

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



DIVISION MEETING OF THE MERCED ACADEMIC SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 2011

12:30-2:00 p.m.

Note: Lunch will be provided
Chancellor's Conference Room
232 Kolligian Library

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- I. ANNOUNCEMENTS
 - A. Divisional Chair Evan Heit
 - B. Vice Chancellor Mary Miller
 - C. Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons

- II. CONSENT CALENDAR
 - A. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the December 2, 2010 Meeting PP 6

- III. APPROVAL OF UC MERCED REGULATIONS PP 17
 - School specific policies for undergraduates have been added
 - See Part II beginning on page 10 of the Regulations PP 26

- IV. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. Support for Success of Untenured Faculty PP 31
 - B. Building UC Merced as a Center for Graduate Education
 - C. New Course Evaluations PP 33

- V. SENATE AWARDS

- VI. CHAIR, VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE DIVISION FOR 2011-2012

- VII. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS
 - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Chair Shawn Kantor (oral)
 - Committee on Academic Personnel, Vice Chair Tom Harmon (oral)
 - Committee on Committees, Chair Tom Hansford (oral)
 - Graduate and Research Council, Chair Chris Kello (oral)
 - Undergraduate Council, Chair Susan Amussen (oral)
 - Committee on Rules and Elections, Chair Nella Van Dyke (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.

Nella Van Dyke
Secretary/Parliamentarian

SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS, 2010-2011

DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

Evan Heit, Chair (SSHA), COUNCIL
Anne Kelley, Vice Chair (NS)
Nella Van Dyke (Rules/Parliamentarian) (SSHA)
Jack Vevea (CoC Chair) (SSHA)¹
Tom Hansford (CoC Chair)²
Shawn Kantor (CAPRA Chair) (SSHA)
Chris Kello (GRC Chair) (SSHA)
Susan Amussen (UGC Chair) (SSHA)
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (At-Large) (SSHA)
(Assembly)
David Noelle (At-Large) (SOE/SSHA)
Tom Harmon, (CAP Vice Chair) (SoE)
Liaisons: Erik Menke (NS), UCAF
Cristian Ricci (SSHA), UCAAD
Sean Malloy (SSHA), UCFW

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UC Berkeley)
Tom Harmon, Vice Chair (SoE), UCAP
Ruzena Bajcsy (UC Berkeley)³
Michael Colvin (NS)⁴
Hung Fan (UC Irvine)
Richard Regosin (UC Irvine)
Jian-Qiao Sun (SoE)
Jan Wallander (SSHA)
Raymond Chiao (NS/SoE)
Michelle Yeh (UC Davis)
Robert Innes (UC Merced)⁵
Robert Deacon (UC Santa Barbara)⁶

ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Shawn Kantor, Chair (SSHA), UCPB
Wolfgang Rogge, Vice Chair (SoE)
Anne Kelley (NS)
Susan Amussen (SSHA)
Chris Kello (SSHA)
Evan Heit (SSHA)

PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

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

GRADUATE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Chris Kello, Chair (SSHA), CCGA
Will Shadish, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Dave Kelley, (NS)
Carolin Frank (NS)
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA)
Matt Meyer (NS)
Shawn Newsam (SoE)
Sholeh Quinn (SSHA), UCOLASC
Michael Spivey (SSHA)
Ariel Escobar (SoE)
Ex Officio: Sam Traina, VC Research/Dean Grad Div
Liaison: Maurizio Forte (SSHA), UCCC

RULES AND ELECTIONS

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

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA), BOARS
Gregg Camfield, Vice Chair (SSHA), UCEP
Linda-Anne Rebhun (SSHA)
Elliott Campbell (SoE)
Stefano Carpin (SoE)
Jay Sharping (NS)
Peter Vanderschraaf (SSHA)
Wei-Chun Chin (SoE)
Jack Vevea (SSHA)¹
Ex Officio: Jane Lawrence, VC for Student Affairs
Christopher Viney, VP Undergrad Ed⁸
Jack Vevea, VP Undergraduate Ed⁹
Liaisons: Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA), UCOPE
Cristian Ricci (SSHA), UCIE

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Jack Vevea, Chair (SSHA) UCOC¹
Tom Hansford, Chair (SSHA) UCOC²
Anthony Westerling, Vice Chair (SSHA/SoE)⁷
Jeff Yoshimi (SSHA)
Kathleen Hull (SSHA)
Sayantani Ghosh (NS)
Miguel Carreira-Perpinan (SoE)
Gerardo Diaz (SoE)
Linda Hirst (NS)

1. Term ended January 4, 2011 due to appointment as interim VPUE
2. Term began January 19, 2011
3. Term through January 2011 on sabbatical
4. Term through January 25, 2011 due to appointment as SNS Interim Dean
5. Served in August 2010
6. Served February and March 2011
7. Term as Vice Chair began January 19, 2011
8. Term Ended January 2011
9. Term began January 4, 2011

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

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
DECEMBER 2, 2010
MINUTES OF MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, December 2, 2010 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Evan Heit presiding. Chair Heit welcomed participants and guests and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Evan Heit

The Senate Chair thanked faculty for participating in the meeting and acknowledged how entrenched the faculty are in senate committees, which is appreciated by all colleagues and people that serve on committees. He thanked faculty that are serving on divisional council, it has been a pleasure to serve this year and the group has been a very constructive and collegial group. The Chair thanked the senate office staff, which is a four person staff that was run by only Susan Sims and Fatima Paul for most of the semester. Chair Heit introduced and welcomed the two new members of the office staff, Kymm Carlson and Mary Ann Coughlin. Chair Heit thanked EVC Provost Keith Alley and Chancellor Steve Kang for attending the meeting and welcomed and introduced distinguished guests, system-wide Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons and Vice Chair Robert Anderson.

