

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



DIVISION MEETING OF THE MERCED ACADEMIC SENATE THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2012

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Garden View Dining Room
Yablokoff-Wallace Dining Center

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- | | | |
|-------------|--|---------------|
| I. | ANNOUNCEMENTS | 15 min |
| | A. Division Chair Peggy O'Day | |
| | B. Chancellor Dorothy Leland | |
| | C. Acting Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Sam Traina | |
| II. | CONSENT CALENDAR | |
| | A. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the April 12, 2012 Meeting | pp. 5-13 |
| | B. Annual Committee Reports (2011-2012) | |
| | • Division Council | pp. 14-18 |
| | • Committee on Academic Personnel | pp. 19-28 |
| | • Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation | pp. 29-36 |
| | • Graduate and Research Council | pp. 37-47 |
| | • Committee on Rules & Elections | pp. 48-53 |
| | • Undergraduate Council | pp. 54-62 |
| III. | CONSULTATION WITH CHANCELLOR LELAND | |
| | A. Budget Requests and Strategic Focusing | 25 min |
| | - Process for faculty FTE and budget requests | |
| | - Strategic Focusing Initiative | |
| | B. Campus Sustainability and Physical Expansion | 25 min |
| | - Urban Land Institute Report | |
| | - Immediate and Long-term Needs and Issues | |
| IV. | DISCUSSION ITEMS | 25 min |
| | A. Proposition 30: | |
| | - Implications for the Campus and the UC System | |
| | B. WASC involvement in Graduate Education- GRC Chair Valerie Leppert | |
| | - CCGA's role in accreditation | |

V. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

30 min

- [Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#), Vice Chair Matthew Meyer (oral)
- [Committee on Academic Personnel](#), Vice Chair David Kelley (oral)
- [Committee on Committees](#), Chair Ajay Gopinathan (oral)
- [Faculty Welfare](#), Chair Sean Malloy (oral)
- [Graduate and Research Council](#), Chair Valerie Leppert (oral)
- [Undergraduate Council](#), Chair Cristián Ricci (oral)
- [Committee on Rules and Elections](#), Chair Rick Dale (oral)

VI. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (NONE)

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (NONE)

VIII. 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.

Rick Dale
Secretary/Parliamentarian

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

2012-2013 SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

DIVISION COUNCIL

Peggy O'Day, Chair (SNS), COUNCIL
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Rick Dale, CRE Chair, Secretary/Parliamentarian (SSHA)
Cristián Ricci, UGC Chair (SSHA)
Ajay Gopinathan CoC Chair (SNS)
David Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (SNS)
Valerie Leppert, GRC Chair (SOE)
Susan Amussen, CAPRA Chair (SSHA)
Wolfgang Rogge, At-Large (SOE)
Paul Maglio, At-Large (SOE)
Liaisons: Maurizio Forte (SSHA), UCCC
Anne Kelley (SNS), P&T
Sean Malloy (SSHA), UCFW
Erik Menke (SNS), UCAF
Rudy Ortiz (SNS), UCAAD

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Raymond Gibbs, Chair (UC Santa Cruz)
David Kelley, Vice Chair (SNS), UCAP
Jian-Qiao Sun (SOE)
Jan Wallander (SSHA)**
Ruzena Bajcsy (UC Berkeley)
Hung Fan (UC Irvine)
Gary Jacobson (UC San Diego)**
Richard Regosin (UC Irvine)
Michelle Yeh (UC Davis)

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA), UCPB
Matthew Meyer, Vice Chair (SNS)
Ruth Mostern (SSHA)
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA)
Marcelo Kallmann (SOE)
Teamrat Ghezzehei (SNS)*

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS

Rick Dale, Chair (SSHA)
Peter Berck, Vice Chair (UC Berkeley)
Paul Almeida (SSHA)
Peter Vanderschraaf (SSHA)

FACULTY WELFARE

Sean Malloy, Chair (SSHA), UCFW
Anna Song, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Lilian Davila (SOE)
Marcos Garcia-Ojeda (SNS)
Shawn Newsam (SOE)
Asmeret Berhe (SNS)

PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Robert Hillman, Chair (UC Davis), UCPT
Anne Kelley (SNS)
Jodie Holt (UC Riverside)
Tom Joo (UC Davis)

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Cristián Ricci, Chair (SSHA), UCEP
TBA, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA)
Wei-Chun Chin (SOE)
Teamrat Ghezzehei (SNS)
Florin Rusu (SOE)
Lei, Yue (SNS)
Kelvin Lwin (SOE)
Sholeh Quinn (SSHA)*
Anne Zanzucchi (SSHA)
Ex Officio: Jack Vevea (SSHA), VP Undergraduate Education
Jane Lawrence, VC Student Affairs
Liaisons: Suzanne Sindi (SNS), UCOPE
Katherine Brokaw (SSHA), UCIE
Michael Beman (SNS), BOARS

GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL

Valerie Leppert, Chair (SOE), CCGA
Ruth Mostern, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Stefano Carpin (SOE)
Erin Johnson (SNS)
Sayantani Ghosh (SNS)
Roummel Marcia (SNS)
Eric Brown (SNS)
Jason Hein (SNS)
Ex Officio: Chris Kello, Acting Dean of the Graduate Division
Liaisons: Mike Cleary (SNS) UCORP
Sholeh Quinn (SSHA) UCOLASC*

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Ajay Gopinathan, Chair (SNS), UCOC
Martha Conklin, Vice Chair (SOE)
Henry Forman (SNS)
Linda Hirst (SNS)
Linda Cameron (SSHA)
Teenie Matlock (SSHA)
Ashlie Martini (SOE)
Jinah Choi (SNS)

*Fall 2012 Only

**Spring 2013 Only

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.

Meeting of the UC Merced Division
April 12, 2012

Faculty Full-Time Employment (FTE)

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

DIVISION COUNCIL
Merced Division of the Academic Senate
Annual Report 2011-2012

The Division Council (DivCo) held a total of 14 regularly scheduled two-hour, in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw I.IV.14.C](#). In addition the Council held a preliminary meeting to establish goals for the year, as well as meetings with Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) candidates when they visited the Merced campus.

2011-2012 Accomplishments

The unofficial theme of DivCo this year was building the academic mission. Issues and concerns falling under this theme include: building connections with academic and physical planning, creating Senate Assessment objectives, and implementing strategic planning across campus.

At the beginning of the 2011-2012 academic year, DivCo held a planning meeting and identified six issues that were priorities for the upcoming year:

- **Assessment:** Improve coordination across the campus for assessment support.
- **Budget:** Increase budget transparency and create a model for allocating resources.
- **Graduate Education:** Improve coordination across campus for issues related to graduate student support.
- **Shared Governance:** Focus on School structures and executive committee functions in order to improve shared governance.
- **Academic Personnel:** Seek ways to increase interdisciplinary hires. Focus on ways to clarify Academic Personnel policies and procedures.
- **Strategic Planning:** Institutionalize a process/policy for faculty involvement in the space planning of new buildings and School academic plans.

2011-2012 List of Activities

The following summarizes the Division Council's activities and actions for 2011-2012. Please refer to the Division Council approved minutes and communications for details.

DivCo made recommendations to the Administration on the following items:

- CITRIS Academic Review Report (9.14.11) - Forwarded comments to the Chancellor supporting the success of CITRIS.

- Compensation for Senate Service (10.12.11) – Sent memo to the EVC/Provost requesting additional funding so that all Senate committee chairs receive compensation.
- Postponement of Tenure Review (10.5.11) – Sent memo to Vice Provost of Academic Personnel suggesting changes to the Tenure Review Policy that would set the review for the sixth year and would only allow review in the seventh year in extreme cases.
- [2012 Summer Session Schedule](#) (10.19.11) – Sent memo to the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs endorsing the 2012 Summer Session Schedule with the condition that enrollment data is presented to DivCo in Fall 2012 before Summer Session 2013 is planned.
- Integrated Planning Project (10.19.11) - Provided feedback to the Director of Institutional Planning and Analysis regarding the enrollment assumptions and projections that impact faculty hires, student credit hours, facilities, budgets and resources.
- [Shared Research Computing Services](#) (11.1.11) – Sent memo to the Vice Chancellor for Research regarding GRC’s and CAPRA’s recommendations against UC Merced’s participation in ShaRCS.
- Long-Term Parking Plan (11.9.11) – Forwarded comments to the Campus Physical Planning Committee about placing the urban model long-term parking plan on the agenda and possibilities of building a parking structure.
- Career Equity Review and Postponing of Tenure Review (11.21.11) – Sent memo to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel requesting clarification on specific language for both policies that will be used when the rewritten MAPP is presented to DivCo.
- [UCAAD’s Report on the Faculty Pay Equity Study](#) (12.7.11)- Sent memo to the Chancellor voicing concern about the implications of the study and recommended that a similar study be conducted at UC Merced.
- Chemistry and Chemical Biology CCGA Proposal (2.1.12) – Sent memo to the Vice Chancellor for Research recommending the Chemistry and Chemical Biology Proposal be submitted by the campus to CCGA.
- [Online Education Pilot Project](#) (2.15.12) – Forwarded comments to the Administration regarding DivCo’s concerns of UC Merced taking on the registration duties of the Online Education Pilot Project and requested clarification on the costs associated with the request from the systemwide Vice Provost.
- [Academic Calendars 2013-2016](#) (5.16.12) – Endorsed the academic calendars.
- [Revised MAPP](#) (6.4.12) – Sent memo to the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel regarding DivCo’s response to the revised MAPP.
- Course Buyout Policy (6.8.12) – Sent memo to the EVC/Provost regarding the concerns with the proposed Course Buyout Policy.

DivCo reviewed and responded to the following campus items:

- Supplemental Questions for Distance or Blended Course Approval Request (9.21.11)- Approved questionnaire for [undergraduate](#) and [graduate](#) courses.
- [ORU Proposal Review Process](#) (10.5.11) – Approved proposal.
- [Merced Division Guidelines for Senate Consultation](#) (10.5.11) – Approved guidelines for administrative and non-administrative consultation.

- [Program Review Policy](#) (10.19.11) – Approved revisions to the policy to protect faculty anonymity.
- Publishing Senate Documents (10.19.11) – Reviewed the current process of publishing the Academic Senate committee attendance records and agreed to share the records internally upon request to the Deans and CAP, but not publically.
- [Bylaw Revision Proposals](#) (12.7.11) – Reviewed the proposed changes to the following Bylaws: ORU authority (II.IV.3.B.14), GRC jurisdiction and duties (II.IV.3.B.3), and UGC jurisdiction and duties regarding Program Review (II.IV.2.B.2).
- [Graduate Program Review Policy and Procedures](#) (2.15.12) – Reviewed the minor revision made by GRC and recommended copying the UGC policy language.
- School Bylaw Revisions: [SSHA](#), [NS](#) and [Eng.](#) (2.29.12) – Reviewed the memos written by CRE on shared governance and agreed on the need to clarify roles, responsibilities and associated resources that are important contributions supporting shared governance.
- [Credit Hour Policy](#) (2.29.12) – Approved the policy amended by UGC.
- Academic Honesty Policy (2.29.12) – Provided feedback to UGC on the Academic Honesty Policy.
- Delegation of Authority for Academic Personnel Actions (4.4.12) – Reviewed the delegation of authority for Academic Personnel actions in the Schools for Assistant Professor Step I, II, and III appointments.
- [Graduate Advisors Handbook Review](#) (4.4.12) – Approved the changes to the course credit requirements for the Master’s degree.
- Academic Strategic Plans (4.4.12) – Reviewed the process for the Academic Strategic Plans and recommended that CAPRA draft guidelines to facilitate the process and increase the probability of receiving the strategic plans on time.
- Academic Honesty Policy Task Force (5.2.12) – Approved the charge proposed by UGC.
- Guidelines for Developing Undergraduate and Graduate PLOs and CLOs (5.2.12) – Endorsed the proposed guidelines drafted by the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO).
- [WASC Policy on Graduate Education](#) (5.2.12) – Forwarded GRC’s memo to the ALO regarding the concerns raised with the language on page five of the policy that suggests that all faculty teaching students in doctoral programs should have postdoctoral training.
- [Course Drop Policy](#) (5.16.12) – Approved the changes to the Course Drop Policy- SR 70.2 submitted by the Registrar.
- Program Review of SSHA Minors (5.16.12) - Reviewed the request from SSHA to combine the Program Review of stand-alone minors with the reviews of different but related majors.
- Proposed Changes to the Economics Major (5.16.12) – Reviewed and approved the changes to the Economic Major that will help begin the separation/planning of the Economics and Management Majors.
- [Lecturers Teaching Graduate Courses Policy](#) (6.4.12) – Approved the draft policy for lecturers teaching graduate courses.

