

**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 more of 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

Meeting of the UC Merced Division  
December 1, 2011

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