring 2011 largely discussing the allocation of the 3% increase for AY2012-2013. The increase was almost across the board with the requirement of a positive merit review over the last four years. The outcome was a huge compromise. Since last spring, the task force has been looking at other salary models. There seems to be some consensus behind mimicking what Irvine is doing where the scales are established based on the average of professors at a given rank and step and the professor is moved to the new scale after a positive merit review. There is hope for a decision on following the Irvine model at the task force meeting next week. There will likely be a report in late December or January. The current proposal being considered is a hybrid of using the Irvine methodology at the systemwide level and using it at the campus level.

## VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

### **Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)- *Vice Chair Jian-Qiao Sun***

The committee has reviewed many cases and is trying to enforce the APM rules throughout the Schools. In the last few months CAP has reviewed a few cases, one of which took three meetings to come to a recommendation.

### **Committee on Committees (CoC)- *Chair Jeff Yoshimi***

CoC has found it challenging to staff all the committees due to the small number of faculty versus the large number of committees. There are one hundred and fifty-three faculty eligible for service, just over a third of eligible faculty, (fifty-six are currently committed to some kind of service. sixty-one faculty have either declined

service, are currently submitting tenure materials or are ineligible for some other reason which leaves thirty-seven eligible faculty.

CoC has openings for some of the committees it is required to staff including the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). The committee has sent out campus-wide emails with very little response.

Three themes have surfaced on how to address the issue of Senate service.

- 1) Reduce the number of committees. Search committees require a lot of faculty time which in return removes these faculty from service on other committees.
- 2) Reward some forms of service
- 3) Disincentives for those who always decline to serve. One faculty member declined service because of past service on CoC stating that many other faculty aren't contributing so why should he.

Senate Chair Amussen stated that the Senate has discussed how to provide incentives even if it is with small rewards for service.

Chancellor Leland asked if there were successful service models on other UC campuses.

Other UC campuses have more faculty. Some campuses have service incentives. The UC Merced model for Chairs is built on other UC campus models but isn't quite as generous as some. Service as a Chair or Vice Chair of the Division and some committee Chairs are the only positions that receive rewards. On some larger campuses, certain committee service, such as for CAP, is rewarded with a complete release from instruction because it is a full-time job. One of the major issues is that faculty who are considered for Senate service also play leadership roles within their academic programs and the Schools. The Senate is also exploring ways to help CAP evaluate not only faculty attendance on a committee but also faculty participation on the committee.

Graduate and Research Council Vice Chair Kelley pointed out that service has been an issue from the inception of the campus. UC Merced is a small campus and a highly inverted campus in terms of tenured faculty versus non-tenured faculty. Finding senior faculty to serve will continue to be an issue as long as the campus continues its trend to largely hire assistant professors. The issue will only be relieved if there is a change in policy where the campus hires more senior faculty, which is increasingly difficult to do, or when the current junior faculty become senior.

EVC Alley noted that the campus has tried to hire more senior faculty but is having difficulty doing so.

Another issue on the horizon for staffing committees is the fact that a large number of sabbaticals are planned in the near future.

Graduate and Research Council Vice Chair Kelley noted that the balance of senior to junior faculty affects all manner of problems including Senate service and mentorship of junior colleagues. There is a systemic problem associated with the age distribution of the faculty.

**Faculty Welfare Committee (FW)- *Chair Sean Malloy***

Chair Malloy has been the representative on the systemwide Faculty Welfare Committee but this is the first year UC Merced has constituted its own Faculty Welfare Committee. Faculty Welfare has representation from each School which is crucial as a committee that represents the interests of a diverse faculty. The School of Natural Sciences and the School of Engineering each have one representative and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts has two representatives. Because the committee is so small we are operating on a consensus basis. No statements will be issued from the committee on a 3-1 vote because that could effectively disenfranchise an entire School. The result has been that deliberation is slightly slower than one might like but it is vital to preserve the credibility of the committee especially in the early stages.

The first item of business for Faculty Welfare was to conduct a faculty survey to determine the priority of issues affecting faculty welfare. However, the Faculty Work Climate Research Team had funding for a similar survey that was already complete. The survey received an 80%-85% response rate. The Research Team has generously agreed to share all the survey information with the Faculty Welfare Committee and should be ready by the end of the semester. The data from the faculty survey will serve as the agenda for Faculty Welfare in the spring with an eye toward retention.