DivCo opined on the following systemwide items:

- Response to the Academic Council regarding [APM 668](#) (11.9.11) – Expressed strong concerns regarding the transparency, forms of peer review, and rewards for outstanding faculty accomplishment that receive external funding in the proposed salary policy.
- [Comments to Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools regarding the Transfer Admission Proposal](#) (11.21.11) – Supported the proposal that is similar to the policy already in place at UC Merced.
- Response to the Academic Council regarding [APM 205](#) (11.18.11) – Supported the proposed policy.
- Response to the Academic Council regarding [UCAAD's Report on the Faculty Pay Equity Study](#) (12.7.11) – Expressed strong concerns with the methodology and recommendation for further study to determine whether the differences identified could be explained by different disciplines.
- Response to the Academic Council regarding the review of the [UC Observatories](#) (2.29.12) – Forwarded concerns raised by the Physics faculty regarding the degree of transparency and the structure of the UC Observatories.
- Response to the Academic Council regarding the [Faculty Salaries Task Force Report](#) (4.4.12) – Expressed concerns regarding the implementation of salary scales.
- Response to the Academic Council regarding the [Academic Personnel Policy Section 035 and 190](#) (4.4.12) – Supported the technical revision to the APM that would ensure consistency with existing federal and state law.
- Response to UCOLASC regarding the draft [UCOLASC Open Access Policy](#) (5.16.12) – Endorsed the draft policy.
- Response to the Academic Council regarding the [APM 010, 015, and 016](#) (5.16.12) – Supported the minor revisions that would protect faculty from being disciplined for not agreeing with the Administration.

2011-2012 List of Guests

- Chancellor Dorothy Leland on August 31, 2011 and March 14, 2012
- Nancy Ochsner, Director, Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis, on October 19, 2011
- Mary Miller, Vice Chancellor for Administration, on February 15, 2012
- Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research/Dean of the Graduate Division on April 18, 2012

Senate Office

The Academic Senate Office workload has increased significantly with the expanding office involvement in strategic planning and ongoing response to the campus requirements for Program Review as well as WASC requirements. 2011-2012 saw the addition of a new Senate standing committee the Faculty Welfare Committee. With the maturing of the Division Council, the growth of the faculty, and the growing needs of Program Review, some Senate committees will likely divide and new ones will likely be added.

Respectfully Submitted:

UCM Faculty

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA)

Peggy O'Day, Vice-Chair (NS)

Nella Van Dyke, CAPRA Chair (SSHA)

Gregg Camfield, UGC Chair (SSHA)

Will Shadish, GRC Chair (SSHA)

Jeff Yoshimi, CoC Chair (SSHA)

Mike Colvin, CAP Vice-Chair (NS)

Rick Dale, Parliamentarian & CRE Chair (SSHA)

Wolfgang Rogge, At-Large Member (Eng.)

Robin DeLugan, At-Large Member (SSHA)

Senate Staff

Susan Sims, Executive Director of the Senate Office

Fatima Paul, Principal Analyst & Manager of Program Review

Mary Ann Coughlin, Senior Analyst

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2011-2012.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included three members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were Jan Wallander, CAP Chair (Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts); Michael Colvin, CAP Vice Chair – Spring 2012 (Natural Sciences); Jian-Qiao Sun, CAP Vice Chair – Fall 2011 (Engineering). The external members were Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB, Computer Science); C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD, Physics); Hung Fan (UCI, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry); Raymond Gibbs (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science, Spring 2012 term); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages). Mary Ann Coughlin served as the CAP Analyst.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

CAP is charged with making recommendations on all Senate faculty appointments and academic advancements, including merit actions, promotions to tenure, promotions to Professor, and advancements across the barrier steps Professor V to VI and Professor IX to Above Scale.

Policies and Procedures

UCM CAP adheres to systemwide policies and procedures as described in the UC Academic Personnel Manual ([APM](#)). Policies and procedures not outlined in the APM, but practiced at other UC campuses, were generally observed at Merced.

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and Academic Personnel Committee (APC) Chairs. As the MAPP is an evolving resource, CAP presents occasional suggestions for revision to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and/or the Divisional Council (DivCo). This year the MAPP underwent a substantial rewrite so that it was better aligned with the APM and more accurately reflected academic personnel practices at Merced. CAP, as well as other Senate bodies, reviewed the revision and submitted feedback to the Academic Personnel Office. Progress on the manual is expected to continue during the next academic year.

Review Process

CAP's review process begins when the committee receives files from APO, where they have been analyzed, vetted, and classified to facilitate further, efficient processing. The cases, as well as reviewer assignments, are distributed to the committee one week prior to CAP's meeting and ensuing discussion of the files. CAP typically reviews three to five files per week. One lead reviewer and one or two secondary reviewers, depending upon the proposed personnel action, are assigned to report on each case; however, all members are expected to read and become familiar with the files. Reviewer assignments are made according to members' areas of expertise. Reviewers serve not as advocates of their areas, but as representatives who act in the best long-term interests of the campus. Committee members who participate in a prior level of review for a file are recused from CAP's respective review of the file.

CAP convenes for two-hour meetings on Friday mornings; non-UCM members participate by teleconference. Reports from the primary and secondary readers on each case are followed by a thorough committee discussion, as well as a vote on the proposed action. CAP's quorum for all personnel actions is half plus one of its membership. Occasionally, a vote on a case is deferred, and the file is returned for further information or clarification. After the meeting the CAP Chair prepares draft reports on the dossiers. These are then distributed to the committee for review, consultation, and approval. The final version of the report is sent as a letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC) and Provost. If the EVC determines that no further deliberation is necessary, the substance of CAP's report and those of other levels of review are summarized by Academic Personnel in a letter that is transmitted to the dean of the candidate's school. In late spring, the EVC, after consultation with the CAP Chair, began forwarding the CAP report as written to the candidate and the responsible Dean.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review of the file. If disagreement prevails at any level of review, the file is returned to the school for reconsideration and/or a request for more information before being resubmitted to CAP. The EVC/Provost communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Throughout the UC system certain categories of academic personnel cases, for example, appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. This *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate and its report is included in the materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate. At the older campuses, these *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit. Due to the limited number of tenured faculty at UCM, CAP frequently serves "as its own *ad hoc*"; however, when there is inadequate expertise within CAP to review a particular case, an *ad hoc* committee of expert faculty from other UC campuses is appointed by the EVC/Provost.

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2011-2012 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 90 cases during the year, compared to 96 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 72 (80%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). In addition, CAP agreed with the School recommendations but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step) for another 12 cases (13%). Tables 1A – 1D detail caseloads and their respective outcomes according to the proposed personnel actions. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendations by the academic units.

CAP recommendations are transmitted to the EVC/Provost for a final level of review. The EVC/Provost is deeply involved in the academic personnel process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels. This final level of review gives significant weight to CAP's recommendations.

III. Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

CAP has general comments regarding the Schools' submission of Personnel cases. These pertain mainly to Mid-Career Appraisals (MCAs) and case materials.

Mid-Career Appraisal

A timely submission of the MCA can be crucial to the career of an Assistant Professor, who should have

a punctual evaluation on his/her progress toward tenure. Long delays in receiving this review leave less time for “corrective actions” when they are needed prior to the end of the tenure clock. The deadline in 2011-2012 for submission of MCA cases to APO was November 18, 2011. CAP had meetings scheduled in late November and December to focus on reviewing these cases; however, none of the six MCAs that were submitted for review during the year were submitted by this date. Schools are strongly urged to complete MCA cases earlier in the academic year for the significant benefit of the Assistant Professors.

CAP urges the APC Chairs and the Deans to establish and enforce early deadlines for review materials, particularly for external letters, so that MCA cases for 2012-2013 are submitted in final form to APO by next fall’s deadline. This is also the normal deadline for the seventh-year final appraisals for some of the Assistant Professors. It is noteworthy that some other campuses solicit agreements for external letters prior to the beginning of the academic year during which the review takes place.

Case Materials

A well-written and comprehensive case file is critical to maintaining the integrity of the personnel review. Case materials should adequately and appropriately analyze a candidate’s research, teaching, and service performance. With regard to research, the case analysis from the schools should thoroughly evaluate the quality and the significance of candidates’ scholarship. Impact factors and related indices, while helpful as additional information, cannot substitute for an in-depth evaluation. Below CAP reiterates text from its 2009-2010 annual report:

"Research. A description of a candidate’s research should highlight and analyze [and not merely enumerate] the nature, significance, and intellectual impact of the main components of the work. The description need not be long, since CAP reads the same dossier. However, especially in areas unlikely to be understood by outsiders, a brief lay description of the research area is [also] very useful. The report should include summaries, without long or numerous quotations of the opinions of the outside reviewers, since they are best able to judge the impact of the work in the field.

"Publication Venue. One measure of quality (albeit imperfect) is the venue of publication. It would be helpful to give an honest assessment of the publication’s recognition in the discipline. Here are some examples: one of the top three general journals in the discipline; the primary journal in the field (where a discipline might be divided into about 6 rather than 30 fields); a well-recognized journal in the subfield; and the major publisher of books on the topic. No adjectives need be applied to journals that do not garner prestige in the discipline."

With regard to teaching, [APM 210-1](#) states, “It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate’s teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. *More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file* [emphasis added].” The manual follows this with an enumerated listing of acceptable forms of evidence. This does not include faculty members’ teaching self-statements, as they do not provide the desired objective evaluations of candidates’ teaching efforts.

With regard to service, CAP stresses the importance of properly documenting university, campus, and school committee efforts. As [expected] levels of commitment vary from committee to committee and from member to member, committee workload descriptions and evaluations should be adequately detailed. They should include an appraisal of the quality of the candidate’s contributions and of the extent of their efforts in committee assignments.

IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost

CAP reviewed various cases during the year that prompted the committee to make recommendations to

the EVC/Provost on academic personnel procedures and policy. Some of these pertained specifically to one case, while others were more general. The topics of the more general administrative comments included the following: Recommendations for Increases in Off-Scale Salary Components, Bylaw Unit Voting Procedures, Accelerated Promotions, and Case Material Relevant to a Review. The substance of these administrative comments is detailed in Appendix B. Deans and APC are encouraged to review these as well.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at the UCM campus, the EVC/Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, scheduled on Aug. 26, 2011, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by outgoing Chair Joseph Cerny, incoming Chair Jan Wallander, two internal members, and five external members. The committee led two discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. This was followed by extensive discussion between the Assistant Professors and CAP. A second session, which was held over lunch and continued into the afternoon, was open to all faculty members, School APC Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Brief minutes from both sessions are available in the APO.

Spring Meeting

Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School APCs convened during the spring semester to discuss the academic review process, as well as academic personnel policies and procedures. This meeting was held on May 11, 2012. CAP was represented by Chair Jan Wallander, two internal members, and six external members. Discussion items focused on the preparation of the Case Analysis, external evaluation response rates, Bio-Bibliography elements, teaching criteria and relevant streams of evidence, consistency in recommendations for beginning steps, off-scale salary recommendations, AY 2012-13 review schedule, and the Merit Short Form. Informal minutes are maintained in the APO. CAP recommends that the spring meeting be held earlier in the Spring semester to balance better the Fall meeting.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. This academic year included a significant amount of such review activity, which was added to the review of cases. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including the Proposed Changes to APM 010, 015, and 020; the Proposed Changes to APM 200 and 205; the Proposed Changes to APM 668; the Faculty Workload Report; the Report of Salary Task Force; the proposed Career Equity Review Procedures for UCM; the proposed Delegation of Appointment Authority for UCM; the proposed Policy for the Postponement of Tenure Review; and the MAPP Rewrite.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the Deans, the APC Chairs, and the AP staff in each school for their dedication to excellence in the personnel review process at UC Merced, and especially Mary Ann Coughlin, the Senate Analyst assigned to CAP.

