

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
April 12, 2012
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, April 12, 2012 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Susan Amussen presiding.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Susan Amussen

The Divisional Council has engaged in numerous discussions on long-range policy issues and issues that have come up from the various committees.

The Systemwide Senate has focused much of its discussion on the University's budget framework. The Office of the President has been in negotiation with the Department of Finance for some months and will begin deliberation with the Legislature. This arrangement is dependent on the passage of the Governor's/Millionaires' Tax Initiative in the fall. If it does not pass we will be facing \$2 million in cuts to the system. The Memorial to the Regents, which will be discussed later, is explicitly designed to ask the Regents to endorse the tax initiative and any legislative proposals that will increase revenue for higher education.

Candidates for the EVC/Provost position will visit the campus on April 23, April 27, May 4 and May 10. Each School will have an hour to meet with each candidate.

Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, Keith Alley

Enrollment

Enrollment SIRs are coming in and we are in the same trajectory as we were last year. However, this year we will only take 400 students over base rather than 600 over base. There are a lot of things that will need to happen at the end of this process that may not be easy, but in terms of enrollment, the campus is on progress.

Budget

We have two more years of support from the MOU, which means we will receive \$6 million in 2012-2013 and again in 2013-2014. You may know about the rebenching exercise that is going on. For planning and implementation purposes UC Merced and UC San Francisco are being held separate from the other campuses. The University intends to distribute new state revenue to the campuses based on an undecided formula. Merced is being held out of the model because it still needs financial assistance in addition to state enrollment dollars. At some future date UC Merced will go back to the pool in terms of the distribution of revenue. This will not happen for a couple of years, at which point we will face a comprehensive review of our financial state.

Faculty Full-Time Employment (FTE)

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

This year and the next two years, we have committed to ramping up the number of faculty hires. 22 searches will go forward in 2012-2013. An extra two positions have already been set up for strategic hires. This will be a reasonable step-up from what has been done in the past: only 16 to 18 allocations annually. Our student enrollments have grown at a faster pace than our faculty hires, translating into a larger and larger student-to-faculty ratio and increasing our distance from the systemwide average. We need to get up to twenty-five new faculty hires per year (not including replacement hires) in order to close this gap. The anticipated 22 allocations will not close the gap, but it will bring us closer to where we need to be. This year we had 24 new positions that we searched for since we had a large number of faculty who left or retired. We need to continue growing the size of the faculty and to increase retention.

Carnegie Classification

In 2012-2013 we will begin collecting data for the Carnegie Classification, which will take place in 2015. 2013-2014 is the actual year of record, but the data for research expenditures will be taken from the prior fiscal year and will be reported this February. Basically, what we have in terms of research dollars is what we should expect to have. We have looked at other relatively small universities, i.e., 8 to 12,000 students, to see how they are classified, their research expenditure per capita and their doctoral candidate graduation rates. Currently, the campus is below average in those categories. One of the problems that we have is that the Foundation looks at expenditures per faculty member using the IPEDS system for collecting data, which includes all lecturers in its faculty count. This basically halves our per-capita research expenditures. The Foundation will review the number of doctorates we graduate, which must be at least 20 in order to qualify as a Research University in any category. Dean of the Graduate Division Samuel Traina has a complete plan for achieving our goals, and the recent audit indicates that we are fairly close to our targets.

A question was asked of EVC/Provost Keith Alley: How many ladder-rank faculty do we have and how many do we expect to lose this year? EVC/Provost Alley stated that there are 156 ladder-rank faculty, three of which we might lose.

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson

Senate Chair Anderson will participate by phone.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

The December 1, 2011 Meeting Minutes were approved with minor changes.

IV. APPROVAL OF UC MERCED REGULATIONS REVISION

CRE Chair Rick Dale proposed revisions to the Regulations. The Multiple Major Policy was approved by UGC in Fall 2010. The policy would place restrictions on the number of overlapping credits that students can take towards separate majors. As a result CRE proposed the addition of the Multiple Major Policy to the UC Merced Regulations in section 55 "Normal Progress to Degree" (PART I.55.B).