Faculty Welfare met early in the Fall semester with Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), David Ojcius, to discuss the Chancellor's interest in a mentoring program for junior faculty. VPAP Ojcius is close to completing a proposal for the Chancellor.

Chancellor Leland stated that a junior faculty mentoring proposal is close to being ready. However, during the Chancellor's visits to the Schools, faculty expressed they want a more comprehensive mentoring program. For example, when faculty move from an untenured to a tenured position, faculty are at a new stage in their careers where new kinds of opportunities open up. Just as junior faculty need mentoring with respect to working with graduate students, successful grant writing, etc., mid-level faculty could also benefit from mentoring opportunities. VPAP, Ojcius has been asked to invite someone in the spring to meet with the faculty of each of the Schools to discuss faculty mentoring needs beyond the junior level.

**Graduate and Research Council (GRC)- *Vice Chair David Kelley***

The Graduate and Research Council has had a very full plate. One of the most important items on the agenda has been the dispersal of funds from the EVC/Provost Office for the support of graduate students. GRC has been given \$500k each year to support graduate student retention and recruitment as well as to support Summer Research Fellowships. The funding has been divided into roughly equal proportions between support in recruiting efforts and the graduate student Summer Fellowship Program. In the past, GRC has more or less micromanaged the process of disbursement; however the current GRC doesn't feel it is in a position to decide how funds should go to individuals and how it should be dispersed between non-resident tuition waivers and the different recruiting needs of the graduate programs. GRC has chosen to allocate funds to the graduate groups in a way that is somewhat unrestricted but not unaccounted for. Approximately \$250k was allocated to the graduate groups for recruiting. The metrics used included the size of the graduate group, the size of the graduate population and a number of other factors. This led to a model that was equitable which is a very difficult thing to do when comparing groups. The needs for each School are quite different. GRC is about to open the Call for the graduate student Summer Fellowship competition. This year student proposals will be submitted to the graduate groups instead of GRC. Each graduate group will then submit the student proposals in order of priority. GRC will take the graduate group orderings into account and make the final decision for distribution.

GRC is also responsible for distributing funding provided by the EVC/Provost Office for small faculty research grants. A number of faculty, especially starting faculty, have found these grants to be extremely useful. Last year, GRC awarded twenty-two (22) small grants at approximately \$5k per award. All of this is indicated in the previous GRC Annual Report.

**Undergraduate Council (UGC)- *Chair Gregg Camfield***

The Undergraduate Council has been reviewing a number of policies that balance student success with the campus' limited resources including a Repeat Course Policy, Transfer Admission Policy, a Readmission Policy for students who have been dismissed due to poor academic performance, and priority scheduling for certain courses in the School of Natural Sciences. These policies are disproportionately affecting at-risk students and given the mission of the campus, gives the committee great concern. UGC is trying to balance the needs for access and need for excellence.

UGC has considered a number of issues related to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) which are still being discussed by UGC and some of which have been taken on at the systemwide level with the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP). The systemwide Senate, the University Office of the President, Cal Tech and the Provost at Stanford submitted letters of strong concern

to WASC's proposed Handbook revision. Campuses have been given a reprieve and now must convince WASC why they should not move forward with their new handbook which will be voted on by WASC in February. There is concern that there is a post-accreditation let-down on campus. An interim report is due in three years. UGC is being vigilant and monitoring learning outcomes to ensure continued compliance.

Program Review - Part of the post-accreditation let down is being manifested in a number of programs asking for deferral of review which simply cannot happen. Program Review is not a question of merely complying with accreditation; it is a systemwide responsibility and a fundamental tool for faculty to be able to plan beyond a one or two-year horizon. Program Review is an opportunity for a program to get external validation of its needs and to use those in the planning process. UGC has been very proactive in talking to the Deans and the Administration regarding using Program Review when it comes to resource allocation. Program Review can serve as a compelling story to tell when a program is asking for additional lines and more resources. Faculty should understand that Program Review isn't a question of compliance but is in fact an important way for the campus to seek excellence.

General Education has been a struggle on campus and has been done on a shoe string. The campus has not been able to resolve fundamental questions about General Education because we haven't had a funding model. UGC has agreed to the principles of General Education resourcing that came out of a task force convened by former Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education (VPUE) Jack Vevea and conveyed by acting VPUE Linda Cameron. When the funding model is established, the UGC Subcommittee on General Education will build a plan to fit the funding rather than creating the plan and finding the funding afterward.