Respectfully,

Jan Wallander, Chair
Jian-Qiao Sun, Vice Chair, Fall 2011
Michael Colvin, Vice Chair, Spring 2012
Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)
C. Fred Driscoll (UCSD)
Hung Fan (UCI)
Raymond Gibbs (UCSC)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
Richard Regosin (UCI)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

APPENDIX A

**2011-2012 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	72*	12	5**	1	90

*Includes two split votes

**Includes one "No Action."

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (3 Acting)	16	4	0	0	20
Associate Professor (Acting)	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	2	3	0	0	5
Lecturer Series (4 LPSOE)	4	0	0	0	4
Chairs	3	0	0	0	3
Total	26	7	0	0	33
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					79
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	12*	1	2	1	16
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Professor VI	1	1	0	0	2
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
Total	13	2	2	1	18
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					72
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					83

*Includes one split vote.

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	0	0	0	0	0
Assistant	17	3	2**	0	22
Associate Professor (2 Adjunct)	13*	0	0	0	13
Professor	2	0	1	0	3
Total	32	3	3	0	38
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					84
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					92

*Includes one split vote.

**Includes one "No Action."

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	1	0	0	0	1
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	0	1
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2011-2012**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering (MCA)	17 (1)	12	3	0	2**	0	71	88
Natural Sciences (MCA)	38 (4)	29*	2	3	3	1	76	89
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (MCA)	35 (1)	31	1	3	0	0	89	100
TOTALS (MCA)	90 (6)	72	6	6	5	1	80	93

*Includes two split votes.

**Includes one "No Action."

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2012

	2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009
Total Cases	61	56	82	61
Total Appointments	43	32	45	22
Total Promotions	3	2	2	3
Total Merit Increases	14	22	35	33
Total Other	1	0	0	3

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012
Total Cases	63	96	90
Total Appointments	13	34	33
Total Promotions	10	17	18
Total Merit Increases	40	39	38
Total Other	0	6	1

Appendix B

Recommendations for Increases in Off-Scale Salary Components (January 20, 2012)

Deans sometimes recommend increases in the off-scale salary component at the time a recommendation is made for an advancement. In such cases, CAP would like to see a rationale that is specifically directed to the off-scale increase. CAP holds that it is not sufficient to point to normative salary data. Rather, the case should preferably be based on extraordinary accomplishments of the faculty in the review period. Alternatively, a specific case for an equity adjustment may be made.

Bylaw Unit Voting Procedures (March 1, 2012)

CAP notes that two SNS Bylaw units adhere to unit voting procedures in which all faculty in the unit, without regard for rank, vote on promotion cases. Typically, only faculty in ranks that are higher than that of the candidate being considered for promotion would be able to vote on the file. When such practice is not the standard, CAP believes that conflicts of interest may ensue because a faculty member at the same rank will vote on the promotion of a colleague who later will vote on his/her own promotion. For example, it seems less likely under these conditions that an Assistant Professor will vote against the promotion of a colleague Assistant Professor who will later be in the position to vote on his/her own promotion. More generally this voting procedure may engender implicitly a situation where it is in everyone's best interest to support the promotion of most or all other colleagues. Consequently, the vote transmitted from such a Bylaw unit may be perceived to be less informative when considered at subsequent levels of review. CAP recommends that only faculty in ranks that are higher than that of the candidate being considered for promotion would be able to vote on the file.

Accelerated Promotion (March 15, 2012)

CAP notes deficiencies in the preparation of material for cases where accelerated promotion is being recommended by a previous level of review. An accelerated promotion occurs when the effective date of the recommended promotion is less than six years after the appointment or promotion of an Assistant or Associate professor. It is important that a clear rationale is presented when an accelerated promotion is being recommended. This needs to be addressed explicitly in the Case Analysis prepared by the unit as well as in the Dean's letter, whenever that level of review recommends this action. This also needs to be clearly communicated in the solicitation for external letters so that referees can comment about the appropriateness of this action.

Case Material Relevant to a Review (May 25, 2012)

CAP would like to address the ambiguity that exists in the Schools around materials that are to be considered for review in a given review period, as this lack of clarity has created variances in how Case Files are assembled and thus weakens the broader fairness of the review process. Listed below are guidelines that should be used in the preparation of the Case Analysis, or more generally the Case File, followed by specific examples of recent files that have deviated from these guidelines and that CAP feels should be formally addressed by Academic Personnel.

Actions Requiring a Career Review (e.g., Appointments, Promotions with Tenure)

For actions that require a career review, all scholarly, teaching, and service evidence pertain to the review and should/can be addressed in the Case File. This includes materials prior to an individual's appointment at UC Merced as well as research that has not yet been published.

All Other Actions (e.g., Merit Increases)

For actions that do not require a career review, the general rule is that evidence may only be counted once and only in the review period to which the evidence pertains. In some instances, determining the review period is fairly straightforward, for example, a grant should be included in the review period in which it was awarded. For publications, the relevant review period can be less apparent because a research manuscript can be described in four stages: in preparation, submitted, accepted (or in press), and published (or in print). The Case File should never pay attention to or count manuscripts that are in the "in preparation" or "submitted" status. Both "accepted" and "published" statuses can be relevant to a review period, but any given manuscript can only be referred to or counted in one review period. In other words, if a Case Analysis or other materials in the Case File refers to or counts a manuscript when it is "accepted" in one review cycle, it may not be referred to or counted in the next, even if its status has changed to "published."

In addition, inclusion of book-type products warrants further attention. Typically a book is introduced in the Biobib and Case Analysis when a publisher has agreed to publish the manuscript as a book after vetted and reviewed, signifying it is "in press." It is accepted that the Candidate receive credit in that review period for the achievement of "in press" status and then again when it is published. Occasionally, a book does not get published. It must be noted in the MAPP that it is the responsibility of the faculty unit to review progress on a book in press and address in subsequent Case Analyses, as appropriate, any failure in the book being published.

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) met 17 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw II.IV.1.B. The issues that CAPRA considered this year are described briefly as follows:

Systemwide Budget:

The University of California's total 2011-12 budget was \$22.5 billion. About 27% of this comprised unrestricted core funds that supported classroom instruction, financial aid, and other operating costs. Historically, the state has contributed the majority of the University's core funds. Under the 2011-12 budget adopted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor, student tuition and fees contributed for the first time in UC history more to core operating funds than the state General Fund (nearly \$3 billion versus \$2.37 billion).

In submitting its 2012-13 Budget Request, the UC's primary focus was to maintain its role in educating the state's workforce and in fostering research discoveries. Consistent with this goal, the University's budget proposal aimed to protect access, maintain quality and affordability, and stabilize fiscal health. The key features of the proposal were enrollment and instructional program expansion, retirement plan stabilization, maintenance of quality, restoration of excellence, cost reductions and alternative revenue sources, and other revenues.

Funding Streams Model

This year the UC Office of the President realigned its financial relationship with the campuses through the UC Funding Streams Initiative. The initiative is particularly significant in light of the considerable reductions in state support to the University and the University's subsequent increased reliance on non-state fund sources. Campuses now retain the revenues they generate, though a 1.6% tax is assessed on their operating expenditures in order to support the Office of the President's central functions. Funding streams did not change the manner in which state General Funds are distributed across the campuses, which is instead addressed by the Rebenching Proposal (see below).

Funding streams likely prompted a number of campuses to discuss local budget models, as the initiative enables campuses to direct revenues such as tuition and indirect costs to the units where they were generated. As UC Merced is not yet financially mature, it was not included in the funding streams rollout. As the campus is eventually integrated into the system, it may benefit from considering a campus funding model based on revenues.

Rebenching

In conjunction with the Funding Streams Initiative, the University discussed the need to address the distribution of state General Funds among campuses. The resulting Rebenching Proposal aims to implement an equitable and transparent readjustment of the campuses' base funding formulas. While a number of considerations still need to be deliberated, e.g., off-the-top items, enrollment management, and weighting of students, the University will begin the rebenching process on July 1 with new enrollments. Over the next six years, it plans to complete and conclude the process. UC Merced will not fully participate until it has appropriate enrollment numbers and financial strength.

Post-Employment Benefits

This year the University and its employees began contributing to the system's retiree health and pension programs, 7% and 3.5% respectively. These figures will increase to 10% and 5% beginning on July 1, 2012. The University faces a significant challenge in meeting its pension obligations in the coming years.

Campus Budget:

Campus Budget

Toward the end of the academic year, CAPRA invited the Chancellor to one of its meetings to discuss the current and future campus budget processes. The following is a summary of that discussion:

This year most of the campus' budget decisions were made without consulting the Chancellor. What remained under her purview was only a small portion of the new revenue dollars. Historically, these funds have been distributed incrementally across the campus based on unit growth. Due to budget constraints, the Chancellor thought the incremental process was no longer effective and decided to distribute the funds using a method that recognized growth, rewarded strategy, and measured success. In alignment with this approach, she created strategic priorities, which were listed on the Budget Call and which reflected a first attempt to move from a strictly operational-oriented budget to a more strategic budget – one that addressed operations and research simultaneously.

For the next academic year, the Chancellor intends to begin the budget process during the summer with a discussion on the principles that should guide the process. The purpose of starting with this step is for the campus to build confidence that decisions are being made in a principled way. The Chancellor plans to distribute all budget calls concurrently at the beginning of the fall semester. After the campus Budget Committee prioritizes requests and the Chancellor decides which of those will be funded, she will hold a forum, open to the campus community, so that she can explain her decisions and answer questions.

Eventually, the Chancellor hopes that a similar process will be implemented at local levels, e.g., within schools and administrative units. This would increase transparency, create a broader understanding of the critical funding needs across the campus, and facilitate a fair process of shared governance. The Chancellor intends to emphasize the importance of shared governance in the next budget process, particularly through the new EVC. The Chancellor would like to see the Deans have more control over their budgets and for that control to be largely influenced by faculty consultation.

Physical Plant/Capital Planning

UC Merced's current "golf course footprint" is only able to support four additional buildings; construction for two of these began this year. Because development beyond this footprint is constrained by the scarcity of available resources, the campus is looking toward development alternatives. One such that was considered and implemented in AY 2011-12 was the movement of some administrative units to off-campus sites. To further these efforts, Urban Land Institute, a nonprofit land-use and planning organization, will assist UC Merced in identifying and evaluating various development scenarios.

During the year, CAPRA expressed its concern to the EVC that physical planning and academic planning are generally not coordinated. The EVC indicated that this largely results from physical planning's close tie to and large dependency on funding from a number of external entities and their financing contingencies, including the state, UCOP, and private donors. However, he agreed that faculty should be consulted on academic building design to ensure that building plans are consistent with long term academic program growth needs.

Enrollment/MOU Support

Due to space constraints, UC Merced aimed to decrease enrollment growth for AY 2012-13 by 300 students so that aggregate enrollment would reach approximately 5,600 students. This reduction wholly affected the undergraduate population, as graduate enrollments saw a positive rate of growth. The campus strategically approached enrollment targets by increasing its selectivity for undergraduate students and allocating substantial resources to graduate recruitment. The EVC informed CAPRA that the reduction in enrollment growth did not have a negative financial impact on the campus, as UCOP continued to honor the terms stated in its MOU with UC Merced.

School Support for Sabbatical, Family, and Medical Leaves

UC Merced has reached a point where a significant number of faculty are requesting sabbatical leaves each year, which means schools are faced with actual or implied temporary shortages of instructors. At mature campuses the Deans or other administrators normally have funds reserved for covering the teaching loads of faculty members on leave. Such is not the case at UC Merced, and a number of faculty have been informed that they are unable to take sabbatical leave at this point or that they must assume heavier-than-normal teaching loads in their semester on campus. These consequences not only threaten faculty retention, but they also undermine the University's interest in ensuring its faculty is productive in its research. CAPRA

recommended to the EVC a formalized structure or process for directing adequate resources toward covering the instructional costs associated with faculty leaves.

