

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



DIVISION MEETING OF THE MERCED ACADEMIC SENATE

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2009

3:30 to 5:00p.m.

Chancellor's Conference Room

232 Kolligian Library

ORDER OF BUSINESS

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. Divisional Chair Martha Conklin
- B. Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang
- C. Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Keith Alley
- D. Systemwide Interim Provost Larry Pitts
- E. Systemwide Academic Senate Chair Harry Powell
- F. Systemwide Academic Senate Vice Chair Dan Simmons

II. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the May 4, 2009 Meeting 5
- B. Annual Committee Reports (2008-2009)
 - [Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#) 10
 - [Committee on Academic Personnel](#) 17
 - Committee on Committees
 - [Graduate and Research Council](#) 24
 - Privilege and Tenure 33
 - [Rules and Elections](#) 34
 - [Undergraduate Council](#) 37

III. DISCUSSION ITEMS

- A. Proposed Revised Bylaws – *CRE Chair Peggy O'Day*
- B. Academic Unit Formation Procedures – *Senate Chair Martha Conklin*
- C. Program Review and Assessment – *UGC Chair Susan Amussen*
- D. Online Education – *Senate Vice Chair Evan Heit*
- E. Strategic Planning – *CAPRA Chair Michael Colvin*

IV. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Chair Mike Colvin (oral)
- Committee on Academic Personnel, Vice Chair Tom Harmon (oral)
- Committee on Committees, Chair Carlos Coimbra (oral)

Graduate and Research Council, Chair Chris Kello (oral)
Undergraduate Council, Chair Susan Amussen (oral)

- V. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (NONE)**
- VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (NONE)**
- VII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE (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.

Peggy O’Day
Secretary/Parliamentarian

SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS, 2009-2010

DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

Martha Conklin, Chair (SoE)
Evan Heit, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Peggy O'Day (Rules/Parliamentarian) (NS)
Carlos Coimbra (CoC Chair) (SoE)
Mike Colvin (CAPRA) (NS)
Chris Kello (GRC) (SSHA)
Susan Amussen (UGC) (SSHA)
Jan Wallander (At-Large) (SSHA)
Nella Van Dyke (At-Large) (SSHA) (Assembly)
Tom Harmon, (CAP Vice Chair) (SoE)
Liaisons: Erik Menke (NS), UCAF
Cristian Ricci (SSHA), UCAAD

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UC Berkeley)
Tom Harmon, Vice Chair (SoE), UCAP
Ruzena Bajcsy (UC Berkeley)
Gregg Camfield (SSHA)
Hung Fan (UC Irvine)
Robert Innes (SSHA)
Richard Regosin (UC Irvine)
Jian-Qiao Sun (SoE)
Jan Wallander (SSHA)
Roland Winston (NS/SoE)

ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Michael Colvin, Chair (NS), UCPB
Wolfgang Rogge, Vice Chair (SoE)
Evan Heit (SSHA)
Susan Amussen (SSHA)
Chris Kello (SSHA)

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Carlos Coimbra, Chair (SoE) UCOC
Ruth Mostern, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Arnold Kim (NS)
Sayantani Ghosh (NS)
Tom Hansford (SSHA)
Anthony Westerling (SSHA/SoE)
Jack Vevea (SSHA)
Miguel Carreira-Perpinan (SoE)

GRADUATE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Chris Kello, Chair (SSHA), CCGA
Dave Kelley, Vice Chair (NS)
Raymond Chiao (NS/SoE)
Yarrow Dunham (SSHA), UCORP
Carolyn Frank (NS)
Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA)
Matt Meyer (NS)
Michael Modest (SoE)
Shawn Newsam (SoE)
Sholeh Quinn (SSHA)
Ex Officio: Sam Traina, VC Research/Dean Grad Div
Liaison: Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA), UCOLSC

PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Robert Hillman, Chair (UC Davis)
Jeannie Darby (UC Davis)
Jodie Holt (UC Riverside)
Carolyn Martin Shaw (UC Santa Cruz)
Tom Wickens (UC Berkeley)

RULES AND ELECTIONS

Peggy O'Day, Chair (NS)
Tom Hansford (SSHA)
Teenie Matlock (SSHA)
Jean Olsen (UC San Francisco)
John B. Oakley (UC Davis)

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA), BOARS
Ariel Escobar, Vice Chair (SoE)
Gregg Camfield (SSHA), UCEP
Yihsu Chen (SoE/SSHA)
Lara Kueppers (NS)
Linda-Anne Rebhun (SSHA)
Jay Sharping (NS)
Peter Vanderschraaf (SSHA)
Jack Vevea (SSHA)
Ming-Hsuan Yang (SoE)
Ex Officio: Jane Lawrence VC for Student Affairs
Christopher Viney, VP Undergrad Ed
Liaisons: Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA), UCOPE

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
UCOC	University Committee on Committees
UCFW	University Committee on Faculty Welfare
UCIE	University Committee on International Education
UCOLSC	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
UCORP	University Committee on Research Policy

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION
MINUTES OF MEETING**

I. CALL TO ORDER

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Monday, May 4, 2009 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Martha Conklin presided. Chair Conklin welcomed participants and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Martha Conklin

The Senate Chair reported on the following topics:

- A. Chair Conklin thanked the faculty members who serve on Academic Senate committees.
- B. We are ending the academic year with grave concerns about the budget and UC Merced's issues being set aside in favor of systemwide issues. UC President Mark Yudof has stated that there will be a review of the policy on pay cuts and furloughs.
- C. Formation of Bylaw 55/Academic units. The Senate has formulated a draft policy that was forwarded to EVC Alley.
- D. The Senate has begun to re-examine its Bylaws and Regulations. (CRE Chair Peggy O'Day will discuss this in more detail later in the agenda.)

Chancellor Sung-Mo "Steve" Kang

The Chancellor reported on the following topics:

- A. Strategic Academic Vision. The document is now available on the UC Merced website. After this academic year, we plan to move on to the next phase of planning. We continue to seek faculty input and support.
- B. 404 Permit. It was a significant achievement to attain the permit and a milestone for the campus. Immediate projects benefitting from the permit are site expansion for the May 16 Commencement and the 1MW solar farm.
- C. Blue Ribbon Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. The Commission released its recommendations on April 22. The next step is to appoint an advisory committee for the formation of athletic programs.
- D. Beginnings Sculpture. It was erected on April 21 and was a concerted staff and community effort.
- E. Commencement on May 16. In addition to keynote speaker First Lady Michelle Obama, many VIPs are expected to attend including state elected officials, UC Regents, and President Yudof. The Bowl is being prepared for nearly 12,000 seats. The financial cost will be large but it is good publicity for our campus. The University Relations team is trying to raise private funds to defray the cost.
- F. Building Updates. The Early Childhood Education Center building will be completed before May 16. The Social Sciences & Management building project is ongoing; OP has assured us that money is available to complete the building. The Student Housing 3 project will proceed for fall 2010 occupancy and will add over 300 beds. Funding for the Science & Engineering 2 building (S&E 2) is unclear but our team is still working on the design.

A question arose as to whether the faculty would be able to interact with the distinguished guests at Commencement. The Chancellor answered that their time will be limited but he will check with Associate Chancellor Janet Young if there is any opportunity for faculty to meet the guests.

EVC/Provost Keith Alley

The EVC/Provost reported on the following topics:

- A. Incorporation of new faculty. More senior faculty were hired during this academic year. According to CAP Chair Joe Cerny, the cases presented to CAP this academic year have been much better than they were in the past.
- B. Enrollment. Last year on this date, we had 1,081 SIRs. This year, we have 1,360. Last year, the melt (students who filed a SIR but did not enroll) was about 12%. The goal is to reduce the melt by half a percent. We will have a student enrollment of about 150 FTEs for summer. We will not get additional dollars if we over-enroll.
- C. WASC Accreditation. The documents for the Capacity review are almost complete and will be submitted on July 7. Accreditation is going to be a very critical piece of the budget process this year in terms of finding the money to provide support for the Educational Effectiveness phase. In the coming year, we will have to collect the data and one program will go through initial program review. In Spring 2011, WASC will come to campus for the second phase. If all goes well, we will get initial accreditation in June 2011. The problem of UC Merced students being turned down by other institutions because UC Merced is an unaccredited university has, for the most part, been overcome on a case-by-case basis. EVC Alley asked the faculty to report to him any student complaints, and he will contact the institution that the student is applying to. He mentioned that in nearly all cases, the institutions have been willing to overlook the accreditation issue and accept the students' grades.
- D. Budget. For the next three years, we lose the \$14 million in state supplemental support. There are no enrollment growth dollars due to the state budget crisis. Other campuses provided us with the \$6.3 million that was our enrollment growth dollars. Next year, OP will provide the \$6.3 million. But, they are uncertain about providing it after that. We will continue to fight to make UC Merced a systemwide priority. If Proposition 1A fails, higher education will likely take another sizeable hit. S&E 2 will probably not materialize without the passing of the Proposition.