- VII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (NONE)**
- VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (NONE)**
- IX. NEW BUSINESS (NONE)**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Attest:

Susan Amussen, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by: Kymm Carlson

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION  
COMMITTEE ON RULES & ELECTIONS (CRE)  
Rick Dale, CHAIR

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD  
MERCED, CA 95343  
(209) 228-6312

**Date:** March 16, 2012

**To:** Susan Amussen, Chair, Academic Senate; Divisional Council

**From:** Rick Dale, Chair, Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE)

**Re:** Placement of "Multiple Major" policy in Division Regulations

---

CRE was asked to determine an appropriate location in the Regulations of the Merced Division for a new section on "Multiple Major" policies. In section 55, "Normal Progress to Degree," two numbered subsections describe generic guidelines on attaining degree requirements. A third note seems suitable there, where details can be given on how a student may pursue multiple majors during that progression of coursework. In this "Multiple Major" section, a number of issues are briefly described, such as the maximum number of units permitted to overlap between two or more major programs. CRE suggests including a third note under 55, and placing the "Multiple Major" details there. Attached is a Word document with the suggested addition. We considered some example regulations at other divisions, and this would be consistent with them (e.g., UC Riverside includes related policy statements under various schools and colleges, e.g. "ENR2.4.6" and "HSR2.4.4" under their "Major Requirements"; UC Davis includes similar statements in regulations of the College of Letters and Science in a detailed section 5.67 under "5. Major Requirements"). At other UC campuses, detailed major guidelines are specified at the school level, and CRE is considering updates to the regulations within each school in the Merced Division. The multiple major and other issues may be discussed, and subsequent changes to the Division regulations and individual school regulations may be recommended at that time.

**CC:** Division Council  
Committee on Rules and Elections



## REGULATIONS OF THE MERCED DIVISION

### PART I GENERAL REGULATIONS UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

#### 50. GRADES (Am 30 Jan 08)

##### A. Grading System

UC Merced's grading system is as follows.

- A Excellent
- B Good
- C Fair
- D Barely passing
- F Not passing
- P Passed (grade of C- or better by an undergraduate student)
- S Satisfactory (passed at a minimum level of B or better by a graduate student)
- NP Not passed
- U Unsatisfactory
- I Incomplete
- IP In progress
- W Withdrew
- NR No report (when an instructor fails to report a grade for a student)

##### a. Credit Toward Degree Requirements

A course in which the grade A, B, C, D, P or S is received is counted toward degree requirements. A course in which the grade F or NP is received is not counted toward degree requirements. Grades of I or IP are not counted until such times as they are replaced by grades A, B, C, D, P or S.

##### b. Grade Points

Grades of A, B, C and D may be modified by a plus (+) or minus (-). Grade points are assigned as follows: A+ = 4.0; A = 4.0; A- = 3.7; B+ = 3.3; B = 3.0; B- = 2.7; C+ = 2.3; C = 2.0; C- = 1.7; D+ = 1.3; D = 1.0; D- = 0.7; F = 0.0; I = 0.0; P/NP = n/a. The grades P, S, NP, U, I, and IP carry no grade points and the units in courses so graded are excluded in determination of the grade-point average.

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09

## **B. Change of Grade**

All grades except Incomplete and In-Progress are considered final when assigned by an instructor at the end of a term. An instructor may request a change of grade when a computational or procedural error occurred in the original assignment of a grade, but a grade may not be changed as a result of re-evaluation of a student's work. No final grade may be revised as a result of reexamination or the submission of additional work after the close of term.

## **C. Incomplete (I)**

The grade of I may be assigned when the instructor determines that a student's work is of passing quality and represents a significant portion of the requirements for a final grade, but is incomplete for a good cause. (Good cause may include current illness, serious personal problems, an accident, a recent death in the immediate family, a large and necessary increase in working hours or other situations of equal gravity.) It is the student's responsibility to obtain written permission from the instructor to receive an I grade as opposed to a nonpassing grade. The Incomplete petition is available from the Registrar and it must be filed prior to the end of the final examination period.

If an I grade is assigned, students may receive unit credit and grade points by satisfactorily completing the coursework as specified by the instructor. Students should not reenroll in the course; if they do, it is recorded twice on the transcript. Once an I grade is assigned, it remains permanently on the transcript along with the passing grade students may later receive for that course.

I grades are not counted in computing the grade point average. An I grade received in the fall term must be replaced by the first day of instruction in the following fall term. An I grade received in the spring or summer terms must be replaced by the first day of instruction in the following spring term.