General Education

During the year, CAPRA and the EVC discussed the role of General Education as it pertains to UC Merced. A topic of concern was how the campus should allocate FTE lines in order to appropriately develop General Education. One idea that garnered attention was to provide FTE lines to College One, which would then distribute fractions of the lines to individual programs. These programs would supply the FTE portions needed to create full lines for their use. Fractional lines would be allocated with the understanding that the programs receiving them would be committed to teaching a determined amount of General Education credit hours over a specified period.

Another suggestion was to concentrate on building strong research programs by allocating FTE for senior faculty positions and dedicating resources to space, and that General Education would develop indirectly from resulting synergies. In other words, General Education should be addressed within a global context, one where directing resources at prioritized goals could indirectly facilitate the realization of other important goals. Student-faculty ratios could possibly be used as an indicator of where the campus stands with regard to addressing these problems globally.

School Academic Plans:

Strategic planning is an annual process that begins with faculty in all units, including schools, graduate groups, and research institutes. The faculty creates plans for the development and growth of research and academic programs. The plans are then used as the basis for formal resource requests (i.e., Senate faculty FTE requests), which are developed in the Deans' offices in collaboration with the faculty. The resource requests and strategic plans are sent to the EVC who passes them to CAPRA for formal review. CAPRA then develops recommendations based on its own Guiding Criteria for the EVC, who makes the final resource decisions. This year CAPRA refined its Guiding Criteria, emphasizing the requirement that school plans are appended with individual unit plans and requesting specific detail around the indirect resource implications for prioritized FTE. CAPRA chose not to stress General Education as a criterion.

In September the EVC transmitted his Call for School Academic Plans to the Deans. In prior years, plans were to cover a three-year period and work under the assumption of a constant annual FTE allocation. This year, schools were asked to develop three-year plans, but each school was allocated one additional FTE line for 2012-13 and promised two additional lines for 2013-14 and three for 2014-15. As has become routine, each plan was to include four tables delineating the nature of its FTE requests: (1) prioritized FTE requests for the 2012-2013 academic year; (2) prioritized FTE requests for the following two academic years; (3) instructional obligations of the School's faculty, by majors and/or graduate groups; and (4) a

table documenting proposed space needs. The CAPRA Guiding Criteria was disseminated to the Schools in October 2011.

School plans were submitted to the EVC in February and March and then forwarded to CAPRA. The CAPRA analyst collected or requested data on undergraduate and graduate enrollments by major or program, credit hours taught by each program, faculty numbers, and the status of open FTE searches. These data aided CAPRA in considering the plans in the context of its guiding criteria, as well as to ensure that programs were not too ambitious with regard to hiring expectations.

In June CAPRA conducted its final review of the School Academic Plans and FTE requests. The committee was generally satisfied with the first-year (2012-13) requests made by SSHA and Eng., but made some suggestions for future planning (see below, *Comments*). Regarding the NS Plan, CAPRA was largely dissatisfied with the Dean's lack of consultation with the faculty. Though CAPRA was supportive of five of the six FTE lines requested by the Dean, it recommended that one of the two 2012-13 Applied Mathematics lines instead be allocated to the Biology program. Because the NS plan did not provide an overall strategic direction for the School, and because both biology groups within the School seemed worthy of the additional line, CAPRA did not specify which group should receive the line, but left the decision to the EVC.

CAPRA chose to make specific recommendations on the 2012-13 FTE requests, only, as the committee felt planning processes may change significantly with a new EVC, which would likely impact FTE requests.

Comments

In general, CAPRA was concerned about the lack of discussion and consultation that occurred as the plans were developed. The committee encourages schools to begin strategic planning earlier in the year, perhaps by October or November, and to incorporate fuller discussions between faculty representatives from units and programs and the Deans. Faculty planning groups, perhaps the school Executive Committees, and their Deans should work together to determine school priorities after individual program plans are put forward and before the Deans submit a final plan to their faculty for a vote. Regarding plan content, CAPRA encourages the Schools to provide more detail with regard to research foci, graduate programs, and consultation processes.

Strategic Investment Faculty Hires:

Per the request of the EVC, CAPRA reviewed the twelve Strategic Initiative Hire proposals that were not funded in AY 2010-11 and, for funding purposes, created a ranked list of the top four. The committee did not focus on identifying one top proposal from each of UCM's strategic research themes, but instead evaluated proposals without regard for strategic research theme. An effort was made to have disciplinary and topical diversity represented among the top

proposals. The committee judged the proposals based on how well they met at least two of following three criteria:

1. Did the proposal involve hiring someone interdisciplinary, who would connect a variety of fields, programs, etc.?
2. Did the proposal clearly move graduate education or research forward in a significant way, filling some gap or making useful connections between areas?
3. Did the proposal do something that is unique in the UC system that would help establish a distinctive identity for the campus?

Listed below in ranked order are CAPRA's final recommendations. The committee provisionally recommended funding two of the proposals, *Prevention Sciences* and the *Fabrication of Electronic Materials*, with the request that the searches and search committees be interdisciplinary. Finally, CAPRA recognized that these senior hires would likely have on-going searches that could take several years to conclude. The committee therefore urged commencing all four searches immediately, in hopes that at least one or two could be filled by AY 2013-14, but also indicated that a process for initiating the searches be detailed before any were given approval to move forward.

1. Parks & Natural Resources Management
2. Prevention Sciences
3. Fabrication of Electronic Materials
4. Modern Latin American Gender and/or Women's History

Additional Review Items:

Revised Summer 2012 Schedule (10.11.2011)

CAPRA reviewed the revised Summer 2012 Schedule, which proposed extending weeks of summer instruction. The committee informed the Division Council that while the additional weeks would have accompanying costs, the new schedule had the potential to substantially increase summer revenue to the point where it would far exceed additional costs. CAPRA was supportive of the revision.

Systemwide Review of the ShaRCS Program (10.24.2011)

CAPRA agreed that while the proposal justified having a shared research computing service for faculty members on some UC campuses, it was not necessarily a program that every campus would utilize. This consideration, combined with the difficult budget climate, led CAPRA to recommend that the UC Merced administration not support central financing of the program. Rather, the costs of the program should be shared only by those campuses that opt in.

Systemwide Review of APM 668 (11.18.2011): CAPRA reviewed the materials regarding APM 668, which proposed a Negotiated Salary Program (NSP) as a means of maintaining the University's competitiveness in general campus faculty compensation. The committee's correspondence to

the Division Council highlighted several negative consequences that could result from implementing the policy. Listed below are general summaries of these.

- The program would likely create salary disparities across and intra disciplines.
- Reducing market pressures in the most market-sensitive areas lessens pressures to create systemwide salary scale increases.
- The program may incentivize certain types of research, whose objectives might not parallel the mission of the University.
- The administrative process that would determine the NSP component of a faculty's salary lacks a unit-level peer review and would thus give too much authority to the AP Chairs and the Deans.

A majority of CAPRA was not supportive of implementing APM 668. However, a minority of the committee felt the long-term interests of the University were served by adopting the policy:

- Salary disparities across and intra disciplines could be mitigated.
- In terms of recruiting and retaining faculty, NSP would enable campuses to be more competitive in disciplines that are very market-sensitive. A similar policy is commonly found at other universities.

Overall, CAPRA believed a broader, more equitable policy for increasing salaries was needed. Rather than adopting a program that could generate a number of negative consequences, the committee would prefer a proposal that wholly served the general campus community.

Health Science Research Institute Proposal (02.03.2012): CAPRA was generally supportive of the proposal. The committee strongly encouraged the administration to formulate an indirect cost return (ICR) sharing agreement during the first year of the ORU's operation. It also recommended that the agreement establish a precedent model for all ORUs on campus, one that may require future revisions. Until HSRI is firmly established, CAPRA indicated that it would like to conduct an annual review of the agreement and of all other terms under which the ORU is operated.

Interdisciplinary Humanities CCGA Proposal (02.03.2012): As the proposed program involved the organization of what were existing individualized graduate study programs, CAPRA supported the proposal and indicated that it did not appear to have significant financial implications.

Systemwide Review of the Report of the Faculty Salaries Task Force (03.31.2012)

CAPRA agreed with the overall goals and recommendations of the task force, the primary being that faculty salaries must remain competitive and that the University should maintain its commitment to merit raises. The committee also supported an increase in base salaries and was generally amenable to the task force's recommended process for doing so. CAPRA suggested that in some cases, e.g., to reward excellence or to retain faculty, the Merced administration should avoid reducing faculty members' off-scale salaries when the bases are adjusted.

Respectfully submitted,

Nella Van Dyke (SSHA), Chair, UCPB Representative

Matthew Meyer (NS), Vice Chair

Paul Brown (SSHA), UGC Vice Chair

David Kelley (NS), GRC Vice Chair

Peggy O'Day (NS), Senate Vice Chair

Marcelo Kallmann (Eng.)

Susan Amussen (SSHA), Senate Chair, *Ex-Officio, Non-Voting*

Beth Hernandez-Jason, Graduate Student Representative, *Non-Voting*

Keith Ellis, Undergraduate Student Representative, *Non-Voting*

**GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the academic year 2011-2012, the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) met 14 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw II.IV.3.B. The issues that GRC considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

CAMPUS BUSINESS

SACAP- Digital Assessment Working Group (DAWG) Recommendations

GRC reviewed the DAWG recommendations on course evaluations on September 28. The committee found the information in the report for online evaluations to be innocuous and uncontroversial. It was noted that online evaluations are not ideal in terms of completion rates, but will be cost effective and ease the burden on staff when compiling the evaluation comments. GRC forwarded comments to SACAP.

Compensation for Graduate Group Chairs

Last year DivCo sent a request to the administration to standardize Graduate Group Chair compensation for the campus. The committee discussed the possibility that as the campus matures Bylaw 55 Unit Chairs may have a larger workload relative to Graduate Group Chairs. However, Graduate Group Chairs' workload could be substantial in years when the program undergoes Program Review. In a memo to DivCo, GRC recommended that the amount of compensation for these positions be reviewed periodically to ensure it is consistent with workload, as it is likely the workload levels will fluctuate over time.

POLICY

Use of Grant-Generated Academic Year Salary Funds

GRC sent a formal request to the Deans and the Executive Committees to consider establishing a policy for course buy-out. GRC reviewed information from other UC campuses and decided that a campus-wide policy at UCM would be neither consistent with other UC campuses, nor wise, given the different needs of the schools. Therefore, GRC recommended that each school consider whether to adopt or adapt an appropriate course buy-out policy.

Conjoined Courses

The Registrar, UGC, and GRC had previously discussed the merits of having a policy in which the schools would submit lists for conjoined courses prior to each semester for approval by the committees. However, GRC did not feel that the policy was necessary, but instead thought the current CRF process was sufficient for conjoined course approval. Any change in such courses will continue to be reflected in the form of a modified CRF submitted to both UGC and GRC.

Approval Policy for Online and remote courses

GRC reviewed UGC's draft Policy for Online Courses, which the council viewed more as a set of guiding principals for evaluating proposed online courses. GRC drafted and approved its own policy, which it based on that of UGC for consistency purposes. One minor edit was made to the supplemental questionnaire, so that it was more appropriate for graduate instruction with regard to faculty contact hours:

“Revised Question 3: The course must at least provide an equivalent educational experience for students. What specific pedagogical advantages does the technologically mediated format offer and how will potential detriments be countered? Specifically, how will the instructor maintain the high proportion of faculty contact hours needed for graduate education?”

The Supplemental Questions for Distance or Blended Course Approval Requests was approved by the Division Council on February 15, 2012.

Credit Hour Policy

The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) requested that GRC and UGC address a new campus Credit Hour Policy which was adopted by the WASC Commission in response to new regulations promulgated by the U.S. Department of Education. In particular, adherence to the policy will be reviewed during all future substantive change and accreditation reviews. In February, GRC endorsed the revised Credit Hour Policy proposed by UGC and that includes the assignment of credit hours for online courses. The Division Council approved the policy on February 29, 2012.

Policy on the Posthumous Awarding of Degrees and Certificates of Attendance

GRC approved the draft policy, written by the Registrar and based on similar policies at other UC campuses.

