

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING
MAY 22, 2007**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, May 22, 2008, in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Shawn Kantor presided. Chair Kantor welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. He thanked Chancellor Sung-Mo “Steve” Kang and Provost Keith Alley for making themselves available to provide updates on the state of the campus.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chancellor Sung-Mo “Steve” Kang

The Chancellor reported on the following topics:

Commencement

- As many as 100 students may participate in tomorrow’s commencement exercise.
- The invited speaker is Ruben Navarrette, Jr., a nationally-known columnist with the San Diego Union-Tribune and a native of the Central Valley.
- Also participating is UC Merced’s first doctoral degree candidate, Ricardo Cisneros.

Enrollment

- Campus SIRs (Statement of Intent to Register) are up 50% compared to this time last year.
- For fall 2008 we will have almost 1,100 entering freshmen, 75 transfer students, and 52 new graduate students. This will bring the total number of students on campus to approximately 2,700.
- Since 2004, the entire UC system has seen a dramatic rise in applications (43.5%) and in admissions (46.3%) from Central Valley students.

Budget

- The state budget remains uncertain. UC is actively campaigning UCOP to recover \$100M in cuts.
- The Regents approved a student fee increase of 7.4% and that will generate some additional revenue.
- The other UC campuses pledged that they will support UC Merced getting full credit for additional students, as many as 700.

Space Planning

- Groundbreaking for the new Social Sciences and Management Building is currently scheduled for July. The \$47.5M building will house additional faculty and staff in SSHA as well as the future School of Management.
- The open space in the Classroom Building is being reconfigured to provide additional office space.
- UCOP approval is being sought to enlarge the Science & Engineering II building.

Campus Planning

- Tom Lollini, Associate Vice Chancellor for Physical Planning, Design and Construction, and his team have done an outstanding job to communicate support for the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). We have had meetings with community members, faculty, staff, and students to solicit comments for the LRDP. By this fall, we want to have a revised draft for public review. We are also working with the city and county in regards to concerted planning for the entire community including our campus.

Faculty Research

- More than \$100M in proposals have been submitted; \$15M has been awarded.
- The Chancellor recognized the following faculty: Shawn Newsam (Presidential Early Career award from the White House); Kevin Mitchell (Faculty Early Career Development award from the NSF); Jay Sharping (Young Faculty Award from the Department of Defense's Defense Advanced Projects Research Agency); Marcos Garcia-Ojeda, Kara McCloskey, Monica Medina, Wei-Chun Chin, Marcelo Kallmann, and Shawn Newsam (NSF Major Research Instrumentation grants); Jennifer O. Manilay and a research team comprising Michelle Khine, Kara McCloskey, and Wei-Chun Chin (Research awards from the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine); Maria Pallavicini and Michelle Khine (Winning proposal for a Stem Cell Instrumentation Foundry funded by the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, almost \$4.4M); and Benoit Dayrat and Sam Traina (Received our campus's first NSF Research Education for Undergraduate Site awards for their project, "Summer Yosemite Research Training in Environmental Science").

New Faculty

- The three Schools have been allocated a total of 136 faculty lines. There are currently 100 faculty members; 22-25 new members will be added by the beginning of the school year.

Academic Planning

- The Strategic Academic Planning process continues. Subcommittee reports will cover academic organizational structure, graduate programs, professional programs and research themes, and undergraduate education. Work will continue over the summer.
- Last week, we got approval from the Regents for continued planning of the Medical School. We will need a lot of political support in Sacramento. In terms of fundraising, we will look beyond the Central Valley.
- Vice Provost Hans Bjornsson has been working in consultation with his Advisory Committee and working group to put forward a proposal for the School of Management. We still have to raise more funds, but the proposal is in good shape.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Accreditation

- In 2007, we received candidacy from WASC. We are going to submit a letter of our intent to WASC this August which will trigger a visit in fall 2009, for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. In spring 2011, we will have the Educational Effectiveness Review. If things go well, we will receive accreditation by June 2011.