Dan and Bob have both been distinguished servants of the Academic Senate. Dan Simmons was the chair of the organizing committee for UC Merced before there was a task force and helped name the mascot. He served on the UCM Rules committee and has offered advice over the years. At the system-wide level, Dan has served twice as the Chair of the Academic Senate. Dan has been a leader in the UC system regarding shared governance. He is a professor of tax law at UC Davis. Bob Anderson made his mark in terms of post-employment benefits and has been an intellectual force in leading discussions in the system-wide senate and how the senate is organized. Bob is a professor of Economics and Math at UC Berkeley. Chair Heit then reported on the following topics:

- A. Research University- The phrase that has come up throughout the semester is "research university" asking ourselves what makes UC Merced a research university. How should UCM status or goals to becoming a greater research university guide what we do? Divisional Council has had numerous discussions on how UCM should measure success. It is time for UCM to turn a corner to expand our measure of success beyond undergraduate student numbers. UCM should look at other ways that make us distinctive and concentrate on research and graduate numbers. Soon UCM will be an accredited university. Once accredited UCM will appear in national rankings and initially it may not be good. The campus needs a strategy for boosting national and international representation as a research university. In addition to growth, another measure of UCM success is the recruitment of UC quality faculty. UCM is accomplishing something by adding faculty to the campus and we need to ask ourselves what is the right number of faculty to add relative to the number of students. Two years ago UCM added 800 students and 8 faculty, this year UCM added 1000 students and 8 faculty. Over the next three years UCM will increase the rate of adding faculty, 1800 students and 50 faculty. Are these the right numbers for building a research university? The campus is making efforts to shore up graduate student numbers. UCM should examine the right

right numbers for building a research university? The campus is making efforts to shore up graduate student numbers. UCM should examine the right proportion of graduate students to be considered a research university, and how those students should be distributed across campus.

- B. Chancellor's Search- There is a general feeling around campus that the search is a great opportunity and seems to be filling people with optimism. The Chair has great confidence in President Yudof and is impressed with the search firm. UC has set high standards in recent chancellor searches. It is a great opportunity to think about what is needed for 2010 and onwards.
- C. Budget- The MOU, Memorandum of Understanding, with UCOP will allow UCM to add 1800 students and 50 faculty. This is a good start, but UCM needs to build on this and should not see this as the minimum number or as an aspiration level as it represents a 36 to 1 student to faculty ratio level that is not appropriate for a research university. The state has allocated the UC system \$51.5 million for enrollment support that will directly benefit UCM (not all for UCM). One year ago UCM only had 2000 state funded places which made it very difficult for long term planning. With the new funding, UCM will have 4020 permanent funded students and another 160 on temporary funding. Almost all current students will have funded places. It was noted that Merced wasn't built on an appropriate funding model for a new university. UCM is funded at a marginal cost rate of the other campuses with 20,000 to 30,000 students.

During this year there will be an exercise in the UC system called re-benching, where a committee will look at campus funding models and address issues for each campus. It is essential that UCM is represented on this committee. The Regents have just approved a ten year capital plan budget. UCM is well represented in this plan. In previous years UCM has had roughly 4% of the funds and in this new 10 year plan UCM has 8% of the UC capital budget. The budget is a signal of the Regents' and UCOP's intention to support growth at UCM. The legislature will need to sell bonds to cover this budget.

- D. Miscellaneous- The Senate has been reviewing plans from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts to divide the school into four Bylaw 55 units (personnel groups or proto-departments). This will allow faculty to vote on their colleagues for merit and promotion and hiring. The Senate has sent the requests to all standing committees and has completed its review. The Senate intends to send a written recommendation for the approval of all four Bylaw 55 units in SHHA. Hopefully this will also be beneficial for other schools to start their processes to create their own Bylaw 55 units.

Chancellor Steve Kang

Chancellor Kang thanked everyone for the opportunity to provide a campus update.

- A. In preparation of the Chancellor's departure in June, campus leadership is working to ensure a seamless and uninterrupted transition. The goal is to make sure campus progress continues uninterrupted. Leaders have identified campus goals for the next three years and secured funding commitment from UCOP to help reach the goals.
 - 1) grow UCM student enrollment by 600 students annually through 2013 while increasing retention rates from sophomore, junior and graduate students.

- 2) new faculty recruitment along with providing research support and mentoring for junior faculty members. In addition, UCM will seek to augment staff ranks as necessary to ensure success of faculty and students.
 - 3) emphasize graduate student recruitment and retention to increase the graduate population from 6% to 7%.
 - 4) as campus population increases, it is important to have facilities that can accommodate growth. The state budget approved in October included \$100 million for UC Merced. Approximately \$81 million will be used to construct the Science and Engineering II building. A site dedication is set for mid-January. Meanwhile, occupancy of the new Social Science and Management building is scheduled for Fall 2011. UCM continues to work with UCOP for funding of a proposed classroom and academic office building.
- B. The search for a new dean in Natural Sciences has begun. Dean Maria Pallavicini is moving to the University of the Pacific to serve as their new Provost. A search committee has been assembled and is almost complete.
 - C. The committee for advising President Yudof for the chancellor's search gathered on November 1st. Committee members met with several campus groups that provided insight helpful in evaluating candidates.
In closing, Chancellor Kang stated "the work you do for this campus is greatly appreciated."

EVC/Provost Keith Alley

EVC Alley thanked Bob Anderson and Dan Simmons for attending the meeting.

- A. Faculty Hiring- A plan was mentioned for the addition of 50 faculty lines over the next three years. This year there are 24 active searches that have been allocated, SSHA 12 searches, Natural Science 8 searches, Science and Engineering 4 searches. This does not include selected investment lines, UCM will start competition for these lines in Spring. The call for those proposals will go out in January for the five strategic initiative areas and evaluations of the proposals will start in the new semester.
- B. Dean Search Committee, School of Natural Sciences- The search committee has been assembled for the Dean of Natural Science. The announcement will go out today to the members of the committee and faculty in Natural Science. It is the hope to use the same search firm used for the last two successful searches. The timing – assemble the candidates for review in early March, evaluate the applications by the end of March, conduct approximately 15 airport interviews in late March or early April then bring the top 5-6 candidates to UCM in the end of April or beginning of May before the semester ends.
- C. Hellman Family Fund- UCM has been chosen along with UC Berkeley, UC Davis, UC Santa Barbara, and UC Santa Cruz to be part of the Hellman Family Fund. This will provide UCM with \$500,000 over five years to help support junior faculty research. It

requires a minimal proposal of a couple of pages, with the stipulation that the recipients go to lunch with the Hellmans because they want to learn about what the faculty are doing on campus. UCM will avoid any administrative costs to the program with all funding going into the granting process. An evaluation will be conducted at the end of the five years, hopefully making the funding permanent. Eventually the funding will go into a foundation as an endowment for continual funding. A substantial amount of the funding will go to SSHA related areas, as part of a stipulation that the money goes to areas that do not have adequate funding. It does not mean UCM can't fund other projects in sciences and engineering.