Except as noted below, any I grade that has not been replaced within the above deadlines will be converted to grade F (or NP/U if taken passed/not passed). After that time, but not retroactively, the grade is counted in computing a student's grade-point average.

Exception: If a degree is conferred before the end of the above deadlines following the assignment of an I grade, the grade will not be converted to an F (or NP/U). However, the student still has the option of removing the I grade within the above deadlines.

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09

Students with 15 or more units of I on their record may not register without permission of the appropriate Dean.

**D. In Progress (IP)**

For a course extending over more than one term, where the evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final term, provisional grades of In Progress (IP) shall be assigned in the intervening terms. The provisional grades shall be replaced by the final grade, if the student completes the full sequence. The grade IP is not included in the grade-point average. If the full sequence of courses is not completed, the IP will be replaced by a grade of Incomplete. Further changes in the student's record will be subject to the rules pertaining to I grades.

**E. Passed/Not Passed (P/NP)**

Undergraduate students in good standing who are enrolled in at least 12 units may take certain courses on a Passed/Not Passed (P/NP) basis. Students may enroll in one course each term on a P/NP basis (two courses if they have not elected the P/NP in the preceding term).

Changes to and from the P/NP option must be made during the enrollment period. No changes can be made after the first two weeks of classes without the approval of the appropriate Dean.

The grade P is assigned for a letter grade of C- or better. If the student earns a grade of D+ or below, the grade will be recorded as NP. In both cases, the student's grade will not be computed into the grade point average. A student may not repeat on a P/NP basis a course that was previously taken on a letter-graded basis.

Credit for courses taken on a P/NP bases is limited to one-third of the total units taken and passed on the UC Merced campus at the time the degree is awarded.

A course that is required, or a prerequisite, for a student's major may be taken on a P/NP basis only upon approval of the Faculty. Academic Schools may designate some courses as Passed/Not Passed only. Students do not have the option of taking these courses for a letter grade.

Deleted: 9  
Deleted: 6.29.09

### **F. Grade Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U)**

The grade of S is awarded to graduate students for work in graduate courses that otherwise would receive a grade of B or better.

Graduate students, under certain circumstances, may be assigned grades of S or U, but units earned in this way will not be counted in calculating the grade point average. Petitions to elect S/U grading are available from the Graduate School's web site at gradstudies.ucmerced.edu and must be signed by the student's graduate advisor. Graduate students may petition to take no more than one course per semester on a S/U grading basis. A graduate course in which a C, D or F grade is received may not be repeated with the S/U option.

In specific approved courses, instructors will assign only Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory grades. Such courses count toward the maximum number of units graded S allowable toward the degree, as specified by each degree program.

## **55. NORMAL PROGRESS TO DEGREE**

UC Merced undergraduate degree programs are designed to be completed in 8 terms or 4 academic years. To meet the normal progress requirement, undergraduate students are expected to enroll in and pass an average of 15 credits per term, completing the 120 credits necessary for graduation in 4 years. The Registrar's Office and the appropriate Dean will ensure that students are making normal progress towards their degrees. Extensions of enrollment beyond 9 terms requires the approval of the student's School. In order to remain in good standing, students must meet the minimum progress requirements of the campus. (See Section 65, Academic Probation and Dismissal.)

### **A. Unit Conversion**

Unit credit earned by students on any campus of the University of California, while that campus is on a quarter calendar, will be equivalent to credit earned on the Merced Campus as follows: Each quarter unit is equivalent to two-thirds of a semester unit.

### **B. Multiple Major Policy**

A student in good academic standing who wishes to declare more than one major must petition the undergraduate School(s) responsible for the majors and receive School

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09

Dean's (Deans') approval. A School Dean may deny the petition for the additional major(s) if it is determined by the School(s) that there is too much overlap in the proposed coursework to justify allowing the student to receive the additional major(s). No more than 12 upper-division units (excluding units required for School and university-level general education) may be used to satisfy requirements for all majors simultaneously, whether these units are explicitly required by the majors or count as electives toward the majors.  
Students must satisfy all requirements for each major, including general education requirements across Schools, if applicable. Coursework for the majors must be completed in 165 semester units or 11 semesters, whichever is greater, from the onset of college work, including AP and transfer credit.  
Majors earned will be noted on the student's transcript and diploma. If the majors lead to different degrees (B.A. and B.S.), that fact will be noted on the transcript and the two-degree designations will appear on the diploma. A student who has declared multiple majors may choose to graduate with fewer majors, but if so may not continue at the University to complete any remaining major(s).