A faculty member inquired about alternative measures if Proposition 1A fails. EVC Alley said OP wants to bring in a group of people from other campuses to look at alternative growth scenarios. The Chancellor mentioned exploring the possibility of the state budget having a separate line item for UC Merced.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

- A. Approval of Draft Division Meeting Minutes, December 4, 2008
- B. Proposed Academic Senate Regulation Changes
 - 1. Senate Regulation 65, Academic Probation and Dismissal
 - 2. Senate Regulation 75, Undergraduate Honors at Graduation

ACTION: Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM

A. Proposed Revised Bylaw Language II.1.A – *CRE Chair O’Day*

Chair O’Day briefly summarized the background of this proposed change and reiterated what this proposed change consists of (information contained in meeting packet). Faculty will vote by paper ballot. A Council member expressed concern that some senior faculty that have part-time administrative roles would be restricted from serving on Academic Senate committees and we would therefore lose their input and experience. Chair O’Day responded that there will be a time in the future when we will have more senior faculty. A Council member requested that a pro and con statement accompany the paper ballot. Another Council member suggested allowing individuals with administrative titles to serve on all committees, including CAP and P&T, but requiring them to recuse themselves when a case or issue comes up in their own discipline or area. A Council member tried to move to have a pro and con statement with the ballot. That move was seconded. However, Chair O’Day pointed out that this is a discussion item and there is nothing to move on. Furthermore, there is no quorum. Chair O’Day will ask CRE to consider the issue of a pro and con statement, but she pointed out that the ballots will be mailed to faculty this week.

V. ANNOUNCEMENT AND PRESENTATION OF SENATE AWARDS

Chair Conklin presented the following awards: Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award (Professor Teenie Matlock), Dr. Fred Spiess Award for Distinguished Service to the Academic Senate (Professor Shawn Kantor), Distinguished Early Career Research Award (Professor Cristián Ricci), and the Distinction in Research Award (Professor Michael Spivey).

VI. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

CAPRA – Chair Evan Heit

CAPRA tries to foster beneficial connections between academic planning and resources. The committee’s guests have reported on capital planning, space planning, operating budget, School of Management planning, and WASC. The committee has helped the Administration prepare for budget meetings with the Office of the President and has improved communication between our campus and the Office of the President. The CAPRA chair serves on the systemwide budget committee, the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB). This year, the committee has reviewed the Sociology major, the Psychology graduate group proposal, the History honors proposal, the School of Management proposal, WAG report, capitol improvement plans, the Long Range Development Plan, general education, and the Strategic Academic Vision. CAPRA also reviews strategic plans from the Schools and will work more on those during the summer to advise EVC Alley on resource and hiring issues. Chair Heit emphasized shared governance and stressed the importance of keeping OP and the systemwide Senate informed of UC Merced’s excellence.

CAP – Committee Member Jan Wallander (Vice Chair Roland Winston was absent)

Six of the ten CAP members are external and have given us extraordinary service in reviewing personnel cases. The committee reviews appointments, merits, promotions, and mid career assessments. CAP has evaluated 49 cases so far this year. There is a meeting on May 8 with the CAP Members, campus AP Chairs, and the Deans to discuss the challenge of reviewing mid-

career assessments. The committee also reviewed the assessment of teaching and the systemwide policy on salary reduction and furloughs.

CoC – Chair Henry Forman

CoC's main responsibility is to populate the Senate committees and to respond to the Administration when it requests a Senate representative. Filling committees is a challenge due to the small number of faculty in general and of senior faculty in particular. Overburdening the junior faculty is a concern. The committee tries to strike a balance between retaining the same members to keep their expertise while also having the perspective of new members. Chair Forman pointed out that UC Merced's CoC is unique in that its recommendations are reviewed by Divisional Council.

GRC – Chair Valerie Leppert

GRC fulfills the task of what are normally three committees on other campuses: graduate council, research committee, and Library committee. The GRC chair serves on the corresponding systemwide committee, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) while GRC Vice Chair Patti LiWang serves on the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP). GRC worked with the campus WASC steering committee and the Graduate Dean to formulate a graduate program review policy. GRC also revised existing policies that needed to include WASC requirements such as the CRF policy and the procedures for establishing new graduate programs and emphasis areas. The committee has reviewed 17 CRFs so far, the Psychology Graduate program proposal, and opined on policies at the request of the systemwide Senate and DivCo. In addition, GRC gave out research and teaching awards, selected graduate students for NRT awards, and awarded the GRC research/travel/shared equipment grants.

UGC – Committee member Kathleen Hull (Chair Manuel Martin-Rodriguez left the meeting)

UGC reviewed over 100 courses this year and recently approved the 2009-2010 catalog copy for all the Schools. It reviewed over 60 applications for Regents Scholarships. In addition, it has reviewed the following policies: revised CRF policy (include WASC requirements), Honors programs guidelines, academic probation, dismissal, and minimal progress policy, policies for reviewing substantive changes to existing majors, and an undergraduate program review policy. UGC has also reviewed changes in majors submitted by the Schools and has opined on systemwide review items such as the Education Abroad Business Plan and the WAG Report.

Professor Chris Kello – UCM Representative to UCFW

(UC Merced does not have a Senate committee on Faculty Welfare so Professor Kello represents the campus on the systemwide committee.) UCFW drafted a memo regarding the lack of a clear, transparent procedure from the Administration on how to respond to the budget crisis. Other issues that the committee addressed are the pension fund and the UC pay scale.

There being no further business, committee adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Attest:

Martha Conklin, Senate Chair

Minutes prepared by:
Simrin Takhar

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
ANNUAL REPORT
2008-2009**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation ([CAPRA](#)) met 15 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in [UCM Senate Bylaw II.4.A](#). The issues that CAPRA considered this year are described briefly as follows:

BUDGET

Throughout the academic year CAPRA conveyed its concerns to the EVC about UCM's budget. Discussions with the EVC included the following:

CAPRA and the EVC discussed a letter from President Yudof in response to the [7/22/08 memo](#) from Michael Brown (2007-2008 Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council) regarding UCPB's recommendations to reconsider UCM's budget model. The Division Council (Divco) drafted a response to President Yudof. In its letter, Divco requested that Council reaffirms UCPB and Council's recommendations to increase UCM's base funding per student, restore the SE II building in terms of square footage, expand Castle and work with UCM to come up with a sustainable budget for the campus.

CAPRA also emphasized the importance of improving and reinforcing the spirit of shared governance by having the Academic Senate and the Administration working together and communicating on the budget allocation process.

Budget Committee

Across the UCs, budget committees send their criteria to each unit and ask them to bid new resources for the following year. CAPRA was concerned that the UCM Budget Committee had not met since August 2008. (It did ultimately meet, on April 16, 2009.) Due to changed parameters, CAPRA suggested that the Budget Committee reconsider budget priorities before sending their request to the units. Upon review of the *Campus Budget Principles for Allocation of Funds*, CAPRA noted that it did not specify how the campus would change its priorities get through the difficult times ahead.

UCM Budget

To address budget cuts, UCOP asked the campuses to curtail their expenditures. Therefore, the EVC asked the schools to reduce their 2009-2010 FTEs searches to no more than two or three most critical positions per school. Another cut is expected for 2009-2010 further reducing campuses budgets and flexibility with resources.

CAPRA conveyed its concerns to the Administration about the impact of the budget crisis on instructional space, graduate education, faculty success, faculty recruiting and retention. The committee also expressed its concern about the lack of space in general and the availability of research and teaching space over the next few years.

On January 22, 2009 Senate Chair Conklin and UCM Administration met with UCOP officials in Oakland to discuss the inadequacy of UCM's funding model. CAPRA Chair Heit also participated in preparations for this meeting. At the meeting President Yudof noted that he was not in favor of a reduced enrollment scenario at UCM. A possible ten year delay of payment of UCM's debt interest rates was also considered.

In February 2009, the EVC/Provost discussed enrollment and budget issues with Debora Obley (UCOP Associate VP-Budget Operations). There was some concern about the effect of the economic downturn on student enrollment. UCOP reiterated their willingness to provide funds from their downsizing to help UCM in the next few years.

In April 2009, UCOP agreed to grant UCM approximately \$6M for enrollment growth for 2009-2010. OP was not ready to commit to an additional \$6M for 2010-2011 due to concerns about the system wide budget.