A motion was made, seconded and carried to approve the addition of the Multiple Major Policy to the UC Merced Regulations.

V. DISCUSSION ITEM

A. Memorial to the Regents

Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson reported that at the last Regents meeting Proposition 30 was discussed. The discussion highlighted the Regents' hesitancy to endorse the proposed tax measure due to its failure to guarantee that the University would actually receive its share of revenue and to their hope of negotiating a better deal with the Legislature. A concern remains that the Regents will not support the tax measure and thus the proposed Memorial to the Regents would assist in persuading the Regents to support this possible revenue increase for the system. If the Regents vote against endorsing the tax measure, it will not be well received by students and faculty members who will be most affected by a loss in revenue. Currently, only UC Berkeley has provided feedback to the Systemwide Senate; the campus indicated that an overwhelming 90 percent of voters support the tax measure. Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Robert Anderson urged the Merced Division to do everything possible to get the majority of the faculty to support the proposition. The deadline for the Merced Division to vote on the Memorial to the Regents is April 19.

B. Shared Governance in the Schools

Chair Amussen opened a discussion regarding the obstacles Merced has faced in establishing effective shared governance within the Schools. This has been a recurring issue and has been discussed with Chancellor Leland, EVC Alley and the Division Council. Identifying effective frameworks for shared governance in the Schools has been a challenge, especially with regard to the role of the Department Chair as outlined in APM 245. At UC Merced, this role is divided among various individuals. For example, the Deans manage the office staff and budgets, the chairs of the academic units handle personnel actions, Academic Units do not always coincide with undergraduate or graduate programs, and while some Academic Units support multiple undergraduate programs, other undergraduate programs are staffed by faculty from multiple academic units. Consequently, the campus does not have a transparent structure. It has become increasingly difficult to 1) figure out where groups and personnel belong, 2) determine who or which unit is responsible for specific decisions, and 3) build a governance and consultation culture in the Schools that is parallel to that at the campus level. We want to begin a discussion on what some of the possible models are, and this is where Systemwide Senate Chair Anderson's experience will be very helpful. We also struggle in part with the relative roles of the Deans and the Chairs especially since some of their responsibilities and authorities are not clearly delineated.

Systemwide Chair Bob Anderson stated that he was not very familiar with a governance structure such as that described by Chair Amussen. However, Merced is relatively small, and even in the larger campuses there are instances where Deans have fewer faculty than departments. Generally, the School Executive Committees ensure that shared governance is

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

maintained within the Schools. Chair Anderson inquired as to the state of the Schools' Executive Committees.

Chair Amussen stated that SSHA has a newly constituted Executive Committee; Engineering has a Chair but not necessarily a functioning Executive Committee, and Natural Sciences has nothing. The campus is migrating from working as a committee of the whole towards functioning with structured school committees.

One member expressed concern with the general lack of clarity on campus between Senate committees that are elected by the faculty representing the faculty versus Dean-appointed committees. Every School will have a combination of these committees and identifying the functions for each would be helpful. Chair Amussen added that clarifying the overall role of the Executive Committees will also help avoid ambiguity.

Systemwide Chair Bob Anderson responded that the roles of the Executive Committees vary from campus to campus. For example, at UC Berkeley the Budget Committee is responsible for approving and advising the allocation of FTE lines to departments, whereas at UC Merced the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) has this responsibility. Also in terms of the submissions of FTE lines, larger schools that have departments have the Executive Committee advice the Deans in that regard. Systemwide Chair Anderson offered to contact the Systemwide Vice-Chair Bob Powell for advice having served as Chair of the UC Davis Division for three years.

Chair Amussen agreed that consulting with Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell would be beneficial.

A faculty member commented that APM 245 duties are at times divided among seven different people. FAOs are responsible for reports for a program which sometimes are part of the faculty chair responsibilities; department chairs as defined in APM 245 are also responsible for research and graduate groups, and then we have to incorporate the program leads and academic personnel.