**60. REPETITION OF COURSES**

A student may repeat only those courses in which a grade of D, F, or Not Passed was received. Courses in which a grade of D or F has been earned may not be repeated on a Passed/Not Passed basis.

Repetition of a course more than once requires approval by the appropriate Dean in all instances. Degree credit for a course will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be permanently recorded.

In computing grade-point average of an undergraduate who repeats courses in which the student received a D or F, only the most recently earned grade and grade points shall be used for the first 16 units repeated. In the case of further repetitions, the grade-point average shall be based on all grades assigned and total units attempted.

**65. ACADEMIC PROBATION, DISMISSAL, AND MINIMUM PROGRESS (Am 04 Mar 09)**

**A. Academic Probation**

Deleted: ¶  
¶  
-----Page Break-----

Deleted: 9  
Deleted: 6.29.09

An undergraduate student is placed on academic probation if one of the following occurs:

- (1) The student's semester grade point average is less than 2.0,
- or
- (2) The student's cumulative University of California grade point average is less than 2.0.

Probation Status: Academic review occurs at the end of each academic semester. When a student is placed on academic probation, the university notifies the student, and the student's official transcript states "Academic Probation" for the affected semester. While on academic probation, the student is under the supervision of his/her School or advising unit.

Removal from Declared Major: A student on probation may be removed from a declared major or changed to Undeclared due to failure to meet the particular standards or fulfill specific requirements that the student's School may impose. If the student is removed from a declared major or changed to Undeclared, the student may apply to be reinstated to a School as follows:

*Lower Division Students* (fewer than 60 units earned at the end of the semester in which the student applies) must meet these requirements:

- a. Cumulative University of California grade point average of at least 2.0
- b. Current semester grade point average of at least 2.0
- c. Major grade point average of 2.0-2.5 (minimum varies by School)
- d. Completion of all lower division major courses with grades of C- or higher

*Upper Division Students* (greater than 60 units earned at the end of the semester in which the student applies) must meet the requirements listed above for Lower Division students and must also complete 8-16 units (minimum varies by School) of upper division major requirements.

Return to Good Standing: Once a student has met grade point average standards listed above, the student's academic status returns to regular academic standing.

## **B. Academic Dismissal**

An undergraduate student is subject to academic dismissal from the university if one of the following occurs:

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09

- (1) The student has been on academic probation for two or more semesters and the student's cumulative grade point average is less than 2.0,
- or
- (2) The student's semester grade point average is less than 1.5 and the student's cumulative grade point average is less than 2.0.

Academic Dismissal Appeals: A student not previously on probation who earns a semester grade point average below 1.5 is offered the opportunity to appeal dismissal. The student who is subject to academic dismissal and does not complete the appeal process as prescribed is automatically dismissed. The student whose appeal is approved returns on probation and is under the supervision of the appropriate School or advising unit.

Dismissal Status: When a student is academically dismissed, the university notifies the student, and the student's official transcript states "Academic Dismissal" for the affected semester.

Note: A student who is academically dismissed may return after fulfilling reinstatement requirements (see the Reinstatement policy on the Office of the Registrar website at registrar.ucmerced.edu).

### C. Minimum Progress

An undergraduate student is subject to administrative probation if the student does not complete a minimum of 24 University of California units during an academic year, including summer.

Return to Good Standing: Once the student has completed 24 units during a subsequent academic year, the student's minimum progress status returns to good standing.

Note: Minimum unit completion does not apply to part-time students or to students who have a Dean's approval to carry fewer units than the minimum progress load (reasons may include medical disability, employment, a serious personal problem, a recent death in the immediate family, the primary responsibility for the care of a family, or a serious accident involving the student).

## 70. COURSE SCHEDULE CHANGES

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09

### A. Adding a Course

During the first week of instruction students may add a course(s) provided that space is available. During the second and third weeks of instruction, a student may add courses only with the permission of the instructor. After the third week of instruction, students may add a class only with the permission of both the instructor and the appropriate Dean. A fee will be assessed for adding a course after the third week.