In April 2009, CAPRA reviewed data related to general funds expenditures by functions. The document provided a comparison of each campus' expenditures and revenues. Figures showed that UCM is highly dependent on state support (57% vs. 22% for the other UCs). CAPRA noted that even with cost saving initiatives, UCM's budget still projects a deficit for a while. Furthermore, UCM's funding mechanism is based on the assumption of an 18.7:1 student to faculty ratio for additional students; however, historically, additional students at other campuses have been funded at a different ratio. All the other campuses have benefited from this and have had their graduate programs funded in a much more favorable ratio. CAPRA was very concerned about the serious implications this inconsistency will have on the future of UCM, in particular growth of graduate programs.

UCOP Visit

On April 27, 2009 UCOP officials visited UCM to discuss the campus budget. During a meeting with the Division Council, Lawrence Pitts (Interim Provost and Executive Vice President) suggested the establishment of a task force who will work over the summer on analyzing different budget models, enrollment projections, funding and demographic trends in the State. The task force would draft a financial plan for the campus. The membership of the task force would include some UCM faculty, administrators, deans and some representatives from UCOP. Provost Pitts suggested that the campus should consider short-term scenarios including slower growth and no growth.

CAPITAL PLANNING

The Division Council asked CAPRA to opine on the Merced's *2008-2014 State-Funded Capital Improvement Request* and the *2009-2018 Combined Capital Program*. The documents provided a descriptive overview of unfunded campus capital needs. CAPRA expressed its concern about the lack of faculty consultation during the preparation of the reports; about the insufficient amount of teaching and research space; and about the inadequacy of enrollment-based funding given UCM's small student body. CAPRA also noted that there was a discrepancy between data presented in the CIP documents and

information contained in the Schools strategic plans. CAPRA recommended Senate consultation regarding Capital Planning activities/discussions.

SCHOOLS STRATEGIC PLANS

CAPRA has been successful in establishing processes and criteria for reviewing the Schools strategic plans. At the beginning of the academic year, the committee edited its 2008-2009 criteria and timeline. Revised documents were distributed to the EVC, faculty, deans, and chairs of the graduate groups.

For the review of the plans, the schools are asked to submit enrollment data about their majors and the number of FTEs in each discipline. In order to ensure consistency, CAPRA recommended that the Office of Institutional Planning and Analysis (IPA) provide data directly to the schools thus eliminating the need for each school to create its own data tables. CAPRA reviewed data provided by IPA. Data included the number of majors in programs affiliated with a prefix, the number of student credit hours taught in courses offered by the program and the number of student credit hours taught by instructors assigned to the program. The idea was to identify faculty's home departments and to make sure that faculty's teaching efforts were accrued back to their home departments. CAPRA recommended that faculty with split appointments be given the choice to designate two prefixes and that an accurate accounting of hours of instruction related to general education be reflected on the IPA report. Graduate teaching was accumulated separately.

The Schools were supposed to submit their plans to the EVC by January 19, 2009 and their second drafts by March 16. However, in December 2008, UCOP implemented a hiring freeze across the UC system and the number of faculty lines allocations for AY 2009-2010 had to be reduced and some searches had to be pulled back. CAPRA encouraged the EVC to send additional instructions to the schools and provide clarity to faculty and the Deans regarding the preparation of the plans and faculty line requests. As a consequence of the budget limitations and the reductions of faculty lines, the schools did not supply complete strategic plans. The Schools of Natural Sciences and Engineering submitted a list of FTE requests and SSHA submitted a draft executive summary. This affected CAPRA's role and process for the evaluation of the schools strategic plans. CAPRA noted that the committee's criteria for evaluating the plans were not designed to interface with the schools' minimal plans. On April 23, 2009 CAPRA sent a memo the NS Executive Committee to request a reprioritization of the school's FTE request.

In May 2009, the EVC suggested that new searches next year be limited to this year's unsuccessful searches, plus five new lines (possibly all LPSOEs).

ENROLLMENT

In December 2008, UCOP warned the UCs against over enrollment. This caused some concern among CAPRA since UCM's funding model is and has been based on enrollment growth. CAPRA discussed solutions to address issues surrounding enrollment and limits imposed by the state on enrollment as part of the state's plans for budget cuts.

GENERAL EDUCATION

In October 2008, CAPRA sent a memo to the Division Council requesting that the administration provide faculty with specific information about resources available for the delivery of General Education.

The Division Council established an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education. Professor David Kelley served as the CAPRA representative on the Ad Hoc Committee. The Ad Hoc Committee held weekly meetings and conducted a thorough analysis of General Education and Core courses delivery. The Committee completed its report in April 2009. A draft report was sent to UGC, GRC, CAPRA and to the Schools for comments before being submitted to the Division Council. Comments from CAPRA members noted that the limited number of ladder rank faculty must contribute to majors, graduate education, as well as general education. The final report was sent to the Division Council in May 2009.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

CAPRA emphasized the priority of building graduate education at UCM. The committee also noted that Non Resident Tuition waivers were critical to the success of graduate education and that opportunity funds at some UCs are translated into non-resident tuition. Being able to redirect funds would allow UCM to boost graduate education.

SPACE

This year, CAPRA members reiterated their concern about current and future space challenges and how they put the campus at a disadvantage in recruiting and retaining faculty. The committee noted that in order to fully address and visualize the space problems, the committee needs detailed reports and analyses from the office of the Registrar and/or IPA. Furthermore, the committee noted that there was a disconnect between the campus' actual space needs (see CPEC numbers) and its inadequate capital budget. According to UCOP, CPEC analyses do not justify larger buildings at UCM. UCOP standards for assessment and analyses of UCM needs for space are below those of other UCs. This alarmed CAPRA given the current space crisis. Committee members noted that UCOP also needs to take into consideration the fact that remedial education occupies a large amount of space.

Discussions with the EVC included the following:

- Shortages of instructional space - Some science classes have experienced difficulty accommodating 80-100 students' class sizes. According to projections provided by IPA, computer labs and biology will be at 350% occupancy in fall 2009.
- Social Sciences and Management and SEII buildings – Funding for construction of these building totals \$168M. There were concerns about SEII's plans for occupancy (scheduled for winter 2013) and how this will affect the ability to conduct successful searches.
- Castle campus renovations and how space will be assigned. Utilization of lab space has been an ongoing problem partly because of the isolation factor.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)

As the UCM UCPB representative, Chair Heit provided regular reports to CAPRA. At UCPB's request and as a follow-up to last year's presentation, Chair Heit reported to UCPB in April 2009 on the state of UCM's budget. The operating budget is built on the notion that in the next three years the campus will lose state support and the expectation is that the gap will be backfilled with the marginal cost of instruction rate. In 2008-09 UCM received \$6.3M which backfilled the \$4M loss in state support. In 2009-10 and 2010-11 the campus will lose \$5M each year which will need to be backfilled with enrollment support as specified in the Higher Education Compact.

CAPRA BYLAWS

The Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) asked CAPRA to review its Bylaws and list any necessary substantive changes. CAPRA discussed this request at its March 2 and 16 meetings and recommended the following language (**bold**):

Bylaw II.4.A: Academic Planning and Resource Allocation Membership:

This Committee has at least ~~six~~ **eight** members: a Chair, a Vice Chair, ~~the Vice Chair of the Division~~, the Chairs of the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate and Research Council, **the Vice Chairs of the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate and Research Council, a graduate student member**, and **an** undergraduate student member.

WASC REVIEW

CAPRA shared its concern with the EVC about the impact of the WASC review on faculty workload and research activities, on UCM's programs ability to submit their proposals for stand alone graduate groups to CCGA.

SYSTEM WIDE ISSUES

Furlough/Salary Reductions (Proposed Amendment to Standing Order 100.4)

CAPRA was concerned that declaring a financial emergency at some campuses would intensify the current discrepancies in the ways the system funds each campus. The implementation of budget cuts, salary reductions and/or furloughs would affect the viability of the programs at UCM and would exacerbate stratification. CAPRA did not support this proposal and forwarded its comments to the Division Council in June 2009.

CAPRA was also deeply engaged with the EVC on the following issues:

- Strategic planning for the planned growth at the undergraduate level.
- Lack of mechanism to limit enrollment in impacted majors.
- Faculty recruitment for AY 09-10 and beyond.
- Resources for faculty start-up packages.
- Faculty success.

CAPRA reviewed and commented on the following proposals, policies and reports:

- General Education – *Comments forwarded to Divco on October 23, 2008.*
- UCM Strategic Academic Plan – *October 23, 2008.*

CAPRA's comments were general and targeted the needs and strategic direction of the campus

- School of Management Proposal- *November 21, 2008.*

CAPRA's concerns were mainly about resources for teaching, resources in general, space and library costs.