- D. Student Admission 2011- Application data for students look good, currently up about 10% from last year at approximately 13,000. Each year UCM has gone into the UC referral pool on its own volition with concern for filling classes. This year, there was discussion to be selective but UCOP has urged UCM to continue to use the referral pool even if it is in a more selective way. This way UCOP can continue to state that they are providing access to every qualified student that applies to UC.

- E. Budget- In terms of the past five years, this has been an exceptional year for UCM. Revenues on the operating side are up about 16% over last year. However, there is indication that there will be some mid-year rescission in the budget to the UC. The numbers vary from \$100 million to \$200 million. This year the legislature restored the one time \$305 million cut and have put it into two different pots, approximately \$200 million in permanent money and the remainder in one time ARRA money. There are two bigger issues for the coming year regarding the budget. The first is the \$5 million of continuing money that UCM received this year on a one time basis. This year the funding would have gone away but the state allocated \$5 million. UCM had asked for a permanent allocation of \$5 million into the base to increase the base from \$10 million to \$15 million. UCM has spoken to UCOP who will continue to work on getting the money instilled as part of the permanent budget. Next year, the potential for new revenue with an enrollment increase of about 600 students means UCM will have approximately \$15 million to \$16 million in new revenue. The second issue for this coming budget cycle is funding the class and academic office building, surge building, which is a \$20 million or \$40 million building. UCOP will go to the legislature to ask for revenue bond money to fund the building, as part of the \$795 million request for capital. UCM is on the higher priority list for the money. It may not be a hard sell as it is a way to stimulate economic growth for the building industry for a severely impacted area of the state. This was part of the rationale to build the S&E II building. If the funding is approved, UCM will build a \$40 million building for an increase in classroom space as well as office and dry laboratory space for graduate students.

System-wide Academic Senate Chair Dan Simmons

Chair Simmons reported he had a good discussion with Keith Alley and Mary Miller regarding budget issues and the future of UCM. He has been a long time supporter of the campus, on the original site selection committee and at UCOP helping keep the idea of UCM alive. Chair Simmons presented a report from the system-wide Senate.

- A. The Regents will be considering the President's recommendations for post employment benefits with a new tier plan and retiree health changes on December 13th. The finance

plan issues will go to the Regents in March. All UC campuses will be experiencing a massive hit financially as employee/employer contributions to the pension plan ramp up. Also at the December 13th meeting, the Regents will receive the Report of the Commission of the Future. There are some good ideas in the report but it is not an overall strategic plan for the university. There is a soft recommendation against differential tuitions on the campuses and to possibly force all campuses to go to semesters. The Senate is actively engaged in the strategic planning process. It has been discussed in the past that the Academic Council recommended to the Commission on the Future to reduce the number of buildings UC is building and reduce faculty. Harry Powell has been asked by the Academic Council to chair a committee on planning for the university. The committee has been meeting this fall and includes faculty that were on the Gould Commission work groups. The committee has the active participation of approximately 15 of the 40 original people. They have produced an interim report as part of the meeting call for yesterday's Academic Assembly meeting. The report is more focused on principles than specific action items. The committee is meeting in early January to identify action items. Additionally, the council is bringing together a group of people who are regular participants in budget talks with Provost Pitts to function as a separate senate group to identify action items and quantify some of the recommendations in the strategic planning report. The Commission on the Future report is really not a long term strategic plan for the university. At the September meeting President Yudof spoke about how everyone has a number of priorities that they want pursued including increased access in the university, competitive salaries for faculty, fund the pension plan contributions, increase diversity, get UCM rolling at the level it should be at. But UCOP doesn't have the money to fund these priorities. There was tremendous success in the state budget that was enacted in September but the fear is the funding is likely to, in large part, go away in the special sessions that are coming up. There is a strong feeling that if the Academic Senate does not come up with a plan for the next several years of the university, the UC will continue to move forward on the current plan by raising student fees and downsizing faculty. For the first time in UC history, this year the ladder rank faculty number was reduced by 1% from the prior year. The reduction of the university is happening on an ad hoc basis. Academic planning, even though it is largely an authority delegated to the academic senate, is being undertaken by the Deans, Vice Chancellors and Chancellors as they determine which departments to infill as people retire and leave. It would be a failure if the Senate didn't try to produce something good for the university. The report of the poll committee and work done by the Academic Senate in response to the report will be shared with faculty for advice and review through divisional senates, the time line for this is undetermined.

- B. Budget- The budget adopted by the Regents has an \$87 million item for staff and faculty salaries that is unallocated. It is unclear if any of this money will survive the budget process. The question is how to allocate the money if the budget stays in place. The President is leery to provide an across the board increase for faculty and staff in light of the fee increases adopted at the last Regents meeting. The President is trying to construct a merit plan for staff as a way of accomplishing compensation increases for staff. There are three options to use the money 1) across the board option that doesn't seem to be politically feasible. 2) put the money for faculty in the salary scale; UC is about 30% below the market. 3) give the money to the Chancellors and Vice-Chancellors to use for recruitment and retention, discretionary compensation increases, which is how it is done

at most universities across the country. But one of the things that really makes UC different is the peer reviewed merit and salary scale and it would be nice to protect that. From the Academic Assembly meeting yesterday, most of the feedback seemed favorable to retaining the salary scale. However, 80% of the faculty are off-scale so bumping the salary scale will not help the majority.