1 <sup>st</sup> week	students may add if space available
2 <sup>nd</sup> - 3 <sup>rd</sup> week	with instructor's approval
after 3 <sup>rd</sup> week	fee assessed and only with instructor's and appropriate Dean's approval

### B. Dropping a Course

During the first four weeks of instruction, students may drop a course or courses without paying a fee and without further approval. After the fourth week of instruction and until the end of the tenth week of instruction (close of business on the Friday of that week), a student may drop for emergency reasons or for good cause with the signed approval of the instructor of record and confirmed by the dean of the school with which the student is affiliated, provided: (1) the student is not on special probation (i.e. students who have successfully appealed disqualification), (2) dropping the course would be to the educational benefit of the student (in the judgment of the instructor and dean), and (3) the student is not being investigated for academic dishonesty in that course. Dropping between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> weeks will be approved only provided the student submits a written description of the special circumstances warranting this action; therefore students should continue to attend the course until their drop request is approved. Any request to drop beginning in the eleventh week of instruction will only be considered under exceptional circumstances (illness or injury substantiated by a doctor's note; recent death in the immediate family or other circumstances of equal gravity), and will only be considered following both signed approval of the instructor of record and submission of a petition that is approved by the dean of the school with which the student is affiliated.

All drops must be received by the Office of the Registrar by the deadlines specified. For students dropping after the fourth week of instruction, a fee will be assessed and a "W" notation will be assigned by the Office of the Registrar and appear under the course grade on the student's permanent transcript. Courses in which a "W" has been entered on a student's record carry no grade points, are not calculated in the grade point average, and will not be considered as courses attempted in assessing the student's

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09



progress to degree. Nevertheless, it is a marker used to indicate that the student was enrolled in the class beyond the fourth week of instruction. It does not indicate whether the student was passing or failing. (Am 22 May 08)

**C. Withdrawal from the University (W)**

Students who find that they will not attend the University for a semester in which they have enrolled may cancel their registration only if instruction for that semester has not yet begun. To do so, they must formally request a cancellation of their registration from the Registrar’s Office. If instruction has already begun and students find it necessary to stop attending *all* classes, they must formally request withdrawal from the University. When a completed withdrawal form is approved by the dean of the school with which the student is affiliated, a W notation will be assigned for each course in which the student has been enrolled. Students also will not be eligible to re-enroll until they have been readmitted. Students who withdraw during a term must file a Notice of Cancellation/Withdrawal, available from the Office of the Registrar’s website at registrar.ucmerced.edu. Before considering a complete withdrawal, students are urged to consult an academic advisor and the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships, if appropriate, to consider the full implications of this action.

Please see the refund policies for specific details on refund rules. Students who fail to submit an approved petition for cancellation/withdrawal will receive F, NP or U grades, as appropriate, for all courses in which they are enrolled for that term.

**75. HONORS AT GRADUATION (SR 640)**

To be eligible for honors at graduation, a student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student’s School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08)

**Dean’s Honor List**

Students will be eligible for the Dean’s Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average or better with no

Deleted: 9  
Deleted: 6.29.09

grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

**Chancellor's Honor List**

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 6.29.09



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR  
[samussen@ucmerced.edu](mailto:samusen@ucmerced.edu)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED  
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD  
MERCED, CA 95343  
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

April 2, 2012

### MEMBERS OF THE MERCED DIVISION

The Assembly of the Academic Senate is conducting a referendum among all members of the Senate to decide whether to send forward a Memorial that asks the Regents to endorse one or more specific ballot measures or legislative initiatives that would increase state revenues and/or increase funding for the University. As required by systemwide Senate Bylaw 95, each division conducts its own vote and reports the results to the Assembly Parliamentarian for a final tally. A Memorial is the Senate's only vehicle for making a recommendation to the Regents from the entire Senate membership, which means it is very important for a large proportion of the Senate membership to vote.

The Merced Division will conduct its voting between April 2 and April 19. Attached to this letter you will find a letter to all Senate members from Assembly Chair Robert Anderson and Assembly Parliamentarian Jean Olson, an explanation and procedural history of the proposed Memorial, the Memorial text, and arguments for and against. I have also attached President Yudof's remarks to the Board of Regents on March 28, which can be seen as another version of the argument for the Memorial. Please follow the directions below to cast your ballot.

In order to provide the maximum opportunity for discussion and deliberation I have placed this topic on the agenda for the divisional meeting on Thursday, April 12, 2012.

Thank you for putting your views on the record at this time of crisis for the University.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Amussen".