- Long Range Development Plan –*December 12, 2008.*
- Proposal for a Graduate Group in Psychological Sciences- *Comments forwarded to GRC on January 28, 2009*

CAPRA requested that a letter from the EVC regarding resource commitments, matching the resources requested in the proposal itself, be included with the proposal before going to CCGA.

- Washington Advisory Group Report – *Comments forwarded to Divco on February 11, 2009*

CAPRA was concerned about the report's resource implications and logistical challenges: funding for a part-time "Executive Director for Medical School Planning", use of a professional planning group, additional instructors and administrative bodies to support the proposed partnership between UCSF-Fresno and Davis Medical Centers, and in general a lack of faculty consultation on planned academic programs such as a new undergraduate program in the health sciences.

- Proposal for a SSHA History Honors – *March 3, 2009*

CAPRA supported this proposal, but noted issues about implicit resource requests and pointed out in its memo that the proposal could affect faculty teaching workload.

- Proposal for a Sociology Major – *Comments forwarded to UGC and to the Sociology faculty on April 2 and April 22, 2009*

During the review of the proposal, CAPRA consulted with the EVC on resource implications. Although CAPRA supported the new major in general terms, CAPRA recommended that the Sociology faculty consider delaying accepting transfer students until students entering the Sociology major are in their junior year. The EVC agreed with CAPRA's recommendation.

- Proposed Policy on the Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs – *Comments forwarded to CRE on June 5, 2009*
- Undergraduate and Graduate Program Review Guidelines – *Comments forwarded to Divco on June 19, 2009*

CAPRA met with the following guests:

- VC for Administration Mary Miller and Director of Capital Planning, John White – Dec. 8, 2008, to discuss CIP, space projections.
- SSHA Dean Hans Bjornsson – Feb. 9, 2009, to discuss the School of Management proposal.
- Professor Gregg Camfield – Feb. 9, 2009, to discuss the WASC review process.
- Kathy Jefferds, Budget Director – May 4, 2009, to discuss UCM's budget.
- Gyami Shrestha, graduate student, attended the April through June CAPRA meetings as a guest observer.

Respectfully Submitted,

Evan Heit, Chair (SSHA), UCPB Representative

David Kelley, Vice chair (NS)
Michael Colvin, Senate Vice chair (NS)
Valerie Leppert, GRC Chair (ENG)
Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, UGC Chair (SSHA)

Ex-Officio

Martha Conklin, Council Chair (ENG)

Student Representative

Kevin Wolff

Staff

Fatima Paul

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
2008-2009 ANNUAL REPORT**

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 2008-2009.

I. Membership

This year the membership of CAP included four members from UCM and six external members. The UCM members were Gregg Camfield (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts), Tom Harmon (Engineering), Jan Wallander (Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts) and Roland Winston (Engineering/Natural Sciences). The external members were: Joseph Cerny, CAP Chair (UCB: Chemistry), Hung Fan (UCI: Molecular Biology and Biochemistry), Arturo Keller (UCSB: Environmental Science and Management), Roger Rangel (UCI: Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering), Richard Regosin (UCI: French and Italian), and Thomas Wickens (UCB: Psychology). Senate Director Nancy Clarke served as the CAP Analyst.

II. General Procedures

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

CAP dealt with about 3-5 cases each week during the peak period of February-May; this was a lower number than anticipated due to sharply reduced recruiting due to the severe budget crisis. CAP begins its reviews when files arrive from the Office of Academic Personnel, where they have been analyzed, vetted, and classified to allow efficient processing by CAP. The CAP Chair reads all the files. One lead reviewer and two secondary reviewers are assigned to read and report on each academic personnel case although all members are expected to familiarize themselves with the files. Readers' assignments are based on their areas of expertise. Readers serve not as advocates of their areas but as representatives acting in the best long-term interests of the campus. CAP members from UCM who serve on search committees or participate in School discussion of academic personnel cases recuse themselves automatically from CAP review of the case. A quorum of six members is required for voting on personnel actions.

Members review files prior to CAP's Friday morning meetings; non-UCM members participate by teleconference. Reports of the primary and secondary readers are followed by a thorough discussion of each case and a vote on the proposed action. Occasionally, a vote is deferred on a case and the file is returned for further information or clarification. After the meeting, drafts of the CAP reports on the dossiers are prepared by the CAP Analyst and the CAP Chair and then provided to all members for review and

consultation. Depending on the level of the personnel action, the final version of the report is sent as a letter to the Chancellor or the Executive Vice Chancellor (EVC). If they determine 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 faculty member's School.

For the vast majority of the cases, the above process ends CAP's review. 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 communicates with CAP to discuss any disagreements with CAP's recommendation on particular cases.

Throughout the UC system, certain academic personnel cases, for example appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, require an additional formal review of all the case materials by an ad hoc committee of experts from that campus. This ad hoc committee is appointed by the EVC and its report is part of the final materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the EVC. At the older campuses, these ad hoc committees typically involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member. Due to the limited number of tenured faculty at UCM, the 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.

III. Specific Procedures

Procedures during 2008-2009. CAP follows UC systemwide policies as described in the academic personnel manual (APM): <http://www.ucop.edu/acadadv/acadpeers/apm/>

Procedures not outlined in the APM but followed at other UC campuses were also, for the most part, followed at UCM.

UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies (MAPP) document is a very useful resource for faculty members, administrators and chairs of academic personnel committees. Since MAPP is still a dynamic instrument, CAP presents occasional suggestions for revision to the Academic Personnel Office and/or the Divisional Council. In particular this year, CAP strongly recommended that the current MAPP "coding" for Mid-Career Appraisals be changed from Positive, Positive with Caution and Terminal to Good, Fair and Poor, which appeared to CAP to be clearer and more concise language.

A further issue arose this year in the WASC deliberations with the Academic Senate/Administration on the evaluation of teaching in personnel cases. It was noted that the APM insists that the evaluation of teaching be based on more than one source of information. Beginning with the 2009-2010 academic year, CAP will require that "each

case we receive [must] evaluate teaching quality on the basis of at least two sources of evidence (at least one of which must register student input) and that each case include a robust analysis of the candidate's 'ability and diligence in the teaching role'."

IV. Work of CAP, 2008-2009 Year

CAP reviewed a total of 61 cases during the year (see Table 3, page 7 below). As noted above, this is down from 82 cases in 2007-2008 due to reduced recruiting (compare total appointments between the two years in Table 3). Overall CAP agreed with School recommendations without modification in 87% of all cases (see Table 2). Tables 1A-1C (page 6) detail the caseloads and outcomes of personnel actions by type of action; Table 2 gives aggregate decisions by academic unit.

CAP recommendations are advisory to the Chancellor and the EVC, who make the final decisions. They are deeply involved in the process, particularly in matters of appointment and promotion at tenured levels, and they take CAP's recommendations seriously. In 2008-2009, one CAP recommendation was overturned by either the Chancellor or the EVC.

V. CAP Campus Visits

As is becoming a UCM campus custom around the beginning of the Fall Semester, at the invitation of the EVC and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP), CAP held two meetings on August 21, 2008 with faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by the outgoing 2007-08 Chair and the incoming Chair as well as five other members of the 2007-08 CAP. A morning session was held solely with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to academic advancement procedures at the University of California and was followed by extensive discussion between the assistant professors and CAP. Then, a second session was held over lunch and continuing into the afternoon which was open to All Faculty Members, Academic Personnel Chairs from the Schools, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on many different facets of the academic personnel process at UC Merced. Brief minutes from both meetings of the faculty comments/questions and CAP responses are available in the Academic Personnel Office.

Then, as the 2008-2009 academic year progressed, it became clear that the quality of the Mid-Career Appraisals (MCA) coming to CAP was very uneven. Two issues of particular importance to CAP are the timeliness of the MCA case preparation and submission and the unique character of the MCA. As a result, the EVC and the VPAP scheduled a meeting on campus on May 8, 2009 to discuss the MCA process (as well as the revised MCA "coding" and the need for augmented evaluations of teaching – both of these topics are covered earlier in this report). Several external and internal CAP members, together with additional external members by telephone, met with UCM Academic Personnel Chairs from the Schools, Deans, Academic Personnel and interested faculty. A summary of the points that CAP brought up for discussion follows:

With regard to timeliness, it is crucial to the careers of the assistant Professors that the Academic Personnel Committees in the Schools prepare the cases and have them voted on by the faculty for submission by a mid-November deadline. Assistant Professors need the timely feed-back that such a schedule affords so that they can understand their prospects for tenure as early in their (typically) fourth year as possible, and have sufficient time to engage in corrective actions when necessary.

With regard to the MCA itself, in accordance with the Academic Personnel Manual, the purpose of the mid-career appraisal is to inform an assistant professor in a thorough and formal way about her or his prospects for tenure on the basis of the accomplishments so far. It is a crucial document and one of the most effective instruments in the UC personnel system. The MCA thus serves a very different function from the unit letter for a merit increase and should not simply re-state the case made for a merit increase.