UCM Organized Research Unit Proposal Review Process

The Division Council approved the Organized Research Unit (ORU) Proposal Review Process drafted by CAPRA and vetted by GRC. The process was revised to ensure there is some calibration of the proposal prior to it being submitted to the GRC. The review must now include comments from appropriate deans, directors and others on issues of academic quality and significance, organizational design and support, budget, and space. Additionally, the Vice Chancellor for Research must submit the completed ORU proposal package with a synopsis of the dean's comments to the Academic Senate Office for distribution to GRC. The process was also edited so that it aligned with UC Merced Bylaws.

Program Review Policy and Procedures

GRC made several edits to the Program Review Policy and Procedures including:

- CoC appoints the Program Review Committee (PRC) members external to GRC.
- Language was made consistent for the constitution of the subcommittee.
- GRC now determines the final review cycle while the PRC makes recommendations to GRC regarding the review cycle.

- PRC conflict of interest statement was added.
- PRC appointments section was added.
- Faculty survey confidentiality language was added to reflect DivCo-approved changes to the Undergraduate Program Review Policy.
- The Review Team specifically includes two to three external reviewers.
- The title of Vice Provost for Research (VPR) now appropriately reflects the title of Vice Chancellor for Research (VCR).
- Minor grammar and formatting revisions were made throughout.

The Program Review Policy and Procedures was approved and distributed by Division Council on February 29, 2012.

Graduate Course and Program Learning Outcomes

The GRC approved guidelines for developing Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Project Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for both master's and doctoral programs to ensure an overarching connection between CLOs and PLOs are communicated in syllabi and curriculum maps so that students and faculty are able to develop holistic views of the major.

Graduate Advisors Handbook

The Graduate Division asked the GRC to review and comment on revisions made to the Graduate Advisors Handbook. The vast majority of revisions were minor and/or previously approved by GRC. The council agreed to approve the revised handbook subject to a few minor edits.

Policy for Lecture Teaching Graduate Courses

GRC was asked to opine on the appropriateness of having non-ladder rank faculty teach graduate-level courses. GRC reviewed relevant information from other UC campuses and decided to draft a policy based on such. GRC approved the draft Policy for Non-Ladder Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses on May 30, 2012. The policy was disseminated to DivCo on June 6.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Standing Library Subcommittee

Last year, DivCo charged GRC with creating a library subcommittee comprised of GRC and UGC representatives, as well as outside members. The committee would advise GRC on library and archival matters, including budget, collection development, research data support, and space allocation, as well as serve as liaison between faculty and the library administration. In September GRC constituted the Library subcommittee: Sholeh Quinn, Chair and campus liaison for the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC); Rob Innes, GRC representative; and Holley Moyes, SSHA faculty member. The subcommittee is appointed for one academic year, will meet approximately twice per semester, and will report to GRC. On January 18, GRC sent a memo to the EVC&Provost, endorsing the library as the campus curator for data management.

Program Review

The Graduate Program Review Cycle, which was approved by DivCo in June, is scheduled to begin next year, AY 2012-2013. Programs will undergo review based on the year in which they began enrolling students into the Interim-Individual Graduate Program (IGP) umbrella or the year they were approved by CCGA as a stand-alone program. The review cycle starts over every seven years. The Committee on committees will be tasked with populating the Graduate Program Review Committee for Fall 2012.

Graduate programs were invited to coordinate their Program Reviews with that of their undergraduate counterparts. This would generally result in moving up the schedule for the graduate group review to match the schedule for the undergraduate review; although, in a few cases an exception would be considered. This year, Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics (MEAM) declined the opportunity to coordinate review with the Mechanical Engineering Program.

Programs scheduled for review in 2012-2013 include Social and Cognitive Sciences, which includes Economics, Political Science, and Sociology. Economics is the only group that has had graduate student enrollments for seven years; therefore, GRC will recommend an amended review process for them.

Master's (M.A. and M.S.) Courses

The Graduate Division requested clarification on whether graduate research units, the 295-299 series, counts as credit towards the degree's 20 required units from the 200 series courses. Currently, 295-299 do not count as credit toward the 20 units. [The Graduate Advisor Handbook](#) stated for MS and MA students under Thesis Plan I, "In addition to the thesis, a minimum of 24 semester units in approved courses is also required, at least 20 of which must be earned in 200 series graduate-level courses exclusive of credit given for thesis research and preparation."

GRC requested feedback from the Graduate Groups and received only one response. After researching other UC campus policies, GRC chose to amend the Graduate Advisors Handbook to state that "*at least 50% of (minimum semester units) must be earned in 200 series graduate-level courses exclusive of courses numbered from 295-299.*"

CCGA discussed and approved the recommendation on March 7, 2012. The Graduate Advisors Handbook was revised and circulated on March 14, 2012.

Graduate Group Review of Policies and Procedures

GRC implemented a practice of annually reviewing Graduate Group Policies and Procedures to ensure that changes in policies are consistent with systemwide and campus policy, as well as to provide a central location for current policies and procedures. A general memorandum was sent to all graduate groups, addressing two recurring issues in Graduate Group Policies and Procedures:

1. Conditional Pass- GRC recommended limiting the number of chances to retake an exam to one, except for extenuating circumstances or unless the proposal makes a clear case that more than one retake is the norm in that discipline at other UC campuses. In the case of minor revisions, a graduate group may wish to allow committees to withhold a Pass on an exam pending revisions.
2. Specification of graduate student fees and stipends in the Graduate Group Policies and Procedures- To ensure accuracy, GRC recommended graduate groups not include specific dollar amounts for fees, but rather refer to the Graduate Division website for the most current information. Regarding student stipends, GRC recommended that graduate groups provide a representative range of stipends that students currently receive, and include a clear disclaimer that the amounts listed are subject to change without notice and that the final stipend will appear in the student's acceptance letter.

In March 2011, GRC reviewed and requested revisions to the policies and bylaws for Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences (EECS). Concerns revolved around the examination process and adjudication. The group was specifically asked to revise their policy to include a committee for the M.S. thesis so that it adheres to campus policy. GRC also requested bylaw revisions from Environmental Systems (ES) and asked that it consider the composition of the Academic Advising Committee and provide clarification on course requirements. Quantitative Systems Biology voted to amend its bylaws. GRC approved the minor revisions.

Graduate Research Council Future Organization

On February 21, Chair Shadish sent a memo to the council regarding a formalized division of tasks for future GRCs. The GRC Chair proposed changing the organization structure of the council so that workload would be evenly distributed among members. Members were concerned that creating additional committees for GRC might create additional work. GRC agreed to continue handling business on an ad hoc basis and advocating for splitting the council into a Graduate Committee and a Research Committee.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

CCGA Approved Graduate Programs

The following programs have been approved by CCGA: Environmental Systems (2014-2015), Quantitative Systems Biology (2018-2019), Psychology (2018-2019), and Cognitive and Information Systems (2018-2019). Listed inside of the parenthesis are the academic years in which each program will undergo Program Review.

Pending CCGA Proposals:

- Chemistry and Chemical Biology- GRC assigned a subcommittee to conduct an initial review of the proposal and make recommendations to GRC. In November GRC sent the CCGA proposal back to the group to make minor edits, define the relationship between the master's and doctoral programs, better define specialization and how it fits with the current UCM faculty and areas of expertise, define programs' competitive edge for CCB applicants, more evidence of "student demand" (required by WASC), explain discrepancy of number

of faculty versus faculty that run comparable programs. GRC, CAPRA and subsequently Division Council recommended approval of The Chemistry and Chemical Biology CCGA proposal. The proposal was transmitted to the Vice Chancellor for Research who in turn recommended approval from the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chancellor. The Chancellor's office submitted the proposal to CCGA on February 27, 2012.

- Interdisciplinary Humanities, formerly individualized studies World Cultures Graduate Group- Interdisciplinary Humanities, currently World Cultures and History, submitted its preliminary CCGA proposal to GRC in December of 2011. The proposal was sent out for review to three identified reviewers. GRC returned the proposal with its comments on June 29.

Health Sciences Research Institute

The Health Sciences Research Institute (HSRI) proposal was originally submitted to GRC in AY 2009-2010. In response to GRC's request for revisions, HSRI resubmitted its ORU proposal in Spring 2011. In Summer 2011 the institute requested that GRC place a hold on its review, and a further-revised proposal was sent to council in October 2011. This latter proposal maintained the elements and essence of the original proposal; however, it reflected an added emphasis on how HSRI will translate research into changes in policy, practice, behavior, and/or treatment. The revision aimed to increase the visibility of health research at UC Merced, to increase extramural donations, and to improve researchers' competitiveness for extramural funding.

GRC assigned a subcommittee, comprised of three reviewers. The subcommittee found the proposal favorable, though it suggested edits to further strengthen it. An external review committee was assembled in February and was comprised of Fred Meyers, Executive Associate Dean, UC Davis School of Medicine; Michael Peterson, Vice Chair of Medicine, UCSF Fresno; and Stan Glantz -Director, Center for Tobacco Control Research and Education, UCSF. The principal concern of the external review committee was funding. However, according to EVC Alley, two years worth of operational funding had already been budgeted for HSRI.

On April 4, the HSRI proposal was endorsed by GRC and then forwarded to DivCo for approval.

Course Request Forms (CRF)

GRC reviewed and approved 16 courses.

- Approval for conjoined/cross-listed courses: ES 212/ESS112, EECS 277/CSE 177
- Approval for modified courses: EECS 290, PSY 202A, PSY 202B, PSY 209, PSY 280, PSY 221, MEAM 210
- Approval for new courses: EECS 265, EECS 267, WCH 264, MEAM 261, MEAM 229, PSY 225, PSY 225

On September 14, GRC voted to adopt the UGC Calendar for Academic Programs. In the past GRC has loosely followed the same deadlines set by UGC for CRFs and program changes, though it has not officially communicated this to graduate groups.

GRADUATE GROUP FUNDING

Distribution Model for Graduate Funding

The funding distribution model for graduate funding changed due primarily to the following three factors:

1. The Chancellor is committed to finding every opportunity to fund and grow the graduate student population.
2. The new UCOP funding streams model allows the campuses to keep all of its revenues and pay UCOP a tax of 1.6%, and assigns each graduate group a separate account and each school an NRT account. The Dean's Office at each school will manage the funds and allow each graduate group to negotiate its share of the funds.
3. The campus will pay 100% of tuition and fees for every Teaching Assistant. The savings in the instructional budget will stay in the schools and can only be used for graduate student support, e.g., GSR, NRT, fees, TAs, or additional staff support for graduate programs. The accounts will not be swept at the end of each year, so the funds can be recycled through the school for continuous funding.

Eligibility of AB130 Graduate Students

GRC agreed that graduate students that fall under the AB-130 classification should be considered eligible for non-state funding (e.g., private funding), so long as it is a legal use of the funds.

Summer Fellowships

AY 2011-2012 is the final year for the EVC/Provost's annual commitment of \$500,000 to GRC for managing student support. Funds are allocated as graduate student support for each graduate group and as student summer fellowships. In AY 2009-2010 a total of \$488,008 was allocated to nine graduate groups and to student Summer Fellowships. In AY 2010-2011 a total of \$473,008 was allocated to 11 graduate groups and to student Summer Fellowships. AY 2010-2011 Summer Fellowships were supplemented by a surplus of USAP funds, allowing GRC to roll over \$51,795 to AY 2011-2012.

Each year the GRC has refined its way of distributing funds based on feedback from the Graduate Division, graduate groups, schools and graduate students. \$250,001 was distributed to 11 graduate groups for recruitment and retention and determined by several factors, including number of recruiting faculty with at least one graduate student advisee, faculty in their first and second year (assuming these faculty will recruit), average graduate group size per faculty.