- C. Admissions- Soon there will be a change in eligibility for admission into the university. The President is encouraging holistic review. BOARS is pushing to have a human read for each application which will be costly. A resolution regarding holistic review will likely be presented in January. BOARS will look at the resolution this Friday. There is an issue for transfers, one of the Commission on the Future's recommendations is for UC to create more consistent lower division prerequisites for majors across the UC campuses, the idea is to enhance the transfer process. This is legislatively driven to a large extent; legislation SB1440 was signed by the governor and requires community colleges to develop associate transfer degrees and for state universities to accept students with those degrees into majors or related majors on CSU campuses. UC is not part of this deal but there is legislation that requests UC explore more uniform requirements. The Senate is calling together people throughout the system from the five disciplines to explore this call. Biological Sciences and Math met last week and History is this week. Both groups found that there are huge consistencies across the University in what they think is necessary lower division undergraduate preparation. The idea of bringing people from each discipline from all campuses has worked well and has lead to interesting conversations. The other disciplines involved include computer science and psychology.
- D. Chancellor's Search- The faculty search group has met twice and has narrowed down a list of 150 to approximately 60 people. The group is looking for people who understand research or scholarly experience, administrative experience, experience building something, a commitment and involvement in graduate education which is very high on the table, and someone who can walk on the water of Lake Yosemite.

There was a question from EVC/Provost Alley to clarify the salary scale. It was answered that the salary scale would be elevated and bump everyone in salary right away. But there is limited benefit for faculty that are off-scale. With so little money on the table, it might be an opportunity to make a philosophical statement about the importance of maintaining the salary scales in the UC. The Academic Council discussed a mixed plan that adjusts the scales a bit and includes a very small cost of living increase on the grounds that everyone is contributing more to their pensions now. The Academic Council resolution presented to the Assembly in yesterday's meeting gave a 2% increase across the board with a subsequent 5% increment that would be allocated 3% across the board and 2% as a market adjustment that would go to the salary scale. It was returned to the council. But giving a 2% increase across the board is seen as politically risky.

Bob Anderson commented- the on scale salary for professor step nine, which might be obtained if a professor is especially productive over a long career--many people opt to stop at professor step five--is below the average full professor salary for the comparison 8. The scale is completely out of line with any notion of reality in the current academic job market. UC is at a point where it either needs to abandon the scale system or put serious money into the scales. UC can't fall further out of alignment with the market.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

The minutes of the April 22, 2010 Meeting was approved as presented.

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

CAPRA- Chair Shawn Kantor

Fall was a quiet semester for CAPRA. In response to the call from the Provost regarding the strategic plans and proposed resource allocations, CAPRA has streamlined its criteria. CAPRA has reduced its expectations from the schools, only requiring 20 pages in hope to reduce workload at the school level. In the fall, CAPRA spent a lot of time on Post Employee Benefits at the committee level. Next on the agenda is working with the Provost and Vice Provost on instructional budgets; this will be the first time the Senate is involved in this process. ECV/Provost Alley has opened the door to not only discuss FTE but also get involved with funds going to the schools for lecturers, TAs and readers. CAPRA will be reviewing strategic plans in the spring.

CAP- Vice Chair Tom Harmon

CAP, in response to the need to work through most of the summer, has been looking into the academic personnel process and where the bottlenecks are particularly with critical cases such as mid-career appraisals. The number one objective this year is for mid-career appraisals to go through the system on time. CAP will be reviewing approximately 60 cases this year.

CoC- Senate Chair Evan Heit (for COC Chair Jack Vevea)

CoC is filling positions on committees. The committee has requested help from the administration to encourage faculty to serve on administrative committees. The Senate is finding it difficult to locate enough people to serve, with no representation on some committees because there aren't enough faculty. CoC will be working on creating a survey to gather information on faculty interests, with the idea of matching committee vacancies with faculty who have expressed interest.

GRC- Chair Chris Kello

GRC Kello thanked everyone that works on and with the GRC. This semester GRC has been working on graduate recruitment and strategic investment lines.

Graduate Recruitment- UCM wants to increase the ability to recruit the best and the most graduate students possible. First GRC gathered information from the graduate groups on factors that make it difficult to recruit and what would enhance recruitment. The number one factor is lack of faculty. GRC also identified the following important factors; moving the admissions and recruitment calendar earlier so UCM can send out offers in a more timely fashion, knowing how many TA slots are available at an earlier time, providing money for recruitment activities such as visits, offer enhancements and fellowships. The Provost made \$500,000 available for graduate student support last year and has done the same for this year. This semester, GRC has taken \$100,000 of the money allocated and has distributed amounts to graduate groups for recruiting purposes in particular and will continue to assign the money throughout the year.

EVC/Provost Alley added that there will be \$500,000 in funds for the same purpose next year with the intent to continue funding in the future. After three years, there will be a review on how the money was spent while also looking at the opportunity fund to see if UCM can enhance graduate funding. There is a small campaign put together by development, \$10 million. They

have already raised \$3.4 million for student scholarships; of that \$1.3 million is directed specifically toward graduate student scholarship.

There was a question on how the remainder of the \$500,000 will be spent this year. GRC Chair Kello responded that NRTs will be the majority of the fund with roughly half for recruiting new students and half for current students. Last year GRC had a competition for summer stipends. There is NRT money left from last year, so there is potential to have twice as many NRT's this year as compared to last.

GRC has been drafting a solicitation for the five strategic investment lines. The draft was given to DivCo, which is working with EVC/Provost Alley and the administration. The draft should be distributed soon.

UGC- Chair Susan Amussen

Program Review- Last year UGC pioneered the first program review. This year UGC will begin its regular process for program review in which UCM will evaluate 4 to 5 programs per year. The procedures have been redesigned so they are comprehensible, shorter and clearer. The procedures were designed so all programs can use the process in a way that makes sense for each area.

Admissions process for UC will change for the class that applies next fall 2011. The admissions sub-committee is beginning to discuss the UCM processes for selection. The assumption is UCM will have a bigger pool of students and the UC will have to select from this pool which will require additional criteria. Up until now the criteria have been 1) does the student meet the UC eligibility index 2) are they in the top 12.5% of high school graduates in the state of California. Next year the task will require more criteria. A study has shown that none of the traditional predictors actually work. In talking about who will be successful, it can't be predicted with grade point average at UCM by high school grade point average and by SAT scores; these are not effective predictors. So, in terms of existing data, these can't be the only screens.