Of utmost importance is rigorous evaluation and complete candor. If there are weaknesses in the candidate's career to date, a unit's natural reluctance to cause pain can do much more harm than good to the candidate and the university. CAP very often rejects mid-career appraisals that withhold severe judgment out of a misguided sense of kindness. Fields vary in their expectations for tenure, and mid-career appraisals reflect this. In general, however, positive mid-career accomplishments show evidence of research independent from her or his doctoral and postdoctoral work, of research projects that promise leadership in the field, and peer-reviewed evidence that research will continue once tenure is granted. In the sciences and engineering, the award of grants for research is a prominent piece of evidence that the research program is valid, although grants do not in themselves substitute for lack of published scholarship. It is important to note that, as in any case analysis, research papers or other scholarship of the faculty member must be analyzed and not just enumerated.

Particularly at the time of the MCA, which requires an evaluation of the junior faculty member's entire career at UC Merced, it is crucial that the scholarship of the faculty member be comprehensively analyzed for its impact. In addition, a similar comprehensive analysis of the faculty member's teaching experiences and growth of expertise is essential in the MCA. Specific evaluations of the components of performance should be supplied, with positive notes where appropriate and cautionary ones where necessary. What is not required is a bland summary of information already in the vita (numbers of papers published, lists of courses taught, etc.), except as it bears on the specific evaluation. A discussion of the service record of the faculty member is also appropriate, with a projection of his/her capacity for future service at UCM. Finally, the School tenured faculty's recorded vote, establishing the MAPP MCA coding applicable to the reviewed faculty member's progress, must be included in the forwarded case analysis.

The above issues were discussed in detail at the meeting, which was then followed by additional comments/questions by the faculty about CAP procedures in other types of personnel cases.

In conclusion, CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with

David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The Chair and all CAP members wish to thank Nancy Clarke for her deep knowledge of UC academic personnel procedures, her wise counsel, and her outstanding service in support of CAP's work for the Academic Senate. We also wish her the very best for the future, following her retirement from the University of California on September 1, 2009.

Respectfully,

Joseph Cerny, Chair (UCB)	Roger Rangel (UCI)
Gregg Camfield	Richard Regosin (UCI)
Hung Fan (UCI)	Tom Wickens (UCB)
Tom Harmon	Jan Wallander
Arturo Keller (UCSB)	Roland Winston

**2008-2009 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1C FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	54	5	2	0	61*

Table 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (1 Acting; 2 Adjunct))	11	2	--	--	13
Associate Professor (1 Adjunct)	2	1	1	--	4
Professor	3	--	--	--	3
Lecturer Series	2	--	--	--	2
Total	18	3	1	--	22
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					82%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					96%

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	2	1	--	--	3
Total					
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					3
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100%

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Agreed with Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant (14 paired w/MCAs)	23	1	--	--	24
Associate Professor (1 Adjunct)	3	--	--	--	3
Professor (1 Adjunct)	5	--	1	--	6
Total	31	1	1	--	33
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					94%
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97%

*This number includes 1 assistant Professor Reappointment and 2 Endowed Chair Appointments.

**CAP Table 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2008-2009**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation				% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down	% CAP agreed w/unit without modification
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree		
Engineering	15	12	1	--	2	87%	80%
Natural Sciences	29	25	2	2	--	100%	86%
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	17	16	--	--	1	94%	94%
TOTALS	61	53	3	2	3	95%	87%

**CAP Table 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2009**

	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

**GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT
2008-2009**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the academic year 2008-2009, the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) met 18 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw II.4.C. The issues that GRC considered this year are described as follows:

ACADEMIC ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

GRC shared the Academic Organizational Structure (AOS) committee's concerns about how to best organize Schools and establish resource streams so that graduate groups receive adequate support. GRC endorsed the committee's recommendation for further discussion of School structure and resource allocation methods.

ACCREDITATION (WASC)

In November 2008, GRC heard a presentation by Dr. Laura Martin (UC Merced's WASC Coordinator) and Karen Dunn-Haley (Faculty Development Coordinator) on WASC issues. GRC was informed that every new graduate program must receive WASC approval in addition to CCGA approval. WASC wants to ensure that UC Merced has the infrastructure that is required in the Capacity & Preparatory review, which will be followed by the Educational Effectiveness review. There was discussion on program learning outcomes (developed by the graduate programs) and course learning outcomes (which faculty need to include in course syllabi).

GRC revised its CRF policy to include course learning outcomes and substantive change language. The revised CRF policy takes into account the new WASC requirements that need to be included with all CRF submissions: WASC compliant syllabus providing the course goals/objectives, student learning outcomes, contact information, class policies, academic integrity policy, disability services information, course schedule/assignments/resources, and assessment/grading policy; and, beginning in Fall 2009, the syllabus should also explain what the course contributes to the student's overall education (its relationship to the Program Learning Outcomes) and how it enriches (rather than duplicates, for example) the existing curriculum (i.e. the course's relationship to extant courses). GRC approved the revised CRF policy in March 2009.

GRC also revised its procedures for the approval of new graduate emphasis areas/groups to include substantive change language. This revised policy was approved by GRC in March 2009.

In anticipation of UC Merced's emphasis areas becoming full-fledged graduate programs, GRC - in collaboration with the VCR - formulated the campus's first ever graduate program review policy. During the formulating process, GRC took into account suggestions from DivCo. GRC was also asked to consider a proposal by DivCo for joint program review between GRC and

UGC. GRC voted to approve its graduate program review policy in May 2009 but did not approve DivCo's joint program review.

CATALOG CHANGES

Eight of the nine graduate emphasis areas/graduate groups (ES had no changes) submitted changes to the Catalog. GRC reviewed and approved the revisions and forwarded them to the Graduate Division and the Registrar's Office.

CENTRALIZED RESEARCH UNITS (CRU) POLICY

GRC formulated a policy for the approval of CRUs at UC Merced, developed in collaboration with the VCR. GRC recommended that in the future, the policy be modified or a new policy established for shared research units operated under departments, Schools, or ORUs. While the formulated CRU policy only concerns research units requesting resources from the VCR, GRC noted that all research units compete for the same campus resources for research. GRC approved the CRU policy in May 2009 and the policy was then forwarded to DivCo and EVC Alley.

CHANCELLOR'S DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

The Chancellor announced that he is placing money into a discretionary fund that he anticipates will lead to the submittal of future competitive grant proposals. GRC was asked to opine on the best way to invest these research dollars. GRC recommended (1) increasing the current grant writer's time to 100% which would benefit the faculty and university, and, (2) the additional increment of funding be used to hire technical staff to support shared research infrastructure. GRC also recommended that for any new funding obtained as a result of these actions that return on overhead be used to augment the Chancellor's discretionary funds.

CRFS

GRC reviewed and approved 20 CRFs.

The committee also formulated a flowchart that shows the approval process for graduate courses.

FEDERAL STIMULUS BILL

GRC had some discussions on the federal stimulus bill and its ramifications for research. NSF funding went up by \$3 billion, NIH \$10 billion, and DOE Office of Science \$2.8 billion. For NSF, \$2.6 billion will be used to fund proposals that have already been reviewed but fall below the funding line. The remaining \$400 million will be divided - half for MRI and half for facilities grants. NIH put out a call in March 2009 for major instrumentation grants ranging from \$600,000 to several million dollars. In regards to graduate student funding, \$10 million dollars was placed into the education directorate.

FUTURE WEB-BASED CRF SYSTEM

UGC currently has a web-based system for the inputting and tracking of undergraduate CRFs. GRC expressed interest in doing the same with graduate courses. GRC invited School of Engineering Associate Dean German Gavilan (who created the undergraduate web-based system) to a GRC meeting to collect ideas from committee members on how to proceed with implementing a web-based system for graduate courses. Based on GRC's course approval workflow and CRF form, Gavilan is formulating a cost proposal that will be forwarded to GRC

members. Ultimately, the goal is to link the undergraduate and graduate CRF systems, but for the near future, Gavilan will implement a parallel system for graduate courses that is not linked to the undergraduate system. Gavilan will have a prototype in place by Fall 2009.

GRADUATE STUDENT AWARDS

- Faculty Mentor Program. The Graduate Division received eleven nominations. A GRC subcommittee evaluated and ranked them and forwarded the top four nominees to the Graduate Division.
- Outstanding Teaching Assistant Award. The Graduate Division received eight nominations. A GRC subcommittee evaluated them and recommended two nominees to the Graduate Division.