One member commented that perhaps Merced should consider creating some uniformity in the Schools. For example, the Senate could have the Chairs of Bylaw units be academic program leads as well. Traditionally, those responsibilities have been assigned to one person, but at Merced they are not.

Systemwide Chair Anderson mentioned that Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell had joined the meeting via telephone. Chair Amussen welcomed the Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell and explained the challenges the campus faces with regards to shared governance in the Schools and the various roles of faculty.

Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell stated that he understood that the role of the School Executive Committees varies across campuses and their respective colleges and schools. For example, UC Davis has five colleges, and in some cases Executive Committees will be independent of their respective Deans and in other instances they are closely integrated with the Dean's Office. UC

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

Davis' College of Engineering had eight departments and each department appointed a member to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee would generally vet new programs before they were reviewed by the College. The committee would also consult with the Deans regarding budget matters. The Executive Committee had a committee structure that parallel that of the Davis Division. At the UC Davis College of Letters and Science the Executive Committee was responsible for reviewing new courses and petitions from students. I can review the structures and roles of each Executive Committee at UC Davis if it would be beneficial for you. Chair Amussen mentioned that it would be helpful as the discussion of shared governance in Schools will be a long-standing issue for the Merced Division.

A faculty member asked for clarification on what Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell meant by the Executive Committee "theoretically would consult with the Deans regarding budget matters."

Systemwide Chair Anderson responded that UC Davis struggled with the budget committee and even at the systemwide level UCPB had to fight to get reasonable access to budget information. Focusing on the faculty Executive Committees, UC Davis had at times over the past decade a very orderly process where Deans submitted annual budget proposals to the Executive Committees. Once the Executive Committees discussed the proposals, they would be transmitted to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget. The Deans and the Chairs of the Executive Committees would attend the Committee on Planning and Budget meeting when the proposals were reviewed and discussed. This facilitated an excellent exercise in consultation. However, the process became side tracked with the budget chaos, and the extent of planning severely faded.

Systemwide Chair Anderson recommended that UC Merced contact one of the smaller campuses, perhaps UC Santa Cruz, since it is the second smallest campus. It might be helpful to contact Santa Cruz Senate Chair Susan Gillman to see if there is anyone still around from when their Executive Committee structure was established. Chair Anderson emphasized that Merced research campuses that similarly lacked School Structures for a long time.

Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell asked for clarification on who currently reviews new courses at UC Merced. Chair Amussen responded that in SSHA, new courses are first reviewed at the Bylaw unit level, then by the School Curriculum Committee and then finally by the Senate Undergraduate Council.

Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell stated that UC Davis experienced bottlenecks in the course approval process when Colleges had a middle step that was not conducive to shared governance (the model used by SSHA). Davis found that there was a lot of recycling that occurred between the units, and it turned out that they were not adding any real value in the long run. Vice-Chair Powell cautioned Merced not to build excessive bureaucracy at the School level. Chair Amussen stated that feedback provided by Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell will be very helpful in structuring future campus discussions. The School Curriculum Committees currently are more robust than the Schools' Executive Committees. Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell mentioned that the structure of the School Curriculum Committee is probably

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

appropriate for the current stage of the campus, but that as the campus matures this will probably not be the best structure. In the future, new courses should be reviewed at the Bylaw unit level. Chair Amussen stated that this issue will be something that DivCo and the overall Senate leadership will have to consider. UC Merced has not really delegated authority to the Executive Committees, and it is still in the intermediate phase in moving toward a structured system.

The campus' previous Senate Chair commented that the notion of the Chair's role being split seven ways is an interesting conundrum but isn't necessary the crux of the shared governance issue in the Schools. The consultation process has been generally from the bottom-up and the culture of consultation in the campus has been different in each School and continues to change. The consultation process is definitely derived from creating a culture, and one cannot force a culture in individual faculty; however, the Senate should highlight good and bad practices within the Schools.

Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell asked how many voting members UC Merced has in the largest School. Chair Amussen responded that the largest School is SSHA, and it currently has approximately sixty-five to seventy voting members.

Systemwide Vice-Chair Powell commented that when he was first hired in the UC Davis College of Engineering there were only seventy voting faculty and it functioned as a committee of the whole. The only active committees at that point were the undergraduate and graduate committees. The faculty Executive Committee really started working when the College had approximately one hundred voting faculty. UC Merced might be entering this transition now. As Merced forms its Executive Committees Vice-Chair Powell urged the campus to be cautious on the relationship that the committees develop with the Dean's Office. He indicated that at Davis some Executive Committees are seen by the Dean as an extension of their office, which can potentially create Executive Committee memberships that go with the flow and do what the Deans want. Instead, the committees should aim to garner strong Senate Leadership.

The CAPRA Chair reiterated that there is ambiguity around 1) who has authority over what functions, and 2) who should have authority over those functions. This pertains to shared governance. What authority should an Executive Committee have? How should the Dean consult with them? Over the past year, CAPRA has seen multiple cases where Deans did not consult with the faculty regarding key issues and decisions. In one School the Dean did not talk to the faculty regarding the FTE decisions and which disciplines received which lines. I know of a case in another School where the Dean appointed a Bylaw Unit Chair without any discussion with relevant faculty. These are examples where we all agree that the Deans should have consulted with the faculty.

Systemwide Chair Anderson mentioned that in the event that a Dean appoints a Chair without faculty consultation, the Senate should discuss the matter with the EVC. In addition, the EVC should ensure administration is educated in terms of the meaning of shared governance in the

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

University of California. APM 245 provides policy and guidelines relevant to the Senate-administration consultation process.

Chair Amussen again noted the fragmented role of Department Chair within the Schools and units, which generally creates confusion in the consultation process. This point was reiterated through examples provided by attending faculty members.

EVC/Provost Alley commented that in the past two years the Schools' governance structures have transformed significantly with the establishment of Bylaw units. He thought the transition progressed rapidly and that it will facilitate the future formation of full departments, an outcome that is currently constrained by a lack of funding and physical space. EVC Alley indicated that when the campus reaches a student enrollment of 10,000 students, it should also have approximately 350 ladder-rank faculty and functioning Executive Committees in each School. As a final note, the EVC cautioned the Senate to be aware of and patient with the challenges that will accompany future changes and growth.

VI. SENATE AWARDS

Chair Amussen announced the 2011-2012 Senate Awards, which were presented as follows:

- The Dr. Fried Spiess Award for Distinguished Senate Service: Chris Kello
- The Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and Mentorship Award: Marcos Garcia-Ojeda
- The Distinguished Early Career Research Award: Jessica Trounstone
- The Academic Senate Distinguished Research Award: Thomas Hansford
- The Award for Distinguished Graduate Teaching: Jennifer Manilay
- The Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award: Jan Wallander (first-time recipient)
- The Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching for a Non-Senate Lecturer: Jon Carlson (first-time recipient)

VII. CHAIR, VICE CHAIR AND SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE DIVISION FOR 2012-2013

CoC Chair Yoshimi announced the Senate leadership for 2012-13:

- Chair of the Division- Peggy O'Day
- Vice Chair of the Division- Ignacio Lopez-Calvo
- Secretary/Parliamentarian- Rick Dale

There being no objections, the Committee on Committees appointments stand.