Fundraising

- Fundraising was very successful in the first three quarters of this year. The campus has received \$9.78M in gifts and grants from private sources, which is a 77 % increase over this time last year. Of these gifts, those designated to support research are up 85%. Gifts to all three Schools are also up.

The Chancellor concluded his remarks by noting that there has been positive progress on many fronts this past year and that he looks forward to the next academic year. A question and answer period followed:

Q Now that the strategic planning committees have given you a report, what are the next steps?

A We will meet in the summer and integrate the subcommittee reports into an organized document. We need to prepare for campus review. When the draft is ready, we'll post it and solicit faculty input. The Steering Committee will be handling that.

Q The committee work for the School of Management got slowed down and the report wasn't completed. Does that mean the School will be on hold for another year?

EVC Alley: Hans has a document that I presume will get to the Senate. I am hopeful that the Senate will finish its deliberations in half a year and get it to system-wide. Hans will work with other institutions in the system that have management schools to get them on board with the document. We also need to start thinking about the kinds of faculty that need to be recruited.

Q You initiated a process to look at IT function on campus. You had a retreat. What are the next steps?

A There will be a report on the retreat. I thought the retreat went very well. Concrete steps need to be taken to improve IT on campus and we also need to show our support for IT function. As we do budget planning, EVC Alley will oversee what the campus priorities should be, and see how much we can support IT function on campus.

EVC Alley: Three committees will be put together and the IT advisory committee is one of them. The next step is to solicit input.

Q When we started the planning process, the charge seemed to be to take a higher level, broader look at how IT functionality is delivered on this campus. What I'm hearing now is the opposite.

Professor Heit: I was at the retreat except for the last half hour. They discussed high level, general principles. I'm sure there were specific steps discussed in the last half hour, but there probably wasn't enough time to work out things like governance and how to get input from the faculty. It would be helpful to see the report.

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley

The Provost reported on the following items:

- The stated enrollment of 700 students would generate approximately \$10M in new income over our base income from last year. We lose the first \$4M of the supplemental support that we have from the state. We have to backfill that amount. That takes down our new revenue to \$6M. Of that \$6M, a large piece is already committed to various projects we're doing on the campus.
- In terms of new income that is available for program support, new faculty lines, start up, instructional budget, and increases in the instructional budget (that are based on marginal cost hours and represented by the increase in student enrollment) are all in the budget. What is not in the budget is staff support issues. We're not going to have a lot of money to build staff, student, and faculty support.
- In his May Revise, the Governor pulled back on the 10% reduction on higher education. The May Revise made it so the 2008-09 budget would be identical to the 2007-08 budget. It is not clear how the Legislature will work it out or when the budget will be passed.

A question and answer period followed:

Q Are we getting money for 700 *aggregate* new students on campus?

A We get the new marginal cost rate for those 700 additional students. The other students are in the base already so whatever the marginal cost rate was when those students came in, we're getting a composite of that rate. As we grow the student body every year, there's a subtle difference in marginal cost rates. The rate has been as high as \$13,000 per student. The projection for next year is around \$8,500-\$8,700.

Q I heard that there probably won't be an educational bond this November. Where does that put us?

A There will most likely not be a bond. If the bond were to be put on the ballot, it would be for the two years from 2008-10. In that bond, there are two pieces that are important to the development of Science & Engineering II: planning and the working drawings. The actual construction piece would be in the next bond, which will be for 2010-12. Mary and I are going on June 3 to meet with Katie Lapp (UC Executive Vice President for Business Operations) and Patrick Lenz (UC Vice President for Budget) to talk about alternatives. Right now, I'm wondering if this is an opportunity we potentially have to move Science & Engineering II back to scale to 100,000 assignable square feet and move it up in the rank so that we could start it at an earlier date. The logical thing would be to pull Science & Engineering II out of the general obligation bond and put it into a lease revenue bond. It would cost a little more in terms of the rate at which you can borrow the money, but it wouldn't take anything away from the other campuses. We did get reclassified in terms of the classification for lab spaces. For the future buildings, we will have larger spaces for faculty labs.