The remaining funding was appropriated for a competition for graduate students in the form of Summer Fellowships of up to \$7500 each. The fellowships could be used for research stipends or travel. GRC conducted its review differently this year than it had in the past. Fellowship proposals were submitted directly to the students' Graduate Group Chairs and ranked by the group faculty based on criteria set by GRC in the following order: 1) student accomplishments and credentials, 2) student progress to degree, and 3) quality of the proposed project. The proposals included a list of the students' current forms of summer support. All graduate students were eligible to apply for the funding this year. Students with guaranteed summer funding from other sources, such as grants, were eligible for an award of a lesser amount for research-related expenses, such as travel. Rankings were combined with students'

GRE scores and GPA and then provided to GRC. The council assigned a percent of available Summer Fellowship funds to each graduate group proportionately based on the number of currently enrolled students. GRC then awarded Summer Fellowships to applicants in the order specified by each graduate group until all funds were used.

One-hundred and thirty-three student proposals were submitted to the graduate groups. GRC awarded 49 fellowships, totaling \$301,001.

GRADUATE DIVISION FUNDING

Fellowships

For each of the following fellowships, a GRC subcommittee evaluated and ranked the nominees and forwarded their rankings to the Graduate Division for award selection.

- Miguel Velez Fellowship- There were two awards available and four applicants.
- Fletcher Jones- There was one award available and 12 applicants.
- Faculty Mentor Program- There was one award available and 11 applicants.
- President's Dissertation Year- There was one award available and eight applicants.
- Eugene Cota-Robles- There were four fellowships available. Fifteen incoming students were identified as potential recipients, allowing the Graduate Division to extend additional offers if the initial recipients turned down the fellowship. Moving forward, GRC will request the Graduate Division to provide its reasoning for nominations, as well as if fellowship offers should be increased to four years instead of two.
- Chancellor's Graduate Fellowships- There were four fellowships available. Nineteen students were identified as potential recipients, allowing the Graduate Division to extend additional offers if the initial recipients turned down the fellowships. The fellowships were awarded in two rounds. Moving forward, GRC will require the graduate groups to submit a statement for each nominee, including a concise summary of the key factors that the group considered when making their nominations.

Graduate students asked that GRC discuss the requirement that students advance to candidacy before becoming eligible for some internal fellowships. This criteria works for students in SNS and SOE, where they advance to candidacy in their second year, but not in SSHA where they advance to candidacy in their third year. In the case of the Fletcher Jones Fellowship, the requirement was set by the donor of the fellowship. Criteria prescribed by donors are normally difficult to change. GRC requested clarification on the flexibility of the requirements for the internal fellowships.

Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award

A GRC subcommittee evaluated and ranked the nominations from each graduate group and forwarded their rankings to the Graduate Division for award selection. GRC funds half of the \$500 cash award with the other half provided by the student's school or the Graduate Division. GRC provided a total of \$750 for the Outstanding Teaching Assistant Awards.

FACULTY FUNDING

Faculty Research Grants

The Academic Senate received \$123,000 from the EVC/Provost to disburse to the faculty for the annual GRC research/travel/shared equipment grant competition. The Call for the grant was distributed to the faculty with a March 1, 2012 application deadline. Thirty-five proposals were submitted to GRC. Each proposal was assigned two reviewers and given a rating on a scale of 1-5 for merit and need. GRC extensively discussed the selection of reviewers and determined it would be mutually beneficial for the reviewers to be from the same school as the PI. This approach is different from previous years.

The GRC funded 22 proposals, totaling of \$122,974. Twelve were distributed to the School of Natural Sciences faculty; eight were distributed to faculty in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, and two were distributed to faculty in the School of Engineering.

Senate Research Awards

For the fourth year in UC Merced's Academic Senate history, faculty members were recognized with Senate Awards. GRC had jurisdiction over the following awards:

- Distinction in Research- Awarded to Thomas Hansford, Associate Professor of Political Science.
- Distinguished Early Career Research- Awarded to Jessica Trounstone, Assistant Professor of Political Science.
- Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award- Awarded to Jennifer Manilay, Associate Professor of Biology.

GRC formed a review subcommittee for the three research award categories, evaluated the nominees, and selected the recipients. The Academic Senate announced all award recipients at the Meeting of the Division on April 12, 2012.

COMMUNICATIONS

Memos to DivCo

In response to DivCo requests, GRC submitted memos to DivCo on Graduate Group Chair compensation, ORU review process, constitution of a Library subcommittee, Graduate Program Review schedule, CITRIS Report, Credit Hour Policy, Graduate Online Course Policy, Graduate Program Review Policy & Procedures, Academic Calendars, Guidelines for Graduate CLOs and PLOs, ShaRCS Report, and UCAAD Salary Equity Report.

Memos to VCR Traina

GRC submitted memos to the Vice Chancellor for Research recommending the UC Berkeley Dissertation/Thesis Release Forms be adapted for UC Merced's use.

REQUESTS FROM CRE

The Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE) requested GRC's review of the minor edits it made to the UCM Bylaws. GRC agreed with the edits and approved the Bylaws as presented. GRC also reviewed the UCM Regulations, which only had specific requirements for undergraduate studies. GRC reviewed graduate regulations of other UC campuses and decided to draft a set for UC Merced.

SYSTEMWIDE BUSINESS

Systemwide Items Reviewed by GRC

- UCAAD Salary Equity Report- October 5, 2011.
- ShaRCS Research Computing Report- October 19, 2011.
- UC Observatories Review- February 15, 2012.

Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)

The GRC Chair's reported on CCGA activities included the following:

- Budget.
- Review procedure of graduate group proposals.
- Systemwide Implementation Task Force- initial report recommended graduate student funding ratios are set lower than undergraduate ratios. 10 to 1 versus 27 to 1.
- Graduate student support in relation to post-doc salaries.
- WASC consideration of an alternative approach to accreditation that would only require graduate courses to go through WASC substantive change review.
- Self-supporting programs and professional fees.
- CCGA plans to protect graduate programs at risk for UC downsizing.
- CCGA approval of the graduate program proposals for Chemistry and Chemical Biology.
- Unionizing graduate student researchers.
- Endorsement of Governor Brown's tax proposal to avoid an increase in tuition for graduate students if the tax proposal does not pass.
- Re-benching and UCOP plans for Funding Streams.

University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP)

The GRC representative reported on UCORP activities included the following:

- External Review of the UC Observatories.
- Creation of the Taskforce on Principles, Process and Assessment of University-wide Research (PPA).
- Competitive Offers for Graduate Student Admissions.
- CITRIS Academic Review.

University Committee on Computer Communications (UCCC)

The GRC representative reported on UCCC activities included the following:

- Shared Research Computing Services (ShaRCS).
- Systemwide Privacy and Security Initiative.
- Web Conference Software.
- Pedagogical report on instructional software used in all campuses.
- Microsoft and Adobe pilot program for data conferencing systems.
- Proposal to abolish UCCC.

GRC also benefited from consultation and reports throughout the year from the Vice Chancellor for Research and the EVC/Provost.

NEXT YEAR'S BUSINESS

- Align GRC and UCM procedures for establishing new graduate emphasis and programs with those in the CCGA Handbook.
- Draft Graduate Regulations.

Respectfully submitted,

William Shadish, Chair (SSHA), CCGA Representative

David Kelley, Vice Chair (NS)

Erin Johnson (NS)

Roummel Marcia (NS)

Sayantani Ghosh, (NS)

Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA)

Stefano Carpin (Eng.)

Rob Innes (SSHA)

Ex-Officio

Susan Amussen, Divisional Council Chair (SSHA)

Peggy O'Day, Divisional Council Vice Chair (NS)

Sam Traina, VCR/Dean of the Graduate Division (Eng.)

Student Representative

Kristyn Sullivan (SSHA)

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In academic year 2011-2012, the CRE conducted business via teleconference, e-mail and in person meetings.

GENERAL PROCEDURES

The Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) issues formal Legislative Rulings to resolve disputes or clear up ambiguities regarding Senate authority, procedures, or jurisdiction. Legislative Rulings are binding unless modified by subsequent legislation or action from the Board of Regents. CRE also prepares and reports to the Division, or to any of its Faculties, such changes and additions to their Bylaws and Regulations as it deems advisable; formally supervises all changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations proposed by other committees or by individuals; edits and publishes the Manual of the Merced Division at such intervals as it deems expedient; and determines whether a person meets the conditions for membership in the Division.

FORMAL LEGISLATIVE RULINGS ISSUED

As requested by Chair Amussen and CAP Chair Wallander, the Committee on Rules and Elections reviewed a vote on a personnel file in the School of Natural Sciences (SNS). This vote was cast by the set of faculty who remain in the SNS Bylaw 55 unit because they have not joined the four new Bylaw 55 units approved by the Senate in 2011. Without *explicit* joint membership in two units, it is implicit in the Bylaws that the faculty of SNS who became part of the four new Bylaw 55 units *left* the original SNS unit, thus leaving a set of "residual" faculty. These faculty, as a group, have all the privileges of voting on personnel issues, etc. as specified in the Bylaws. The vote was therefore valid. The confusion appeared to have come from the use of the LES name not yet recognized by CAP. The name, as chosen by these faculty, refers to the future Bylaw 55 unit that will soon be codified by these faculty members. A glance at the recent history of the formation of these SNS units reveals explicit plans for such membership in a fifth unit. Use of this name seemed immaterial to the vote, though it may help future such situations by making explicit that voting faculty are those remaining in the original Bylaw 55 unit.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS***UC Merced Bylaw Revisions***

After extensive revision and feedback through the course of the 2010-2011 Academic Year, CRE presented at the Meeting of the Division minor edits to the UCM Bylaws. There was no quorum at the Meeting of the Division on December 1, 2011 and the edits were approved through an electronic ballot in February 2012. The following substantive changes were made:

- **Bylaws I.III.1.A, I.III.2.A, I.III.3.A, I.IV.2.E, II.I.2.A, II.III.2.B, and II.III.3.A.2-** The first day of Senate service for incoming members was moved from the first day of instruction to the first day of the semester. This aligned the Academic Senate's year with the

campus' instructional academic year. In Section II.IV.2.A the word "undergraduate" was added to student member for UGC. This clarified the type of student that would serve in the committee.

- **Bylaws I.IV.3.D, II.IV.2.B.6, and II.IV.3.B.3-** Statements were removed that granted the Division Council authority to make recommendations to relevant officers and committees regarding the establishment or disestablishment of academic programs. In this regard, the UGC has final authority over undergraduate programs and the GRC has final authority over graduate programs. The change aligned the academic authorities of the UGC and the GRC, providing additional clarity and uniformity in the Bylaws.
- **Bylaw II.IV.1.B.3-** Language was removed that gave CAPRA the capacity to advise CAP on staff allocations. The language does not pertain to processes on the Merced campus.
- **Bylaw II.III.3.A.5-** A normal term on the CoC is two years. Membership staggers, so that half of the committee's members are appointed one year and the second half are appointed the following year. A statement was added to the Bylaws, so that if the number of vacancies becomes unbalanced (e.g., five members due to be elected one year and three the next), the committee could reduce one member's term by one year. Finalized wording stated "The committee may reduce the term of a member to be elected from two years to one year as needed to maintain a balance of newly elected members each year". This improved continuity and ensured that annual elections are more equitable.
- **Bylaws II.III.3.A.6, II.III.3.C.1, and II.III.3.C.2-** The timeframe between the distribution of the ballot and the final day to vote decreased from 14 days to 7 days, and the lead time for the notice of Election in the spring decreased from 30 days to 21 days. The shortened timeframe will increase the process' efficiency while maintaining its integrity.

School Bylaw Review

- *School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts Bylaws*

The CRE was asked to review school Bylaws, and consider how they may be updated. In doing so, the CRE identified a number of recommendations and noted what minor changes would address each concern. Below is a list of our recommendations for SSHA.

1. The SSHA Bylaws state that the "School's Management Services Officer (MSO) must mail to each voting member of the Faculty a Notice of the Election". The CRE discussed that it would be compliant with system-wide Bylaws to have an officer of the Faculty (e.g., vice chair or secretary) communicate the results of the election through the MSO.
2. The Bylaws do not include any appointment and duties for a vice chair and secretary, which is customary in school Bylaws. The CRE recommends including guidelines about these faculty officer roles.
3. A final issue concerns Section 7c in the SSHA bylaws where it is noted that any voter has the right to require a secret ballot. This may be necessary under circumstances of personnel issues. However, traditionally, all other matters are typically discussed by members of schools as a deliberative body. In a deliberative body, it is customary that no voting member be denied the right to summon a roll call. It is fine if the SSHA faculty

choose to maintain 7c as it is, but secret ballots are not part of the parliamentary tradition of a deliberative body.