CRE- Chair Nella Van Dyke

Bylaw 55 Units- Proposals for the four Bylaw 55 units from the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts were reviewed. CRE made sure the bylaws in the units were consistent with UCM, the APM and the Regents' standing orders. The review is complete and will be transmitted to the administration for final approval.

School specific regulations added to Division regulations- UCM has Division regulations that are school-wide academic policies but there tends to be a variation at each School such as minimum GPA for courses in a major and school-wide curriculum requirements. CRE had SSHA's list of policies. CRE requested and have just received policies from Natural Science and Engineering. In the spring CRE will work on implementing the policies and putting them into the division regulations. A draft will be circulated to the Schools and faculty for input once it is complete.

Academic Degree Policy- CRE has continued work from last year on the policy for how new academic programs are approved. CRE cleaned up the flowchart and a few other minor issues. It was discovered that UCM bylaws delegate approval of graduate degrees to both DivCo and GRC, so some bylaws will need a little more clean up. The Academic Policy will be circulated to the faculty in the spring.

EVC/Provost Alley inquired about how UCM is handling double majors. UCM has a new policy on multiple majors which makes it harder to complete a double major. The number of courses that can overlap between majors has been reduced. The policy is now written so it applies to multiple majors. If a student wants to triple major, UCM has a policy that spells out the requirements and requires the dean's approval.

V. DISCUSSION ITEMS

UC Merced-San Joaquin Valley PRIME Program

Chair Heit- There is great interest in UCM offering medical education. UCM has received an outside grant from United Health. Some of this money has been given to UC Davis for a program called the UC Merced San Joaquin Valley PRIME Program (at UC Davis). UCM should think about how this program will benefit our campus. Documents The program was not developed with consultation from the Senate. EVC/Provost Alley has suggested a Memorandum of Understanding or MOU between the UCM and UCD administrations. Chair Heit would like to start the conversation on how UC Merced can benefit from the program in terms of research and faculty.

Comments were made that UCM is already looking at healthcare disparities in the Psychology and Sociology groups; it would be a good idea to consult with these faculty to find out ways in which they can be supported. Chair Heit responded by talking about UCM's HSRI, Health Sciences Research Institute. HSRI has not had an opportunity to be part of the PRIME program as of this date. There is a great opportunity to involve HSRI faculty and students with the PRIME program. EVC/Provost Alley stated that Don Hilty from UC Davis and the PRIME program would be meeting with Andy LiWang and Jan Wallander from HSRI next week. It was stated by CAPRA Chair Shawn Kantor that when he met with Fred Meyer, co-director of PRIME, Fred Meyer stated that UCM faculty are on the admissions committee therefore they are consulting with faculty. Members of Divisional Council had a frank meeting with representatives from UC Davis which has led to some progress.

The PRIME program directs physician training for particular areas, rural and inner-city. It was expressed that it is peculiar that PRIME in a UC Davis medical school program that is called UC Merced program. There is concern from DivCo that UCM has no control over something that is named after UCM. EVC/Provost Alley stated that part of what needs to be included in the MOU is identifying control points. It was expressed that the MOU should outline targets or offer a time line to shift the responsibility and benefits to UCM. Chair Heit noted that the UCM admissions website takes you to the UC Davis site if you click the link to apply to the UCM PRIME program. The Davis website states that this is a new curriculum and there are new admissions criteria for the program. UCM should be able to see in writing the new admissions and curriculum requirements.

EVC/Provost Alley said the program has 150 applications for 6 spots; of those the group has been reduced to 60 people that will be interviewed. Approximately half of the interviews have been completed. There are four current students and alumni from UC Merced in the group. It seems UC Davis will take a relatively traditional approach in the curriculum for the first two years in Sacramento and then they will move in some capacity to UC Merced. There will be some introduction in the first two years to rural health issues and disparities, sociology and social psychology.

It was stated that UCM shouldn't underestimate the political importance of trying to answer the concerns of people in the area. The PRIME program could help address the local concerns about the campus doing enough for valley health care since UCM currently can't afford to add many more premeds. UCM can't take more biology students with only 15 faculty and 1000 students. There was concern that the program could backfire on UCM's credibility since the perception in the community is that UCM will have a medical school. The response affirmed the same concerns and that is why an MOU is important to spell out the UCM connection to the program.

To close the discussion, Chair Heit expressed, with EVC/Provost Alley's agreement, that UC Davis is now taking steps to include UCM faculty. There will be more meetings in the future. There is also talk with Don Hilty for the possibility of UCD and UCM pursuing additional fundraising to move the program forward. Chair Heit hopes this is the beginning of an open conversation for members to take to their Schools.

ACTION: Members to communicate the discussion with colleagues and share comments and concerns with DivCo.

Academic Personnel Processes

Vice Chair Anne Kelley reported that DivCO has explored academic personnel process. Most faculty have been up for some type of personnel action and are aware of the voluminous amount of material that one has to generate and the many revisions that take place through AP and the schools before a case is allowed to go forward. APC Chairs are even more acutely aware of the amount of proofreading and fact checking that goes into these cases before they move forward. No matter how hard the schools try, things are sent back by the academic personnel office for reasons that are felt as trivial and not addressing academic issues. Some cases were sent back for punctuation and spelling. There is strong belief in the value of having a peer review merit advancement system. CAP is doing what it is supposed to be doing by applying appropriate criteria and making appropriate decisions. But the concern is the perception that the AP staff is being excessively particular in trying to make sure every case that goes to CAP is perfect in every way including in ways that do not matter. DivCo has had discussions with the VP for Academic Personnel, with EVC/Provost Alley and the school AP staff. It has been determined that the MAPP will be significantly revised. 1) Unwritten rules that have been applied to cases in the past must be written in the MAPP. 2) Anything not in the MAPP will not be a rule. 3) There should be some explicit statement in the MAPP stating rules that are not in the MAPP should be adjudicated by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and/or the Provost. The hope is to streamline the process to A) make sure all the legalistic issues relating to personnel matters are properly dealt with and B) from the faculty perspective, make sure the appropriate standards for advancement and promotion are being applied.