VIII. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Academic Planning and Resources Allocation (CAPRA) – *Senate Vice Chair and CAPRA Member, Peggy O'Day*

Senate Vice Chair O'Day reported on the major accomplishments of the committee. CAPRA focused much of its attention on the Schools' strategic plans and FTE requests, as well as the Strategic Hires Initiative proposals, making recommendations to the EVC on both. The EVC/Provost has authorized funding for two of the four strategic hires recommended by

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

CAPRA. One of these will support interdisciplinary health prevention sciences; the other is an interdisciplinary position for natural parks management. Both searches will begin in 2012-13. CAPRA hopes the remaining two FTE it recommended will be funding in the coming year(s). CAPRA also reviewed various campus and systemwide reports, requests, and proposals, including CITRIS Academic Review Report, Shared Research Computing Proposal (ShaRCS), UCAAD's Report on the Faculty Pay Equity Study, the Report of the Senate-Administration Task Force on Faculty Salaries, the HSRI ORU Proposal, the CCGA Chemistry Graduate and Interdisciplinary Humanities Graduate Program.

Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) - *Senate Chair Susan Amussen*

Senate Chair Amussen gave a brief report in CAP Chair Jan Wallander's stead, as he was not able to attend. CAP is fully staffed with ten members, seven of whom are faculty from other UC campuses. CAP is grateful for their service. To date CAP has opined on 15 appointments, 15 merits, 5 promotions and 2 MCAs. Approximately an additional 43 merit and MCA cases and an additional 20 appointments will flow through CAP this year. In addition to its routine work, CAP also reviews items from the Academic Senate and advises the administration on procedural matters.

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

CoC Chair Yoshimi reported that the committee is working on the Senate slate for next year.

Faculty Welfare Committee (FW) - *Vice Chair Anna Song*

Vice Chair Anna Song gave a brief report on Faculty Welfare's inaugural year at the Merced campus. The committee had a balanced representation from the three Schools. During the year it opined on the negotiated salaries matters, APM 668 and UCCAD's Report on the Faculty Pay Equity Study. Vice Chair Song communicated Faculty Welfare's concern with faculty retention, stating that the committee began discussions on the results of the Climate Study, aiming to identify and address the pressing issues. In the coming year the committee plans to effectively disseminate information to the faculty and staff regarding retirement changes, increased healthcare costs, and salary and benefit concerns.

UGC Chair Camfield asked if there was in anything in particular that stood out from the Climate Study. Vice Chair Song responded that the committee is still analyzing the data but that family support, spousal accommodations and spousal hires were already an apparent concern with respect to both retention and recruiting.

Graduate and Research Council (GRC) - *Chair Will Shadish*

GRC Chair Shadish reported that GRC approved the HSRI proposal and forwarded the request to DivCo. The Chemistry Graduate Proposal was approved and submitted to CCGA. The Interdisciplinary Humanities Proposal is currently being reviewed at the campus level. GRC awards substantial funding for faculty research grants and graduate summer. The council has made efforts to create more efficient and effective processes for granting and disseminating the

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

funds. Nevertheless, as GRC continues to receive an increased number of proposals, the committee will be unable to continue the review and granting processes.

Undergraduate Council (UGC) - Chair Gregg Camfield

UGC Chair Camfield reported that UGC has continued to receive a relatively normal amount of business; however, the Schools' related workload had increases. The committee recently approved the School of Natural Sciences Pilot Proposal for allocating spaces for certain impacted classes. The Schools are beginning to recognize the campus' physical space constraints. The committee supports a fair and efficient manner of allocating space on campus. This matter will likely persist for some time. Next fall UGC plans to revise the Academic Integrity Policy. The committee has already begun to research best practices, and more information will likely resurface in the near future.

Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) - Chair Rick Dale

CRE Chair Dale reported that the committee has remained consistently busy. The committee facilitated the approval of the revisions to the UCM Bylaws. An overwhelming majority of the Senate faculty approved the proposed six amendments. In addition, CRE presented to DivCo suggested changes to the Schools Bylaws in order to make them compliant within the system. The committee also worked on a number of smaller issues, such as the Multiple Major Policy and suggestions for updating the Regulations. CRE is finalizing the annual committee elections. Most of the relevant positions have been filled, but the write-ins for the open CoC position are in progress.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (NONE)

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (NONE)

XI. NEW BUSINESS (NONE)

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Attest:

Susan Amussen, Senate Chair