ITAC/SENATE IT COMMITTEE

The Academic Senate was asked by the Chancellor to nominate a faculty member to serve on an IT advisory committee. GRC provided input to DivCo on which issues the advisory committee should look at. DivCo declined to appoint a faculty member to the advisory committee. DivCo proposed that the Senate form its own IT committee. GRC was asked to opine on this proposal and concluded that it was in favor of forming a Senate IT committee that would deal with both research and teaching needs. GRC felt that it would not be practical, given its current size and workload, for GRC to take on responsibility for representing Senate IT needs, and that a separate Senate committee should be formed for this task.

MEMOS TO DIVCO

- Indirect Cost Return. GRC had several discussions about indirect cost return. The QSB emphasis area submitted a memo to GRC requesting that each fiscal year a certain percentage of indirect cost return be returned to facilitate ongoing research activities and programs in QSB. GRC acknowledged that this is a general issue that more broadly affects all research at UC Merced. GRC convened a subcommittee to deliberate on this issue and submitted a memo to DivCo that recommended the establishment of a joint committee comprised of Senate committees, the business office, the EVC, and School Deans to create a long-term distribution model of indirect cost returns.
- S&E 2 Building. Some members of GRC felt that there was confusion among the faculty regarding the configuration of the S&E 2 building. GRC submitted a memo to DivCo requesting that DivCo ask the Deans to communicate to the faculty an update on the progress in planning S&E 2. Furthermore, GRC requested that the Deans be asked to receive input from the faculty and articulate to DivCo how the planning process will proceed going forward, including transparency in decision making, dissemination of information to the faculty, and faculty input.
- Teaching Relief for Assistant Professors. GRC was concerned with the heavy workload placed on Assistant professors. The committee submitted a memo to DivCo requesting that ways be explored in which the Senate, Schools, and central administration may work independently or together to provide relief from service and teaching for one (or two) full semesters. This would give mid-career Assistant professors time for intense activity focused on preparing data for publication and grant proposals at a critical juncture before application for tenure.

NON-RESIDENT TUITION (NRT)

GRC and VCR Traina had several discussions about non-resident tuition and how much money UC Merced would have available.

There will be nine slots for new NRT for the 2009-2010 academic year. The graduate emphasis areas/groups were asked by GRC to submit their NRT allocation policies. After deliberating on the various areas/groups's policies, GRC decided to allow the areas/groups to continue with their own allocation policies and not create a university-wide one.

Another issue that GRC deliberated on was the idea of faculty swapping their start-up funds for NRT in order to get more international students.

After discussing various models of allocation GRC decided to allocate one slot to each area/group for the coming year. In the future, when UC Merced receives more than nine slots, GRC will further explore the idea of creating a swap model for faculty start-funds.

PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM PROPOSAL

GRC received the Psychology program proposal in December 2008. GRC chose a review subcommittee to make initial comments and then the committee as a whole opined. In general, GRC found the proposal to be thoughtfully constructed and included the detailed information requested in graduate program proposals by CCGA. GRC evaluated the proposal according to the four major CCGA review criteria: (1) quality and academic rigor of the program; (2) adequacy of the size and expertise of faculty to administer the program; (3) adequacy of the facilities and budgets; and (4) applicant pool and placement prospects for the graduates. CAPRA also reviewed the proposal. GRC submitted its comments along with CAPRA's to the Psychology graduate group requesting that the proposal be amended to address the concerns raised by GRC and CAPRA. GRC also requested that EVC Alley provide a letter of support to the proposed program detailing resource commitments in order to assist the proposers in this effort. GRC looks forward to receiving a revised version of the proposal in the next academic year.

REQUEST FROM CRE

The Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE) reviewed the Bylaws of each Academic Senate committee. GRC was asked to review its Bylaws and list any substantive changes it felt was necessary. The committee will continue this task in the next academic year.

REQUESTS FROM DIVCO (REVIEW ITEMS)

- Strategic Academic Plan (later changed to Strategic Academic Vision)

In response to DivCo's request, GRC reviewed the Strategic Academic Plan (SAP). GRC suggested more extensive deliberation by the relevant standing committees of the Academic Senate. GRC was also concerned with the SAP's focus on localism. As such, GRC recommended that the document be contextualized to national and international levels. Another observation the committee made was that the areas of science and engineering were downplayed in the SAP and need to be more developed. In addition, the research components of the currently proposed themes needed to be emphasized. And for research areas that are already established and not described in the SAP, GRC concluded that discussion of whether and how they receive

future resources is needed. Lastly, GRC was concerned that the SAP called for the realization of a total of 10 Schools and 5 Institutes at UC Merced within 20 years. GRC recommended that the breadth of future research themes be re-examined and that discussion of how these research themes will grow in the context of current programs be included in the SAP.

- School of Management Proposal

GRC reviewed the School of Management Proposal and while it felt that the interdisciplinary nature of the proposed School presented opportunities for UC Merced to develop a unique management program, the committee also identified academic and resource issues that are of concern. Specifically, GRC examined the following issues: (1) there is concern about the academic feasibility of the degree programs involving more than one School; (2) if it is found that existing courses in the current Schools will not meet the needs of management majors, additional courses that will need to be introduced by the Schools should be listed in order to determine if the additional hires proposed for the will be sufficient to deliver the necessary courses; and (3) office and lab space for Management faculty and staff. GRC concluded that the budget model should include a number of different scenarios for revenue and expenses in order to demonstrate how the School will respond in the event that actual revenue and expenses vary from estimates.

- Washington Advisory Group's (WAG) Report on the Medical School

GRC reviewed the WAG report and submitted its comments to DivCo. GRC agreed with the report's recommendations that the planning process must deal fully with fiscal realities and that the planning process be more structured, inclusive, and transparent. GRC raised the concern about the proposed biomedical track, specifically, the section in the report that suggested that the track can be introduced without substantial additional resources. GRC was also concerned by the report's statement that an early medical school need not be research intensive. The initial focus on instruction seems to imply that medical education faculty would be hired mainly for instruction and not research. This diverts resources from the research enterprise and is inconsistent with the faculty's intention to develop UC Merced into a premier research institution.

- Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan

GRC reviewed the Furlough/Salary Reduction Plan and forward its comments to DivCo. GRC did not support any of the proposed furlough/salary reduction plans. The committee remained unconvinced that UC explored all available alternative strategies for making up the budget shortfall. Any reduction in compensation will have a disproportionate affect on UC Merced, which is highly dependent on state support and at a critical stage of its development. Should furlough/salary reduction be implemented, GRC favored the furlough option over the pay reduction or hybrid models as it is more likely to be perceived as a temporary measure, while salary reduction might easily become permanent. GRC asked for reassurance that planning is underway for scenarios in which the state decides to keep the funding at the same level for next year, or drops funding, as it seems to do every year. Reduction in compensation, if implemented, should be accompanied by reduced expectations for the workload of faculty. The academic year should be shortened. Lastly, GRC concluded that any compensation reduction should have a more progressive scale (not just two steps). There should be a threshold below which no cuts are

taken (some workers at the lower end of the pay scale live below the poverty line and cannot afford any reduction in compensation).

REQUESTS FROM GRADUATE DIVISION

- Dates & Deadlines

In December 2008, the Graduate Division submitted to GRC a revised list of 2008-2009 Dates and Deadlines pertaining to graduate students – including deadlines for the advancement to candidacy – and a proposed list of deadlines for the 2009-2010 academic year. After some discussion and clarification by VCR Traina, GRC approved the revised 2008-2009 deadlines and proposed 2009-2010 deadlines in January 2009.

- Fellowships

- Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship. The Graduate Division received five nominations. A GRC subcommittee evaluated and ranked them and forwarded the ranking to the Graduate Division.

REQUESTS FROM GRADUATE EMPHASIS AREAS/GROUPS

- GRC collected each graduate emphasis area/group's current Policies & Procedures and Bylaws.
- The Physics and Chemistry emphasis area submitted a revised version of their Policies & Procedures. They added rules pertaining to students seeking a waiver on graduate courses. In addition, the area changed its course requirements to: three core courses, three electives, and no compulsory requirement to present a seminar. GRC approved these revisions in January 2009.
- GRC also deliberated on the Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) emphasis area's revised Policies & Procedures. GRC felt that certain EECS policies were not in accordance with the Graduate Advisor's Handbook and asked EECS to revise its policies. EECS also submitted a request to GRC to change all CSE 2XX courses to EECS 2XX. GRC approved the request and the change was effective Summer 2009.
- Conjoining Courses. It came to GRC's attention that the Registrar recently stated that graduate and undergraduate courses can no longer be conjoined if they were not listed as conjoined on their CRFs. (Earlier conjoined courses that have already been approved and delivered as such did not specifically state on their CRFs that they were conjoined.) GRC deliberated on the topic and decided to ask each School to send the committee a list of all the courses the School wants to "grandfather in" as conjoined courses for Fall 2009 and beyond. Upon receiving the lists, GRC approved them at one time and the Registrar was notified.
- TA Policy. The Graduate Advisor's Handbook stated that the total length of service rendered by a graduate student in any combination of Teaching Assistant or Teaching Associate titles may not exceed 4 semesters following advancement to candidacy for the Ph.D. Three graduate areas/groups from the School of Natural Sciences submitted a request to GRC asking for this four semester limit to be deleted. After deliberating, GRC agreed to delete the four semester limit in February 2009.