Concern was raised by a member that there may be a problem with implementation, as there are issues regarding personnel and personalities as much as issues about policy. The discussion continued that the way around this is to have policies clearly spelled out in the MAPP so that CAP, AP and the schools understand the policies. There seems to be staffing issues at the AP office and in the schools and how they are working together.

ACTION: Please share your thoughts on these issues with members of DivCo.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

EVC/Provost Alley asked to mention WASC. EVC/Provost Alley personally thanked Gregg Camfield in being instrumental in the success with the CPR and what EVC/Provost Alley believes we will be equally successful with the Educational Effectiveness Review. Chair Heit also extended thanks to everyone in the room as most have been involved in the accreditation process.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:32 pm.

Attest:

Evan Heit, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Kymm Carlson

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.

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.

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.

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 require 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.

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

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:

- (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).

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

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 st week	students may add if space available
2 nd - 3 rd week	with instructor's approval
after 3 rd 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 4th and 10th 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 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 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)

PART II SCHOOL REGULATIONS FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

SECTION 1: SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING REQUIREMENTS

101. MAJOR COURSE REQUIREMENTS

All students in the School of Engineering, regardless of major, are required to complete all requirements for all majors with a C- or better (effective Fall 2009) for entering and readmitted students.

160. REPETITION OF COURSES

Students in the School of Engineering cannot repeat a course for the third time after receiving a grade of D+, D, D-, F, U or Not Passed for the course two times.

SECTION 2: SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES REQUIREMENTS

200. COURSE REQUIREMENTS

A. General Education Requirements

In addition to University requirements, students pursuing a degree within the School of Natural Sciences are required to complete at least 46 units of general education courses and at least 47 semester units of upper division coursework.

Lower Division General Education Requirements:

Students must complete all pre-requisites to major requirements with a C- or better.

B. Major Course Requirements

Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements

Students must complete all major requirements with a C- or better and maintain a 2.0 GPA in all major course work.

Major Coursework Requirements

Students must complete all major courses with a letter grade option.

C. Minor Course Requirements

Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements

- Students must complete all minor requirements with a C- or better and must maintain a 2.0 GPA in all minor coursework.
- To declare a minor, students must have an overall grade point average of 2.0 (C) or better.

Minor Coursework Requirements

Students should consult with the School of Natural Sciences Advising Office to officially declare the minor and plan their courses. The following guidelines must be adhered to:

- At least five courses, four of which must be upper division, must be taken for a letter grade.
- At least three of the required courses must be taken at UC Merced.
- Only one course may be used to satisfy two minor programs' requirements.
- Only one course may be used to satisfy both a minor and a major requirement.
- Work for the minor must be completed within the 150 unit maximum limit for graduation.
- If the student's major and minor are in different schools, the higher unit maximum will apply.
- Students must consult the UC Merced General Catalog for prerequisites to required courses.
- The minor will appear on the student's transcript and diploma.

265. ACADEMIC PROBATION, DISMISSAL, AND MINIMUM PROGRESS

A. Academic Probation

Enrollment Limits

Students on academic probation will not be permitted to register in more than 16 units per semester and may not elect to take courses with a P/NP grading option in courses that are optionally graded.

B. Dismissal Policies

Reinstatement

Students who have been removed from the major for academic reasons must meet the following requirements in order to petition to be re-admitted to the School of Natural Sciences.

- Cumulative University of California grade point average of at least 2.0
- Current semester grade point average of at least 2.0
- Grade point average in School of Natural Sciences courses of 2.5
- Completion of all lower division courses with grades of C- or higher

If students do not complete these requirements, they may take these courses at another institution and petition to be readmitted to the School of Natural Sciences.

C. Minimum Progress Policy (*Added Spring 2010*)

Majors in the School of Natural Sciences are competitive and space is limited. Students must make appropriate degree progress to remain in any Natural Sciences major.

Students in the Natural Sciences must meet the following requirements to continue in the School: All students must pass the following courses with a C- or better, **prior to the start of the third regular (Fall/Spring) semester**. Students may repeat a course only one time (for a total of two attempts to earn a C- or better).

- Either MATH 05 or MATH 011 or MATH 021
- Either CHEM 001 or 002

SECTION 3: SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

300. Course Requirements

A. General Education Requirements

In addition to University requirements, students pursuing a degree within the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts (SSHA) are required to complete 48 units of general education courses. Please see the "General Education" section of the current University catalog for more information.

Lower Division General Education Requirements

- Students must complete all lower-division general education requirements with a “D” or better.
- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of lower division general education courses with a pass/no pass grading option.
- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of lower division general education courses at an institution other than UC Merced.

Upper Division General Education Requirements

- Students must complete all upper-division general education requirements with a “D” or better.
- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of upper division general education courses with a pass/no pass grading option.
- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of transferrable upper division general education courses at an institution other than UC Merced.

B. Major Course Requirements

Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements

- Students must complete all major pre-requisites with a C- or better.
- Students must complete all major requirements with a C- or better and maintain a 2.0 GPA in all major course work.

Major Coursework Requirements

- Students must complete all major pre-requisites with a letter grade option.
- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of the total number of units of upper division major coursework with a pass/no pass grading option.

C. Minor Course Requirements

Grade Point Average (GPA) Requirements

- Students must complete all minor requirements with a C or better and must maintain a 2.0 GPA in all minor coursework.
- ARTS minors must maintain a 2.7 GPA in all minor coursework.

Minor Coursework Requirements

- Students must complete all minor courses with a letter grade option
- At least three (3) of the courses for the minor must be taken at UC Merced.
- If designated as fulfilling general education, courses in the minor may satisfy general education requirements.

- Only one (1) course may be used to satisfy both a minor and a major requirement.
- Only one (1) course may be used to satisfy two minor programs' requirements.

