

**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 their service on Senate committees, which is appreciated by all colleagues and people that serve on committees. He thanked faculty that are serving on Divisional Council, noting that 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 Ally and Chancellor Steve Kang for attending the meeting and welcomed and introduced the 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 campus 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. 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’s 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 expand our measures of success beyond undergraduate student numbers. UCM should look at other ways that make us distinctive and pay attention to research and graduate numbers. Soon UCM will be an accredited university. Once accredited, UCM will appear in national rankings and initially rankings will be low. The campus needs a strategy for boosting national and international representation as a research university. In addition to growth, another measure of UCM’s 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 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 strategic 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 Science- 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