Susan Amussen  
Chair



Office of the Chair  
Telephone: (510) 987-9303  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: Robert.anderson@ucop.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 2, 2012

**MEMBERS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Dear Colleagues:

The Academic Senate is conducting a systemwide mail ballot vote on a proposed Memorial to the Regents of the University of California asking the Regents to endorse ballot measures and or legislation that increase revenues to the state and prioritize funding for higher education.

Disposition of this proposed Memorial is determined by a simple majority of those Senate members voting. **PLEASE VOTE.**

Enclosed you will find a ballot and associated written materials that will allow you to participate in this vote. The following materials are included:

1. Background information on the issue and the Memorial
2. Argument for and against the Memorial
3. The Memorial ballot

For divisions that conduct the vote electronically, the electronic ballot must be cast and verified by **the date and time specified on the electronic ballot**. Similarly, for divisions that conduct the vote by mail, the paper ballot, properly marked, signed and sealed must be received in your divisional Academic Senate Office **by the date and time specified on your ballot**.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Robert Anderson in cursive.

Robert Anderson, Chair  
Academic Senate

Handwritten signature of Jean Olson in cursive.

Jean Olson, Secretary/Parliamentarian  
Assembly of the Academic Senate

**PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS  
INCREASED STATE SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY**

**DESCRIPTION**

Senate Bylaw 90.B. authorizes the Assembly to initiate “Memorials to the Regents on matters of Universitywide concern to be submitted to The Regents through the President . . .” The Memorial would request the Regents to endorse specific ballot measures or legislation that would increase revenue to the state and/or prioritize state allocation of funds to the University.

A vote in favor is a vote to send the “Memorial to the Regents” to the President and ask him to transmit the Memorial to the Regents. A vote against is a vote to not send the “Memorial to the Regents” to the President.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

At a meeting on February 1, 2012, the Academic Council approved (14 in favor, 1 against) a motion to ask the Assembly to initiate a Memorial to the Regents that would request the Regents to endorse ballot measures or legislation that would increase revenue to the state and/or prioritize state investment in the University.

The proposal was placed on the agenda for the Assembly’s February 15 meeting as Item VII.B.2 and included in the Call to Meeting, together with the proposed text and arguments for and against, as required by Bylaw 90.B. Substitute language, which was circulated to the members of the Assembly prior to the meeting and posted on the Senate website as an accompaniment to the Call to Meeting, was proposed and adopted as an amendment. After debate and further amendments, the Assembly voted (47 in favor, 12 against) to distribute a ballot to all Senate faculty members in accordance with the procedures stipulated in Senate Bylaws 90 and 95.

## **MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

WHEREAS the series of budget cuts that began at the onset of the Great Recession has reduced total state funding to the University of California by 25% since 2008-09, continuing the two decade long trend of defunding higher education by the State;

WHEREAS diminishing support for the University is directly related to falling State revenues and the decreasing fraction of the State's budget allocated to higher education;

WHEREAS during this period California undergraduate resident students have suffered an 80% increase in tuition and are for the first time paying a higher proportion of the cost of their education than that supported by the State;

WHEREAS the university system provides intrinsic critical public benefit to all Californians by offering education to all qualified California residents;

WHEREAS increasingly damaging budgets have produced a downward spiral that threatens the survival of the University as the leading public university in the world as it experiences higher student-faculty ratios, larger class sizes, reduced depth and breadth in course offerings, staff layoffs, and lack of investment in infrastructure;

WHEREAS the faculty are prepared to advocate publicly, consistently, and forcefully for the future of the University,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**

That the faculty of the Academic Senate call on The Regents of the University to support specific ballot measures and legislation that will increase state revenues and/or specific ballot measures and legislation that will prioritize funding for public higher education.

## ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS

The University's current fiscal situation is dire as a result of drastic declines in state investment. Despite an increase of over 50% in student enrollment since 1990-91, state support has increased by only \$140 million, just over 5%, in non-inflation adjusted dollars. In adjusted dollars, state support per student has dropped from \$16,720 per student in 1990-91 to \$6,770 per student in 2011-12. UC's total expenditure per student has declined 19% over that same period from \$21,370 in 1990-91 to \$17,390 in 2011-12; fee increases have only partially offset the loss in state funding. At the same time, the student share of the cost has nearly quadrupled: in 1990-91, students paid 13% of the cost of their education; in 2011-12, students paid 49% of the cost of their education.