RESEARCH/TRAVEL/SHARED EQUIPMENT GRANTS

The Academic Senate received funds in the amount of \$107,000 to be disbursed to the faculty to support research activities and the purchase of shared equipment. A revised call for proposals was approved by GRC in November 2008 and distributed to faculty with a February 1, 2009 deadline for submission. Twenty-six proposals (totaling \$132,232.31) were evaluated by GRC. Each proposal was assigned two reviewers – a lead reviewer affiliated with the PI's School and a second reviewer unaffiliated with the PI's School. GRC funded all twenty-six proposals totaling \$107,000.

SENATE RESEARCH AWARDS

For the first time in UC Merced's Academic Senate history, Senate awards were made to faculty. GRC awarded the following:

- Distinction in Research

The Senate Award for Distinction in Research (for tenured faculty) is intended to encourage and recognize individuals for research and/or other creative activities that have had a major impact on the field, either through a sustained record of contributions or through a specific, highly influential contribution.

- Distinguished Early Career Research

The Senate Award for Distinguished Early Career Research (for non-tenured faculty) is intended to encourage and recognize individuals for research and/or other creative activities that have had a major impact on the field, either through a sustained record of contributions or through a specific, highly influential contribution.

- Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award

This Senate Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award is intended to encourage and recognize individual excellence in teaching at the graduate level and mentorship of graduate students. Both of these are important functions of faculty at a research university.

GRC did not receive any nominations for the Teaching/Mentorship award.

Following its decision on the awards, GRC sent a memo to DivCo detailing its recommendations regarding solicitation of nominations for these awards in the future in order to increase the number of candidates for the awards. GRC suggested (1) that the request for nominations go out earlier in the academic year; (2) that the advertising and/or nominating process be modified in 2010 to encourage a larger number of nominations from across a broader cross-section of academic disciplines; and (3) that review instructions for the subcommittee include some wording on whom the committee may consult in case an issue (such as a possible conflict of interest) arises.

SYSTEMWIDE ITEMS REVIEWED BY GRC

- Report on the Professional Doctorate

GRC reviewed the report of the Subcommittee on the Professional Doctorate of the UC Task Force on Planning for Professional and Doctoral Education. Overall, GRC found that the report presented a thorough analysis and list of recommendations regarding the principles that should be used to determine when such doctorates are distinct from doctorates based on research and scholarship, and therefore appropriate for the CSU to offer them (either independently or jointly with UC). In summary, GRC was in agreement with the key recommendations of the report that

UC should strive to retain sole authority to grant research/scholarship-based doctoral degrees in order to ensure effective use of public resources, and that for professional doctoral titles, UC and CSU should develop principles and a process for evaluating the appropriateness of sharing granting authority.

- UC Accountability Framework Draft

GRC reviewed the Accountability Framework draft and suggested using indicators that are more relevant to UC Merced such as retention of under-represented students or under-represented student enrollment in the Freshman through Senior years, early career awards per faculty member (as UC M has a high percentage of untenured faculty), research expenditures reported on a per capita basis, and number of courses taught per faculty member. GRC also recommended broadening comparison institutions.

GRC CHAIR (PROFESSOR VALERIE LEPPERT) REPORTS ON CCGA ACTIVITIES INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING:

- Budget
- Graduate student support/funding
- Furloughs and pay cuts
- UC Pension
- Indirect cost return
- Review process for part time or self supported graduate programs

GRC VICE CHAIR (PATTI LIWANG) REPORTS ON UCORP ACTIVITIES INCLUDED THE FOLLOWING:

- MRUs
- Opening of a new office at OP: the Proposition Application Review Center that will handle all aspects of peer review that deal with OP and the Office of Research.
- Research grants (including those being awarded from Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos labs) and administration of grants.
- Research infrastructure
- Technology/teleconferencing/web seminars
- Furloughs and pay cuts
- Federal stimulus bill
- PRO/UAW (post doc union)

GRC also benefited from consultation and reports throughout the year from VCR Traina.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Leppert, Chair (ENG), CCGA Representative
Patti LiWang, Vice Chair (NS), UCORP Representative
Raymond Chiao (ENG and NS)
Michael Dawson (NS)
Yarrow Dunham (SSHA)
Maurizio Forte (SSHA)
Sayantani Ghosh (NS)

Qinghua Guo (ENG)

Wolfgang Rogge (ENG)

Ex-Officio

Martha Conklin, Divisional Council Chair (ENG)

Mike Colvin, Divisional Council Vice Chair (NS)

Sam Traina, VCR/Dean of Graduate Studies (ENG)

Student Representative

Ryan Lucas (ENG)

**COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
2008-2009 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure did not meet during the academic year and no formal hearings were held.

On behalf of the Committee:

Peggy O'Day, Chair (Natural Sciences)

Robert Hillman (UC Davis)

Jodie Holt (UC Riverside)

Carolyn Martin Shaw (UC Santa Cruz)

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ANNUAL REPORT
2008-2009**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

I. 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 legislative or Regental action. 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.

In academic year 2008-2009 CRE performed its business via teleconference and e-mail which has proven to be an efficient method for conducting the business brought before this committee.

II. FORMAL LEGISLATIVE RULINGS ISSUED

None.

III. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS AND REGULATIONS

- A. The following proposed Bylaw changes were placed on the Merced Division Meeting Consent Calendar and approved. (*Complete language and rationale can be found on the Senate's website, Division Meeting Agendas for December 4, 2008 and May 4, 2009.*)

Approved at the December 4, 2008 Division Meeting:

Senate Bylaw II.2.A., Committees

Senate Bylaw II.2.B., Committees

Senate Bylaw II.4.B., Committees

Senate Bylaw II.4.C., Committees

Held for further discussion:

Senate Bylaw II.1.A., Committees

Following the Division Meeting, Senate members were invited to provide comments on the proposed bylaw change by a memo sent to all Senate members. After considering comments from Senate members and Divisional Council, this item was placed on the May 4, 2009 Division Meeting agenda as a discussion item and voted by mail ballot. It was approved by faculty on May 22.

The following proposed Regulation changes were placed on the May 4, 2009 Merced Division Meeting Consent Calendar and approved at the May 4 Division Meeting:

Senate Regulation 65, Academic Probation and Dismissal

Senate Regulation 75, Undergraduate Honors at Graduation. Approved by UCEP but will be placed on the systemwide Assembly agenda for the December 2009 Assembly meeting.

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

- A. Revising Academic Senate Committee Bylaws.
CRE members examined the Bylaws for each Senate committee and drafted revised text. This task will continue in the 2009-2010 academic year.
- B. Policy and Procedure Manual: Establishment or Revision of Academic Units
CRE was asked by Divisional Chair Conklin to make recommendations to DivCo for developing a process by which faculty may organize into units governed under UC Title VI, Bylaw 55, which are responsible for voting on appointments and promotions that confer membership in the Academic Senate. CRE drafted policy and procedures on the establishment or revision of academic units and sent them to DivCo members for comments. The draft was submitted to EVC Alley who solicited comments from the School Deans. The final version was completed in May 2009. It is intended that this be incorporated into a UC Merced Academic Policy and Procedure Manual.
- C. Policy and Procedure Manual: Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs
In order to compile and clarify policy and procedure for establishing or revising Academic Degree Program, CRE drafted a document incorporating present Academic Senate procedures for undergraduate and graduate degree program approval together with faculty and administrative steps in the approval process. This document was sent to Senate committees (UGC, GRC, CAPRA) and to EVC Alley for comment. The final version was completed in June 2009. It is intended that this be incorporated into a UC Merced Academic Policy and Procedure Manual.
- C. D. School Bylaws and Regulations.
CRE Chair O'Day began to consider the issue of School Bylaws and Regulations, specifically, the items in UC Merced's catalog that are not codified in Regulations or other official documents. CRE will explore this in more detail in the 2009-2010 academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Peggy O'Day, Chair (NS)
Tom Hansford, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Daniel Simmons (UC Davis)

Jean Olson, (UC San Francisco)

Ex-Officio:

Martha Conklin, Divisional Chair (ENG)

Mike Colvin, Divisional Vice Chair (NS)

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
ANNUAL REPORT
2008-2009**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the academic year 2008-2009, the Undergraduate Council (UGC) met 15 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM [Senate Bylaw II.4.B](#). The issues that UGC considered this year are described briefly as follows (in alphabetical order):

ADMISSIONS

UGC received regular reports from VC Student Affairs and Lawrence and Assistant VC for Enrollment Browne. Items discussed included admissions data, events, recruiting, Post baccalaureate program, university extension.