D. Coursework at Other Institutions

Unit Limits

- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of lower division and 1/3 of upper division general education courses at institutions other than UC Merced.
- Students are not permitted to take more than 1/3 of the total number of lower division major pre-requisites and 1/3 of the total number of upper division major requirements at institutions other than UC Merced. Limits on upper division coursework may vary by major, please contact the SSHA Advising Office for more information.

Course Approvals

Students must obtain pre-approval through the SSHA Advising Office for all courses completed at institutions other than UC Merced.

365. ACADEMIC PROBATION

Enrollment Limits

Students on academic probation will not be permitted to register in more than 16 units per semester and may not elect to take courses with a P/NP grading option in courses that are optionally graded.



OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
EVAN HEIT, CHAIR
ehait@ucmerced.edu

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

March 4, 2011

EVC/PROVOST KEITH ALLEY

RE: TEACHING RELIEF FOR UNTENURED FACULTY

The Divisional Council has discussed how best to support junior faculty, specifically if there should be a more systematic way of giving assistant professors a teaching break after their midcareer reviews to focus on research. The Senate staff surveyed the other UC campuses, as well as the Comparison 8 Institutions. Campus policies varied, and fell into two categories:

1. Mentoring support: offered through a variety of offices, sometimes for all junior faculty, but also targeted particularly at women and underrepresented minorities; also at family support issues. This is done at the University, school and department level. What seems to be important is establishing this as an institutional practice, rather than an individual one. Training for mentors is often part of the process.
2. Teaching release: Policies for teaching release were more varied than those on mentoring. Most were at the School or Department level, and often these were practices rather than policy. Some universities have competitive grants for junior faculty which allow them a quarter, semester or year of leave (UCLA, UCI, UCSB, Michigan); in other cases the teaching release is automatic (e.g., Stanford).

On the basis of this, Divco recommends:

1. Each school should develop a mentoring policy for junior faculty. The Deans should consult with the executive committee of their schools to establish effective programs, which provide a mentor close to a faculty member's field who, ideally, does not vote on personnel actions; in most cases this will be someone from another UC campus. A small amount of funding will be necessary to support this. This needs to be a joint project, with Deans providing funding and faculty such as academic personnel chairs collaborating in building and implementing the policy. Information about the available resources for mentoring should be available on the Academic Personnel website.

2. A central source of information and advice for families is frequently available at other universities, and this would be a useful addition to the AP website.
3. Funding for junior faculty research leaves (separate from semesters when new faculty have a teaching release to set up a lab) should be a priority. Given the current budget situation, it might be useful to start with a competitive grant program. This could be a fund raising priority. In addition, Deans and faculty should work together to increase flexibility, so that it may be possible for an assistant professor to rearrange teaching so that there is a semester free from teaching to prepare for the tenure review.

Establishing both a clear mentoring policy and junior faculty research leaves will help ensure the success of our colleagues who are in a critical stage of their careers.



Evan Heit, Chair

cc: David Ojcius, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
Nancy Tanaka, Assistant Vice Chancellor
DivCo Members



SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
P.O. BOX 2039
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-7742
FAX (209) 228-4007

MEMO

To: Senate Faculty

From: The Ad Hoc Committee on Course Evaluations
Carolyn Frank (GRC)
Laura Martin (SACA)
Nella Van Dyke (DIVCO, Committee Chair)

Date: March 29, 2011

Re: course evaluations

In January of 2010, the Divisional Council formed an Ad Hoc Committee on Course Evaluations in response to the following feedback from WASC:

- in the Report of the WASC Visiting Team Educational Effectiveness Review, May 2007, it was stated that “course evaluation forms used by the Schools varied greatly and in general did not engage students in assessing their learning with respect to the objectives of the course” (p. 22) and “We encourage the faculty in the Schools, CAP and the administration to engage in serious consideration of how the evaluation of teaching effectiveness will be related to the stated program goals for student learning.” (p.40)
- in UC Merced’s Capacity and Preparatory Report, July 2009, it was proposed that “Before the Educational Effectiveness report is submitted in Fall 2010, the University will have established a uniform set of questions about teaching and learning that will appear in all student-course questionnaires. The University’s assessment procedures will ensure that students evaluate learning outcomes as part of course evaluations.”

Based on this information, the Ad Hoc Committee worked with the Curriculum Committees in the three schools to develop a set of uniform course evaluation questions (Objective 1), and two options for evaluating student learning outcomes (Objective 2). The new course evaluation forms have been approved by DivCo and the three schools, and will be used in Spring 2011.

On the following pages you will find the final memo the Committee wrote to the Schools with information on the process as well as the final course evaluation forms.

MEMO

To: Patti LiWang, Chair, Curriculum Committee, School of Natural Sciences
Ariel Escobar, Chair, Curriculum Committee, School of Engineering
Jan Wallander, Chair, Curriculum Committee, School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts

From: The Ad-hoc Committee on Course Evaluations
Carolyn Frank (GRC)
Laura Martin (SACA)
Nella Van Dyke (DIVCO, chair)

Date: 11/19/10

Re: final course evaluations

CC: Mark Aldenderfer, Dean, School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts
Maria Pallavicini, Dean, School of Natural Sciences
Dan Hirleman, Dean, School of Engineering
Cristian Ricci, Chair, SSHA
Mike Colvin, Chair, School of Natural Sciences
Tom Harmon, Chair, School of Engineering
Evan Heit, Senate Chair
Susan Amussen, UGC Chair
Chris Kello, GRC Chair

The Ad-hoc Committee on Course Evaluations once again appreciates the timely and helpful feedback on our proposal provided by the School Curriculum Committees and faculty chairs. All three schools approved the 14 uniform course evaluation questions. All three also approved the 8 questions for evaluating learning outcomes, although SSHA requested 2 additional questions and had suggestions for improving the instructions. We provide additional information on these in the pages that follow, along with the final evaluation questions. We leave it to the schools to implement the new evaluations in the manner they see fit (e.g., scantron, online, etc). We request that the new questions be used for the Spring 2011 course evaluations.

The Committee would again like to thank the three schools for their prompt and helpful attention to this project.

Objective 1: Establish Uniform Course Evaluation Questions

All three schools approved the 14 questions for course evaluation. SSHA's faculty chair suggested some question re-wording which the Committee seriously considered. However, we chose to retain the original wording. The final set of questions, which will be used for student evaluations for every course on campus, are included in the following pages.