To preserve access for low-income students in the face of rapidly rising fees, UC has dedicated a third of the tuition it receives to financial aid. In other words, one-third of tuition revenue supports accessibility rather than providing instruction. Without a reliable revenue stream from the state, the University will necessarily come to rely increasingly on payments by those who can afford them, thereby reducing its ability to serve all academically qualified California students regardless of their financial resources.

The state's two-decade withdrawal of support from the University has been the result, above all, of a series of sharp declines in state revenue, accompanied by increased spending in other areas, notably prisons. Unless the state is able to project sustainable and consistent increases in revenues, and prioritize higher education in its funding decisions, it will not be able to provide the funding needed to maintain UC as the greatest public university system in the world. The political deadlock in the legislature makes it impossible to enact revenue enhancing measures through the normal legislative process and forces advocates for such measures to resort to ballot propositions.

Most Assembly members who argued against submitting the proposed Memorial expressed concern that it might not garner enough votes to be a strong statement. These individuals did not advocate that Senate members vote against the Memorial.

By asking the Regents to support ballot measures or legislation to increase state revenue and prioritize investment in the University, the Senate will signal that it does not accept the view that loss of state support is inevitable.

By law and University policy, only the Regents may take a position on behalf of the University in support of a specific ballot measure. (*See* <http://www.ucop.edu/state/advocacy/ballotguidelines.html>.) When faculty and members of the public campaign as individual citizens in support of revenue enhancing ballot measures, their message that such a measure is essential for the University will gain credibility and force if they are able to point to a statement by the Regents that a specified ballot measure would benefit the University.

Moreover, calling on the Regents to endorse measures to enhance state revenues and to prioritize higher education will place the Senate on record in solidarity with current and

future students in seeking solutions to California's and the University's budget crisis.

### **ARGUMENT AGAINST MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS**

The priority of the faculty is the teaching, research and service missions of the University of California, not political advocacy.

Although faculty do not give up their rights as private citizens to campaign for political causes, they should not attempt to involve the University in their private efforts. The political environment is in rapid flux, and it would be a mistake for the Regents to bind themselves to support any one among several potentially competing revenue enhancement measures.

There is no guarantee that any measure placed on the ballot will be constructed in a way that benefits the University. Proposals reportedly under consideration do not appear to provide adequate guarantees of long-term funding for the University.

The constraints on University advocacy in support of a ballot measure (<http://www.ucop.edu/state/advocacy/ballotguidelines.html>) are so severe that there is little to gain from Regental support of a ballot measure.



**President Mark G. Yudof Opening Remarks  
UC Regents Meeting UCSF Mission Bay  
March 28th, 2012**

[Prepared for delivery]

Let me begin by saying that, for the most part, I try as President of this University to remain as politically agnostic as possible. When it comes to politics, I'm a firm believer in the better part of valor.

With that said, there are moments when silence, however pragmatic, is not the proper course.

In my view, we are approaching one of those moments. I am speaking about the tax initiative that the Governor is trying to place on the November ballot.

In my view, it represents the best opportunity I've seen in my four years in California for the state to clamber out of a sinkhole of fiscal uncertainty and move forward into a better, more prosperous future.

And so I want to go on record here this morning that I intend to bring to this board, at a subsequent meeting, a recommendation that it step up and endorse the Governor's ballot initiative.

This is not just about the University of California. It is about all of California. It is about the CSU system and the community colleges. It is about health care and safe streets and parks and libraries and public schools and all the rest of it.

It is about restoring California's place in the world as a shining monument to the value of a commonwealth society, willing to invest in the present to ensure a brighter future for the generations ahead.

Now I know that, as regents, you don't all share the same political points of views. I suspect that some of you might wish that there were a better path to solvency than raising taxes.

But I also know that you care deeply about this state and about this university.

Of course, the Governor's initiative won't be a complete panacea. But I will say, again in my view, that it offers the best promise I've seen to press the re-set button on an epoch of dismal decline, and put this state clearly on the road back.

Now, on a somewhat but not completely related matter, I wanted to inform you about progress we've made in talking to Sacramento leadership about a long-term financial plan.

We're not there yet. These things take time. But we are hopeful. Executive Vice President Nathan Brostrom and Senior Vice President Dan Dooley will discuss this further tomorrow.

In this context, I want everybody to know that one item on the table is a potential buy-out of any tuition increase for the 2012-13 fiscal year. I am cautiously optimistic we can get there.

Job one, however, remains the Governor's tax initiative. And so, to borrow a line from our previous governor, I'll be back.

Chair Lansing, this concludes my remarks.