The Division Council forwarded the CRE recommendations to SSHA. SSHA updated its Bylaws to address a number of issues, such as the membership on its Executive Committee. Upon receiving the updated [Bylaws](#) approved by SSHA faculty, CRE reviewed them and deemed them compliant on June 11, 2012.

- *School of Engineering Bylaws*

CRE identified a number of recommendations for SOE Bylaw updates but did not require the recommendations to be fulfilled. For example, it is not explicitly against system-wide Bylaws that there is currently no explicit mention in the SOE Bylaws of how curriculum issues are decided (such as by a Curriculum Committee). The implication, however, is that the entire faculty of SOE as a whole decide on these issues. This may be an inefficient means of approving new or changed courses. Given the number of SOE faculty, CRE recommended that the Bylaws be rendered explicit about these curricular decision issues. Below is a list of CRE's recommendations

1. As noted above, the SOE Bylaws do not contain any specification on issues relating to curriculum. This implies that all SOE faculty, as a whole, vote on such matters. SOE faculty may wish to render the Bylaws more explicit. For example, perhaps the curriculum issues are currently being delegated to SOE's Executive Committee, or perhaps courses are voted upon in SOE faculty meetings. Any such option is up to SOE faculty, but the Bylaws are traditionally explicit in this regard.
2. In general, CRE recommends that the SOE Bylaws be more explicit about how the Executive Committee is constituted and how it functions. For example, as in #1 above, perhaps curricular issues are part of its purview?
3. A final issue concerns Section 7c in the SOE Bylaws. Here it is noted that any voter has the right to require a secret ballot. This may be necessary under circumstances of personnel issues. However, traditionally, all other matters are typically discussed by faculty members as a deliberative body. In a deliberative body, it is customary that no voting member be denied the right to summon a roll call. It is fine if the SOE faculty choose to maintain 7c as it is, but we discussed that secret ballots are not part of the parliamentary tradition of a deliberative body.

CRE forwarded its recommendations to DivCo on February 27, 2012.

- *School of Natural Sciences Bylaws*

CRE was asked to review the SNS Bylaws, and consider how they may be updated given recent changes in the Bylaw 55 units that faculty from SNS have formed. In doing so, the CRE identified a number of recommendations and forwarded them to DivCo on February 27, 2012. Below is a list of the recommendations.

1. The SNS Bylaws do not contain any specification on issues relating to curriculum. This implies that all SNS faculty, as a whole, vote on such matters. SNS faculty may wish to

render the Bylaws more explicit. For example, perhaps the curriculum issues are currently being delegated to the SNS Executive Committee, or perhaps courses are voted upon in SNS faculty meetings. Any such option is up to the SNS faculty, but the Bylaws are traditionally explicit in this regard.

2. In addition, CRE recommends that the SNS Bylaws be more explicit about how the Executive Committee is constituted and how it functions. Bylaws appeared to reflect an SNS faculty body that functioned as a personnel committee. Now that new Bylaw 55 units have formed, more explicit composition and function of the committee would be useful. What functions will the Executive Committee have? For example, as in #1 above, perhaps curricular issues are part of its purview?
3. A final issue concerns Section 7c in the SNS Bylaws where it is noted that any voter has the right to require a secret ballot. This may have been necessary when SNS, as a whole, was operating as a personnel committee. With the formation of new Bylaw 55 units, the School will consider issues that, traditionally, are decided upon by a deliberative body. In a deliberative body, it is customary that no voting member be denied the right to summon a roll call. It is fine if the SNS faculty choose to maintain 7c as it is; however secret ballots are not part of the parliamentary tradition of a deliberative body.

In response to CRE's February 27 memo, DivCo sent an email to Dean Meza and SNS Unit Leads regarding the SNS being out of compliance with its own Bylaws. The memo requested that SNS elect a school chair and determine the size and composition of its Executive Committee. It was recommended that SNS consult with CRE Chair for guidance in amending the Bylaws to account for Academic Units.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGULATIONS

Changes to UC Merced Regulations

CRE reviewed and endorsed the below change and addition to the UC Merced Regulations.

- **Change:** In response to a request from the Registrar to revise the course drop policy, CRE reviewed and approved changes to UCM Senate Regulation 70.2, Course Schedule Changes, Dropping a Course. The Regulations were changed in order to synchronize the deadline to drop course with the deadline to add courses at the end of the third week of instruction.
- **Addition:** The Multiple Major Policy was adopted by UGC in Fall 2010, as a result CRE proposed that the policy be added to Section 55-Normal Progress to Degree of the UCM Senate Regulations.

The change to UCM Senate Regulation 70.2 was pending the approval from other Senate Committees and only the addition of the Multiple Major Policy was presented and approved at the Meeting of the Division on April 12, 2012.

Addition of the School Regulations to the Division Regulations

In 2010-2011 CRE requested the Regulations from each School to be included in the campus Regulations as is customary on other UC campuses. It was found that some of the School Regulations needed to be revised prior to being included in the campus Regulations. In response, CRE made the following queries to the Schools:

- *School of Engineering*- It would be useful to provide information to the students regarding what happens to them if they do not complete requirements for their major with a C- or better. Presumably they will be dropped from the major, but we would like to confirm this and provide students with any other information that might be available. This information should be added to Part II, Section 1, 101.
- *School of Natural Sciences*- It would be helpful to provide students with information on where they can find out what the School's General Education requirements are. This should be added to Part II, Section 2, 200.A.
What happens to students that do not complete all major requirements with a C- or better? Part II, Section 2, 200B and C.
- *SSHA*- What happens to students who do not complete major and minor course requirements with the required grade of C- or better? Relevant to Part II, Section 3, 300B and C. The language regarding unit limits for coursework from other institutions is currently in violation of the transfer agreement between the UC and community colleges.

On January 30, 2012, CRE agreed to first address the review of School Bylaw issues before reviewing Regulations.

OTHER BUSINESS

- ***Lecturer representation in UGC***- On October 19, 2011, DivCo discussed the UGC Chair's request to formalize a process where CoC appoints Unit 18 lecturers to serve on UGC. The request originated from both the WASC visiting team and the external Program Review team for the Merritt Writing Program recommendation that the campus find a way to better communicate with the lecturers. The UGC Chair has currently invited two lecturers to be guests. The lecturers were non-voting members – much like the student members. It was agreed that a revision of the UGC duties would be a simple way to accommodate the request without changing the Bylaws.
- ***Addition of Senate Elections Tab on Academic Senate, Merced Division Website***
- ***UC Merced Naming Policy***- The Campus Physical Planning Committee submitted an informational item to CRE for review. A draft naming policy and procedures was drafted in response to the Regents established policy on the naming of University properties, programs and facilities. CRE had no issues with the initial draft and recommended that the draft be forwarded to DivCo.

ELECTIONS**• *Academic Senate Election***

The call for nominations for two positions on the Committee on Committees and one At-large member of the Divisional Council was distributed to the Senate membership on February 15, 2012. All positions for both committees were for two-year terms. Nominating petitions required five signatures including the signature of the candidate showing willingness to serve and were due to the Senate office on February 29. An electronic election ballot was created on UCM CROPS and sent to all Senate members on April 9. The last day of the election was April 11. The ballot included two nominees for CoC and one nominee for the DivCo At-Large vacancy. The electorate was asked to submit write-in candidates for both committees. The two CoC candidates were voted into office.

• *Special Election*

A total of 11 write-in candidate submissions were received during the Academic Senate Election in early April. Once write-in nominees were confirmed as willing to serve, an electronic ballot was created for a Special Election. Ballots were open for voting from April 24 through May 1, 2012. The ballot included four nominees for one position on the Committee on Committees.

NEXT YEAR'S BUSINESS

- Begin reviewing School Regulations so that they may be added to the UC Merced Regulations.
- Present revised UCM Regulations at the next Meeting of the Division for faculty vote.
 - Revised Course Drop Policy to the UC Merced Regulations (Section 70 to reflect approved changes by DivCo)
 - Revised Probation and Dismissal Policy to the UC Merced Regulations (Section 55 and 65 to reflect approved changes)
- Review the [Undergraduate](#) and [Graduate](#) Handbooks to make sure they're aligned with updated UC Merced Bylaws and Regulations.

Respectfully submitted,
Rick Dale, Chair (SSHA)
Peter Berck (UC Berkeley)
Paul Almeida (SSHA)

Ex-Officio:

Susan Amussen, Divisional Chair (SSHA)
Peggy O'Day, Divisional Vice Chair (SNS)

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
ANNUAL REPORT
2011-2012**

To The Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its standing subcommittees held a total of 11 regularly scheduled in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.4.B](#). Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate subcommittee(s), followed by full Council review. The issues that UGC considered this year are described briefly below.

Undergraduate Council Organization

The Undergraduate Council designated several subcommittees that met separately throughout the year:

- General Education
Professors Robert Ochsner, Carrie Menke, Todd Neuman, and Elliott Campbell
- Program Review
Professor Paul Brown (Chair), Professors Jeff Gilger and Erik Rolland
- Admissions/Financial Aid
Professors Wei-Chun Chin and Christopher Viney, Chon Ruiz (Director of Admission, non-voting)
- Policies/Courses
Professors Sholeh Quinn and Lei Yue

In addition, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed for the Regents Scholarships and the Undergraduate Distinguished Teaching Awards for Faculty and for Non-Senate Lecturers.

Academic Program Reviews

This academic year UGC accepted the Environmental Engineering, Physics and Merritt Writing Programs Review Reports. UGC made a recommendation to the Administration to close the reviews of those programs.

The Program Review policy was revised to include a mechanism that would allow programs to request that some aspects of the review report would be accessible to the review team, the program review committee, and UGC only.

In addition, in consultation with the Deans, the program review cycle was amended due to several programs asking for their reviews to be extended for various reasons.

Admissions

UGC received regular reports from the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jane Lawrence. Items discussed included admissions, enrollment data, recruiting and scholarships. The UGC admissions subcommittee collaborated with the UCM Office of Admissions to set policies to make UC Merced transfer admissions a selective process. Priorities of this subcommittee changed as the Administration began to focus on enrollment management.

Catalog

In accordance with the UGC Academic Program Calendar, the three Schools were asked to send their sections of the Catalog by March 1, 2012. UGC reviewed revised sections of the Catalog from the following:

SNS

- Applied Mathematical Science Major
- Biological Sciences Major
- Chemical Sciences Major
- Earth Systems Science Major

SOE

- Computer Science and Engineering Major
- Mechanical Engineering Major
- Materials Science and Engineering Major
- Environmental Engineering Major

SSHA

- Psychology Sciences Major
- Public Health Minor
- American Studies Minor PLOs
- Economics Major and Minor PLOs
- Management Major and Minor PLOs
- Services Sciences Minor PLOs

The Catalog addendum for SOE was approved on March 7, 2011. The SSHA and SOE catalog edits were approved on March 21, 2012.

Courses and CRF System

According to the UCM Bylaws, UGC is charged on behalf of the Division to review and approve all new undergraduate courses and modifications to existing undergraduate courses, including withdrawal, conduct, credit evaluation, description, and classification of existing courses. The UGC analyst transmitted CRFs to UGC via the web-based system. UGC reviewed and approved 122 courses, changes to existing courses and discontinuation of courses.

On November 16, 2011 UGC decided, in response to a memo from GRC, to abandon the practice of reviewing all scheduled conjoined courses prior to the semester in which the courses will be taught, in favor of having faculty submit new CRFs for conjoined courses.

On December 14, 2011, UGC granted “Administrator Rights” to the Managers of Instructional Support in each school for the purpose of making administrative, non-substantive corrections to the CRFs.