The third floor of the Classroom Building is expected to be completed by the time school starts this fall. We're hopeful that the "peach pit" will also be ready. I think we can figure out a way to accommodate most people next year but the following year is going to be very difficult. We should get Social Science and Management in the middle of 2010 assuming everything goes smoothly. That will help with some office space, but not with wet labs that we'll need for Science & Engineering.

Q Do you know what the FTE growth will be from this year to next?

A I'm still hopeful we'll put out 24 to start. It may be modified in a subtle way by space issues.

Chancellor Kang: I want to share an email message I received from OP. There will be three new research projects with a focus on the Central Valley. These projects will be headed by UC Davis and UC Merced faculty including Professors Ruth Mostern, Maurizio Forte, and Robin DeLugan. These projects are very significant as they are investing time and money in Central Valley research.

Chair Shawn Kantor

Chair Kantor acknowledged Chancellor Kang and Provost Alley for being highly responsive to the Academic Senate and faculty requests for participation. He commented that among the items being reviewed by the Senate is the Medical School proposal. He added that the Management School proposal will get deferred until next year as will the Strategic Academic Planning output.

There's a search for a new Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and there are Senate members participating in that. There is also a search for a SSHA Dean. Review of the Deans of Schools of Natural Science and Engineering will hopefully take place soon.

III. SPECIAL ORDERS – CONSENT CALENDAR

Chair Kantor stated that the Bylaws allow the Council to place items that it deems non-controversial on a Consent Calendar.

Action: The Council voted to approve the Consent Calendar as noticed.

Chair Kantor commented that the main order of business for the incoming Senate should be a re-examination of the Senate's Bylaws and Regulations.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Chair Kantor stated that there is a piece of new business that was deemed controversial and constitutes a major change in the Bylaws. The change deals with how Committee on Committees

(CoC) appointments are handled. According to current Bylaws, the appointments that CoC suggests have to be confirmed by the Divisional Council. CoC would like to strike this from the Bylaws on the grounds that CoC is the body that is elected by the faculty to make appointments and its approval should be final. Further, Merced is the only UC campus requiring this additional step. A memo will be sent to the incoming CoC and Council Chairs advising them about this piece of business that is awaiting action.

Action: Lacking a quorum, the Assembly tabled the item.

V. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) -- *Professor Even Heit*

- CAPRA consults with other committees and administration on issues related to space, money, and faculty lines. It also sends a representative to the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB), the system-wide version of CAPRA.
- This year I gave a presentation to UCPB on UC Merced's budget. The system-wide budget is about \$18B annually. Our operating budget is about \$70M which is .4% of the system-wide budget. The system-wide capital budget, which is buildings and infrastructure, is planned to be \$2.3B over the next five years. UC Merced's share is planned to be about \$16M, which is 2.7% of the system-wide.
- UCPB was surprised at how little resources we're getting and how well we are doing despite that. Our base is a lot lower than the other campuses. Even though our funding is mainly student-based, we're not going to be fully funded for all the students we take in next year. This is something that happens to every campus, but it affects us differently. UCPB was concerned that we are not getting a good deal from the system.
- UCPB was also concerned that building UC Merced is being framed as costing other campuses (UCPB does not agree with this framing). Our students should not be singled out as costing the other campuses because this occurs across the UC system. UCPB appreciated what our Administration is doing and shows a lot of interest in UC Merced.

EVC Alley: I think there is good news in there and that is each of the other campuses said they want to support UC Merced. In regards to framing, it is understandable that they would want to know what is coming out of their budgets so they can plan accordingly. From now on, there is going to be more transparency than there has been in the past.

Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)

The CAP Chair was not present so former CAP Chair and Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, Professor David Ojcius, was invited to comment.

- We're moving towards a CAP that has more Merced members. We had nine external members and two UC Merced members last year. This year, we had two UC Merced members and five observers, most or all of which will be voting members of CAP next year.

Chair Kantor commented that the UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures (MAPP) was one of Professor Ojcius's first orders of business when he took his position as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. A revised Draft has been through the Schools and the Deans, and has just come to the Senate.