Course Evaluation Form

Please print the name of your instructor and the course title and number.

Instructor: _____

Course title and number: _____

Please indicate how this course fits in with your academic program. It is:

1 in my major 2 in my minor 3 a general education requirement 4 an elective 5 other

Use the scale below to rate the following statements:

Disagree Strongly			Neither Agree nor Disagree			Agree Strongly	Not Applicable N/A
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Score

1. This instructor was effective overall.	
2. The instructor's explanations were clear.	
3. In this class, I was treated with respect.	
4. Materials used in this course (text, readings, notes, websites, etc) were useful.	
5. Assigned work was valuable to my learning.	
6. This class was well organized.	
7. I knew what was expected of me in this class.	
8. The instructor was well prepared for class.	
9. There was sufficient time in class for questions and discussion.	
10. The instructor displayed enthusiasm for the subject matter.	
11. Methods of evaluation in this course were fair.	
12. Feedback on my work was valuable to my learning.	
13. The instructor was available for consultation outside of class.	
14. I learned a great deal in this course.	

Please answer the following questions:

1. What do you like most about the course and instructor?

2. What could the instructor do to improve the course, if anything?

3. Other comments or suggestions.

Objective 2: Establish Questions to Evaluate Student Learning Outcomes

Natural Sciences and Engineering faculty approved the set of 8 learning outcome questions proposed by the Course Evaluation Committee in fall of 2010 as well as the proposed method for ensuring that it is clear which outcomes are relevant to a specific class. The SSHA Curriculum Committee approved the 8 questions but had a suggestion and a request. First, they suggested that in addition to instructors completing a form indicating which outcomes are relevant to their course, we include a recommendation that instructors tell their students which outcomes are relevant before they begin the evaluation. This will ensure that students know which questions to focus on and which to indicate were not applicable (N/A). We have modified the instructor form to include this suggestion.

SSHA requested that the final set of learning outcome questions include two questions from the previous version that we had cut: those regarding “gaining factual knowledge” and “understanding fundamental concepts and principles,” for a total of 10 questions. In order to accommodate their request while addressing faculty concerns regarding questionnaire length, we have provided two versions of the student learning outcomes evaluation forms. One includes the 8 questions proposed by the Course Evaluation Committee in the fall of 2010, the other includes the 8 questions and the additional 2 requested by SSHA. Faculty in Natural Sciences and Engineering can choose which form they would prefer to use.

Version 1: 8 Learning Outcome Questions (schools must select which version to use)

Instructor Form:

Instructor: _____

Course title and number: _____

As part of course assessment students are being provided with a series of questions regarding learning objectives. They are asked to indicate the extent to which the course contributed to their progress on UCM's institutional learning objectives.

We recommend that you tell your class which learning outcomes are relevant to your course before they begin completing their evaluation form.

Please indicate which of the following are desired learning outcomes for your course by putting an X by each relevant objective. If the objective is not one that is applicable to your course, then leave it blank. Turn this form in to the office staff who handle course evaluations.

	1. Learning to apply knowledge, concepts, principles, or theories to a specific situation or problem.
	2. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments or points of view.
	3. Developing communication skills (oral or writing).
	4. Learning to value diverse perspectives in both global and community contexts.
	5. Following ethical practices in the profession or discipline.
	6. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team.
	7. Gaining a broader appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
	8. Gaining skills that will help me realize my full potential.

Student Form

Appraisal of Progress (Note: only to be included with primary instructor evaluation)

Instructor: _____

Course title and number: _____

How much did this course contribute to your progress on the following UC Merced institutional learning objectives?

Use N/A if the learning objective was not specifically addressed in this course.

Not at all			Moderately			Very highly	Not Applicable N/A
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Statements

Score

1. Learning to apply knowledge, concepts, principles, or theories to a specific situation or problem.	
2. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments or points of view.	
3. Developing communication skills (oral or writing).	
4. Learning to value diverse perspectives in both global and community contexts.	
5. Following ethical practices in the profession or discipline.	
6. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team.	
7. Gaining a broader appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)	
8. Gaining skills that will help me realize my full potential.	

Version 2 - 10 Learning Outcome Questions (Schools must select which version to use)

Instructor Form:

Instructor: _____

Course title and number: _____

As part of course assessment students are being provided with a series of questions regarding learning objectives. They are asked to indicate the extent to which the course contributed to their progress on UCM's institutional learning objectives.

We recommend that you tell your class which learning outcomes are relevant to your course before they begin completing their evaluation form.

Please indicate which of the following are desired learning outcomes for your course by putting an X by each relevant objective. If the objective is not one that is applicable to your course, then leave it blank. Turn this form in to the office staff who handle course evaluations.

	1. Gaining factual knowledge.
	2. Understanding fundamental concepts and principles.
	3. Learning to apply knowledge, concepts, principles, or theories to a specific situation or problem.
	4. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments or points of view.
	5. Developing communication skills (oral or writing).
	6. Learning to value diverse perspectives in both global and community contexts.
	7. Following ethical practices in the profession or discipline.
	8. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team.
	9. Gaining a broader appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)
	10. Gaining skills that will help me realize my full potential.

Appraisal of Progress (Note: only to be included with primary instructor evaluation)

Instructor: _____

Course title and number: _____

How much did this course contribute to your progress on the following UC Merced institutional learning objectives?
Use N/A if the learning objective was not specifically addressed in this course.

Not at all			Moderately			Very highly	Not Applicable N/A
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Statements

Score

1. Gaining factual knowledge.	
2. Understanding fundamental concepts and principles.	
3. Learning to apply knowledge, concepts, principles, or theories to a specific situation or problem.	
4. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments or points of view.	
5. Developing communication skills (oral or writing).	
6. Learning to value diverse perspectives in both global and community contexts.	
7. Following ethical practices in the profession or discipline.	
8. Acquiring skills in working with others as a member of a team.	
9. Gaining a broader appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity (music, science, literature, etc.)	
10. Gaining skills that will help me realize my full potential.	