General Education

Background: In AY10-11 UGC voted to suspend the Core 100 requirement because it had become unsustainable. It was staffed on an ad-hoc basis by the MWP. The VPUE and a team of faculty and administrators established a task force which included experts from the AAC&U, to provide Merced with guidance for identifying cost-effective models to implement its GenEd Program. The task force concluded that what the campus had originally planned was commendable, and rather than giving up and going back to an “old-fashioned” GenEd system that is not particularly effective, the campus ought to figure out some other way to deliver its upper-division General Education. The solution was to allocate resources to fund the model.

In February 2011, VPUE Cameron presented a supplement to the GenEd proposal which provided more detail about the proposed restructuring of GenEd. The supplement was also presented to the EVC who seemed generally favorable to the plan. The proposed model would consolidate the campus-wide GenEd activities and courses under College One, under the authority of a full-time Vice Provost/Dean of Undergraduate Education. College One would have its own instructional budget and dedicated resources, proportional to other units on campus. The proposal also delineated the need to expand the GenEd subcommittee to include broad faculty representation (two faculty from each School); representatives of adjunct faculty who are involved in teaching GenEd; and the VPDUE and the VCSA as ex-officio members. Under this proposal, College One would receive 2.1 FTEs distributed across 7 lines with 30% of those lines dedicated to GenEd. UGC was supportive of the proposed model and agreed to have broad school representation of lecturers on the GenEd committee. UGC agreed to defer approval until the Administration finished discussing the proposal.

Items Reviewed/Approved/Revised by UGC

- **[Policy for Approval of Distance or Blended Courses](#)**: In response to two SNS faculty members request for approval of an online version of MATH 5, UGC approved an online education policy on September 21, 2011 as an interim policy until guidance is provided by UCEP. Faculty submitting CRFs for online courses will have to fill out the questionnaire included in the policy.

- **Proposed 2012 Summer Session Schedule:** UGC reviewed the proposed schedule on September 21, 2011 and expressed concern on the overlap of the summer session terms that could place unnecessary pressure on students who wish to enroll in both terms. Comments were sent to DivCo on September 30, 2011.
- **Reinstatement Policy:** Revised by SALC Director Boretz and VCSA Lawrence as recommended by UGC. UGC approved the revision on November 16, 2011.
- **Proposal for a Summer Colloquium in Teaching Writing-** On November 16, 2011 UGC was asked to opine on the proposal to provide faculty development programs for Unit 18 Lectures (non-senate members). UGC agreed to work with the EVC to develop a budget and identify procedures for allocating the money.
- **Posthumous Awarding of Degrees and Certificates of Attendance:** Approved on December 14, 2011.
- **Digital Assessment Working Group Report-** UGC reviewed the report and provided comments on January 18, 2012.
- **[Credit Hour Policy](#):** In response to a request from the Department of Education and the WASC Commission, UGC drafted a Credit Hour Policy. Adherence to this policy will be reviewed during all future substantive change and accreditation reviews. On February 8, 2012, UGC approved and submitted the policy to the Division Council for review and approval.
- **Proposal to WASC for General Designation-** At the February 8, 2012 meeting, UGC supported the campus' request submitted to WASC to be granted "General" designation. Approval of this request would mean that the campus would not be required to go through substantive change review when a new undergraduate degree program is approved.
- **Academic Dismissal Policy:** Revised in January 2012 by the campus-wide academic advising team and further amended on February 22, 2012 by UGC. The initial revision sought to place the burden to pursue appeals upon the students and aimed at dispelling the notion on the students' part that they are entitled to an opportunity to appeal. The second revision included a timeline for review, examples of acceptable documentation to justify appeals, and clarified the language and process for appeals.
- **Guidelines for Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs):** Approved on March 21, 2012. The guidelines are aligned with WASC framework and their goal is to

ensure that faculty members, in consultation with the school assessment coordinators, are asked how the PLOs fit in the curriculum as a whole.

- **Guidelines for Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs):** The guidelines were developed by ALO Martin and endorsed by UGC on April 25, 2012. The drafted set of guidelines are aligned with WASC framework and their goal is to ensure that an explicit connection between CLOs and PLOs are communicated in syllabi and curriculum maps so that students and faculty are able to develop a holistic view of the major.
- **Course Drop Policy:** Registrar proposed to synchronize the deadline to drop and add courses for the end of the third week of instruction, effective Fall 2012. The committee approved the revised policy on April 25, 2012.
- **Proposed Academic Calendars-** UCOP has asked that institutions with similar semester systems have the same Academic Calendar start dates. On May 9, 2012, UGC recommended approval of the proposed Academic Calendars up-to AY 2015-2016.
- **Academic Honesty Policy Task Force**
Background: During AY 2010-2011, UGC noted that the policy did not comply with best practices. It was therefore decided that the policy be replaced. In AY 11-12 UGC developed a charge for a task force that would revise the Academic Honesty Policy. The Division Council approved the charge for the Academic Honesty Task Force. Membership of the committee will consist of UGC members, the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment, students, and staff. At the beginning of AY 2012-2013 UGC members will be solicited to serve on the committee.

Requests from the Schools

School of Engineering

- In December 2011, UGC received a request to revise the ENVE and MSE Programs as part of the School's effort to push these two programs forward through concurrent accreditation through ABET. Revisions were approved on December 14, 2011, effective Fall 2012 and were included in the Catalog addendum
 - Revised Environmental Engineering (ENVE) Program to require technical elective in biology and earth sciences which are relevant to environmental engineering.
 - Revised Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) Program to require PHYS 10 in order to acquire necessary preparation for PHYS 141 that would replace MSE 110, since the scope and content of the courses are similar.

- In March, SOE submitted a proposal to change the CSE, ME, MSE and EE Programs as a part of the School's efforts to expand the technical elective alternatives for students. Revisions were approved on March 7, 2012, effective Fall 2012 and were included in the Catalog addendum. Changes proposed affect the following Programs:
 - Computer Science and Engineering (CSE) Program – Revised to expand the courses that count for the technical electives by adding MATH 131 and MATH 141. In the past students had the option to take these courses only by exception and the proposed change creates the policy that allows students to take these courses. Change the course title for ENGR 57 from “Dynamics” to “Statics and Dynamics”.
 - Mechanical Engineering (ME) Program – Revised to expand the courses that count for the technical electives by adding MSE 117, MATH, 125 and MATH, 126. In the past students had the option to take these courses only by exception and the proposed change creates the policy that allows students to take these courses.
 - Changed the course title for ENGR 57 from “Dynamics” to “Statics and Dynamics” required by the Materials Science and Engineering (MSE) and Environmental Engineering (EE) Programs.

School of Natural Sciences

- **Enrollment Modification Pilot Proposal**- The two-fold proposal addressed the issue of availability of freshmen level seat and enrollment in critically impacted courses. In November 16, 2011, UGC had no objections to the implementation of the repeat enrollment aspect of the proposal and asked SNS to consult with the other two Schools to revise the first part of the pilot proposal of freshmen course availability.

In response to UGC's concerns, SNS revised its proposal to provide more seats for continuing students. SNS proposed to reserve a certain percentage of courses for continuing students in hopes of meeting the needs of both continuing and incoming students for a few impacted courses (Chemistry 1 and 2, Math 5, 11, and 21). In March 21, 2012 UGC approved the SNS Enrollment Modification proposal as a two-year pilot program.

- **Revised Applied Mathematical Sciences Major** Addition of PHYS 116 as a course that Physics Emphasis Track students cannot take for their upper division requirements.
- **Revised Biological Sciences Major** by updating the prefix from BIO 125 to PH 125, removing the requirement that two of the three upper division elective courses must be BIO for Human Biology emphasis track students and expanding

the upper division elective courses available to include BIO 133 to Ecology and Evolutionary Biology emphasis track students.

- **Chemical Sciences Major** - Revised course title for CHEM 150
- **Revised Earth Systems Science Major** to include all of the lower division courses available that satisfy the lower division requirement.

All SNS revisions were approved on March 21, 2012.

Schools of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts

- On March 1, 2012, SSHA proposed revisions to the PSY Major and PH Minor. Changes were approved on March 7, 2012 effective for the 2012-13 academic year.
 - **Revised Psychological Sciences Major** to create a sequenced structure of courses and delete the exit examination requirement.
 - **Revised the Public Health Minor** to require PSY 124 (Health Disparities), PH 01 (Introduction to Public Health) and PH 105 (Introduction to the US Health System). The revisions provided students an opportunity to participate in research PH 195.
- **Revised Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for American Studies, Economics, Management and Services Sciences** were submitted on March 1, 2012. UGC approved the revised PLOs on March 21, 2012.
- On April 30, UGC received a request from SSHA to revise the **Economics Major**, effective fall 2012. Changes were approved by the committee on May 9, 2012.
- **Program Review for Stand-Alone Minors-** UGC received a request to combine the reviews of stand-alone minors with the review of different but related majors. UGC recognized that the disciplinary diversity of academic programs could render this an impractical feat, and that the faculty of the relevant majors would be best qualified to make this determination. UGC recommended to the School that the relevant faculty assess and determine whether some reviews could be combined.

Looking forward, DivCo asked UGC to consider drafting policies for internal abbreviated reviews which will help the campus decide how to review small programs. Until the policy is established, UGC proposed deferral of the review of the American Studies minor to AY 2013-2014.

Senate Awards

The Senate Office received nominations for the Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award for Faculty and for Non-Senate Lectures. Two UGC ad-hoc subcommittees with

balanced representation from different academic areas reviewed the nominations and made recommendations to the Senate Office. [Award recipients](#) were announced during the April 12 Meeting of the Merced Division.

Systemwide Review Items

UGC reviewed and provided comments on the BOARS Transfer Proposal. Under this proposal UC transfer applicants would be entitled to a review- but not guaranteed admissions-if they complete any of the three proposed pathway options. A memo was sent to DivCo on March 21, 2012 stating no objection to the proposal due to the congruency with the policies that were adopted last year by UGC.

UGC Guests

- Kevin Browne, Vice Provost for Academic and Enrollment Services attended the September 21, 2011 UGC meeting to discuss the proposed summer session schedule.
- Diana Ralls, Director of Financial Aid and Scholarships, and Heather Nardello, Associate Director of Financial Aid and Scholarships, attended the October 12, 2011 UGC meeting to solicit guidance on choosing awardees of the Regents Scholarships.
- John Haner, Merritt Writing Program Lecturer attended UGC meetings.
- Stan Mattoon, Natural Sciences Education Minor Lecturer attended UGC meetings.
- J. Michael Thompson, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, attended the April 25, 2012 UGC meeting to provide an update on the enrollment data for the fall semester.
- Rebecca Sweeley, Director of International Affairs, attended the April 25, 2012 UGC meeting to discuss how to facilitate home campus transfers for students and faculty that participate in the Education Abroad Program.

Systemwide Representation

BOARS: Professor J. Michael Beman (SNS)

UCEP: Professor Gregg Camfield (SSHA)

UCIE: Professor Cristián Ricci (SSHA)

UCOPE: Professor Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA)

Regular reports on the activities of UCEP were provided at the UGC meetings.

2012-2013 UGC items to be discussed:

- Academic Honesty Task Force membership and Policy
- Policy for Abbreviated Program Reviews
- Procedures for Discontinuing Minors
- Revise Online Course Policy

- Policy for CRF submission to require memo from the assessment coordinator providing his/her perspective so that UGC has some context when reviewing new/revised CLOs and PLOs.

Respectfully Submitted:

UCM Faculty

Gregg Camfield, Chair (SSHA) - UCEP Representative

Paul Brown, Vice Chair (SSHA) – Program Review Subcommittee

Robert Ochsner, (SSHA) - General Education Subcommittee

Sholeh Quinn, (SSHA) – Policies/Courses Subcommittee

Yue Lei (SNS) – Policies/Courses Subcommittee

Wei-Chun Chin, (SOE) - Admissions/Financial Aid Subcommittee

Christopher Viney, (SOE) - Admissions/Financial Aid Subcommittee

Florin Rusu, (SOE)

Jan Goggans, (SSHA)

Teamrat Ghezzhei, (SNS)

Ex officio, Non-voting members

Susan Amussen, Division Council Chair (SSHA)

Peggy O'Day, Division Council Vice Chair (SNS)

Jane Lawrence, Vice Chancellor Student Affairs

Linda Cameron, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Student Representative

William Hamilton

Staff

Fatima Paul