Committee on Committees (COC) -- *Professor Mike Colvin*

- Most of CoC business is done towards the end of the year when we're coming up with the Senate slates for the following year. The business we do during the year consists of repopulating committees if someone steps down and filling in the various incidental requests that come out. We try to fill in for any requests we get like Deans reviews and Provost searches.
- There are fewer members of the original group of founding faculty serving on committees. New faculty were a bit reluctant to participate this year. I encourage you to talk to your new colleagues about the importance of being a member of a committee.

Graduate and Research Council (GRC) -- *Professor Anne M. Kelley*

- GRC is the committee that deals with everything having to do with graduate education and research policy. It sends representatives to two of the system-wide committees – the University Committee on Research Policy (UCRP) on which David Noelle has been our representative, and I have been the representative on the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), the system-wide committee through which graduate programs get approved. Issues come to GRC from a variety of sources such as the Division Council, Graduate Dean's office, the Office of Research, and directly from faculty. GRC approves revisions in the policies and procedures and changes of name. It also makes recommendations or in some cases actually makes awards and fellowships.
- UC Merced has two approved graduate programs: Environmental Systems, which received its final system-wide approval last year, and the Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP), which is the umbrella program under which all of the graduate emphasis areas currently operate. The IIGP was supposed to have expired already and we are currently working on getting year by year extensions on it.
- Last fall, I did a presentation for CCGA about these graduate emphasis areas. CCGA members are very supportive and are willing to help us make them into graduate programs. There is a limited length of time during which we can continue operating programs under the umbrella. We need to start putting programs forward for system-wide approval.

- We reviewed about 37 new or revised CRFs. We also reviewed the preliminary Medical School plan. We recommended dividing the Vice Chancellor for Research and the Graduate Dean position into two positions. We're also having an ongoing discussion among committee members, Professor Traina, and EVC Alley about the issue of core facilities. We solicited, reviewed, and awarded almost \$100,000 worth of faculty research and awarded 23 travel grants. We established criteria for a couple of Academic Senate awards: one for graduate teaching and mentorship and one for research. We reviewed and made recommendations to the Graduate Division for the Cota-Robles and Faculty Mentor fellowships. We also reviewed and made recommendations to the Graduate Division for the outstanding T.A. awards which Professor Traina presented at the graduate student reception yesterday afternoon.

A question and answer period followed:

Q Regarding CCGA recognition, what would be a realistic number of graduate groups to go forward next year?

A That is difficult to say. We probably have a couple that could go through. I have not reviewed each of the emphasis areas well enough to know for sure. CCGA members have been supportive of us trying to go forward even though some of our groups are incomplete. CCGA will try to be generous in terms of giving us credit for assigned faculty lines even though they haven't been filled yet. Ultimately, these issues have to go out for external review – within the UC system and outside - no matter how supportive CCGA wants to be.

A Council member pointed out that the challenge we have with a lot of the graduate groups is that we have a very small number of senior faculty. The logistics of getting a CCGA proposal together with one or two senior people is difficult. That should change quickly over the next couple of years both through recruitment and promotion.

Q What will the diplomas say for those students that are in graduate emphasis areas.

A Diplomas will refer to their emphasis area, for example, Master of Arts with an emphasis in World Cultures.

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

UGC member Professor Kathleen Hull offered comments on behalf of UGC:

- UGC reviewed over 100 CRFs. It reviewed system-wide documents such as Education Abroad and the new BOARS admissions criteria. It covered policy issues like course withdrawal, academic honesty, and course unit value. UGC was also asked to comment on various documents such as the Medical School proposal, block scheduling, and Catalog revisions.

There was some discussion among Council members on the status on the graduation with honors issue, UCM Senate Regulations 75. Chair Kantor confirmed that the Deans and Chancellors portion of the Regulation will be approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate meeting on June 11, 2008.

In regards to whether honors can be applied retroactively and if students can receive new diplomas that reflect their honors status, it was mentioned that Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jane Lawrence will give a directive to the Registrar to go forward with it after the Assembly approves the Deans and Chancellors honors.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Attest: Shawn Kantor, Division Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Committee Assistant