The UGC Admissions Subcommittee met with Diana Ralls, Director of Financial Aid, to review applications for the Regents Scholarship

CATALOG REVIEW

The Schools were asked to send their sections of the Catalog by March 1st. UGC reviewers examined sections of the Catalog outside of their School. The Catalog was approved by the committee in April 2009.

CRFS

Using the newly developed online CRF system, UGC reviewed and approved over 200 courses, changes to existing courses and discontinuations of courses.

UGC recommended that for courses that fulfill general education requirements, a statement be included in the course outline to demonstrate how the course fulfills those requirements.

GENERAL EDUCATION

Background: In 2007-2008, UGC drafted a set of recommendations for the delivery of General Education during AY 2008-2009. In its recommendations, UGC proposed to the Division Council that a temporary ad hoc committee be formed to consider how to deliver GE.

At the beginning of AY 08-09, the Division Council asked the UGC to re-examine the issue of General Education. UGC approved and sent the previous UGC report back to the Division Council with a request that a resource analysis be conducted by CAPRA.

In October 2009, a request went to Committee on Committees (CoC) to constitute the ad hoc committee on general education. CoC proposed a slate of nominees. Two of the members were UGC members. The slate was approved by the Division Council.

The ad hoc committee held weekly meetings and conducted a thorough analysis of General Education and Core courses delivery. The ad hoc committee completed its report

in April 2009. The report was sent to UGC, GRC, CAPRA and to the Schools for comments before being submitted to the Division Council.

MAJOR(S) APPROVED BY UGC

- **Sociology Major** – to be offered Fall 2009 [pending approval by the Provost and WASC review]

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES DRAFTED/REVISED AND APPROVED BY UGC

- **Policies and procedures for approval of new undergraduate courses and undergraduate courses changes.**

The UGC CRF subcommittee and UGC policy subcommittee worked in consultation with the WASC steering committee to determine what kind of revisions would be reasonable. Proposed revisions took into account general education, student learning outcomes and how they connect to a program or degree objectives.

Final draft was approved in April 2009

- **Program Review Guidelines**

The Division Council asked UGC to draft guidelines for program reviews. UGC Chair Martin-Rodriguez met with Senate Chair Conklin, GRC Chair Leppert, GRC WASC subcommittee Chiao and WASC Steering Committee Chair Camfield to discuss the process. Senate analyst distributed a summary of UC practices to UGC. The committee noted that program reviews include, in many cases, the review of both graduate and undergraduate programs. The process also requires the collection of a large amount of statistical data and document management. UGC sent a memo to the Division Council (Feb. 17, 2009) in which it highlighted the difficulties associated with conducting the review of undergraduate programs.

UGC drafted some guidelines for undergraduate program reviews. The WASC steering was given the opportunity to review the draft and provide comments. The final document was approved by UGC in May 2009 and was forwarded to the Division Council.

- **Policies and Procedures for Reviewing Substantive Changes to Existing Majors**

The Division Council asked UGC to respond to the WASC Steering committee's request to amend policies, procedures and/or forms, related to the approval of new programs or courses, to include questions to alert faculty to the need to seek WASC Substantive Change in the following circumstances:

1. A new degree
2. New modalities
3. New off-campus sites
4. Change in duration of a program

WASC requested that faculty be informed that new degree programs not yet approved through substantive change review be considered as "pending the review of our accreditation agency, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)".

UGC revised the existing policy for review and approval of undergraduate programs accordingly. UGC also recommended that proposals for new tracks be accompanied with

a statement describing the nature of the proposed changes, how they affect the existing program and if there will be resource implications. Final draft of the policy was sent to the Division Council and to the Schools.

▪ **Proposal for a New Academic Probation Dismissal and Minimum Progress Policy (Senate Regulation 65, Academic Probation and Dismissal)**

This proposal was put forth by the deans, assistant deans and the Registrar's office. The rationale was to clarify for students, faculty and staff what would happen under probation and dismissal. The original policy was written when there were no students at UCM and was revised to better serve current and future students. Main features of the proposed policy include the opportunity to appeal dismissal with the school having the last decision, and the option of removing a student from a major if the school would see fit. The UGC considered and approved the proposed policy in October 2009. This item was approved by the Division on May 4, 2009 and is effective the first day of instruction in fall 2009.

REQUEST FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS (CRE)

▪ **Recommended Changes to UGC Bylaws**

During AY 08-09 CRE initiated revisions of the UCM Academic Senate Bylaws. For that purpose, CRE asked UGC to review its Bylaws and list any substantive changes it feels is necessary.

UGC recommended the implementation of a different mechanism for appointing system wide representatives and that the minimum number of members be formally increased to its current de facto membership (nine members plus chair). UGC's recommendations were forwarded to CRE in March 2009.

REQUESTS FROM THE SCHOOLS:

UGC reviewed and approved the following requests:

School of Natural Sciences

▪ **Revisions to the Chemical Sciences Major (Dec. 3, 2008)**

The proposed changes offer a larger set of core courses required of all tracks. Majors in all tracks are now required to take CHEM 115 and CHEM 120.

▪ **Revisions to the Applied Mathematics Major Feb. 2009**

Revisions allow students to design custom emphasis tracks by combining existing courses, or courses that may be introduced by other disciplines in the future, to be used to satisfy an emphasis track.

▪ **Revisions to the Biological Sciences Major**

The purpose of the proposed changes was to broaden the range of courses that may serve as Quantitative Biology electives and to provide more flexibility for students in these emphasis tracks with no substantive resource implications. This would allow the students more course options and flexibility in fulfilling the existing requirement.

▪ **Revision to BIO 1 CRF to Allow Course to Fulfill GE Requirement.**

- **List of NS conjoined courses to be offered in fall 2009**

School of Engineering

- **Minimum Grade for Major Requirements Policy**

UGC approved the SOE request to require all School of Engineering students, regardless of major, to complete all major requirements from a D- to a C-.

UGC suggested the following changes in the language (**bold**):

All students in the School of Engineering, regardless of major, are required to complete all ~~major~~ requirements **for all majors** with a C- or better **effective fall 2009 for entering or re-admitted students.**

- UGC approved the list of conjoined courses submitted by the School of Engineering (to be offered in fall 2009).

SSHA

- **Honors Program**

UGC received a proposal from SSHA for a History Honors program. The review of the proposal was done in consultation with CAPRA for resource issues. CAPRA comments were shared with UGC members. UGC drafted a set of guidelines for these awards. UGC reviewed and approved the proposed revisions to UCM SR 75, Honors (SR 640). The proposed language was forwarded to CRE, the Division Council and was approved during the May 4, 2009 Meeting of the Merced Division. In accordance with system wide Bylaws UCEP reviewed and approved the change. The Assembly of the Academic Senate will consider this item at its December 2009 meeting.

- **Changes to the Cognitive Science Major**

The Cognitive Science Faculty asked UGC to consider and approve the addition of COGS 101 (Mind, Brain and Computation) as a required upper division course to the COGS major; thus adding four credit hours to the B.A. and the B.S. UGC approved COGS request with the provision that the effective date of fall 2009 be added to the text in the Catalog.

- **UGC approved the list of conjoined courses submitted by the SSHA (to be offered in fall 2009).**

- **SSHA Foreign Language Limitation [this should be placed before the preceding paragraph]**

- **UGC approved the SSHA request to add the following language to the AY2009-10 General Catalog (effective fall 2009):**

“No credit is allowed for completing a less advanced course after successful completion (C- or better) of a more advanced course in the foreign languages. This applies only to lower division foreign language courses, not upper division courses”

REQUEST(S) FROM THE REGISTRAR

UGC considered and approved the registrar's request to add the term "conjoined" to the online CRF system for clarity purposes and to be consistent with the CRFs policies and procedures.

SENATE AWARDS

A UGC ad hoc subcommittee reviewed nominations for the Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award and made recommendations to the Senate office.

SENATE ITEMS REVIEWED BY UGC

The Division Council requested UGC's comments on the following:

- **UCM Strategic Academic Plan**

UGC's comments were forwarded to the Division Council in October 2008.

- **School of Management Proposal**

UGC examined curriculum issues and the delivery of courses. UGC comments were forwarded to the Division Council in November 2008. SSHA Dean Bjornsson attended the January 28th UGC meeting to discuss the proposal.

- **WAG Report**

UGC commented on the Washington Advisory Group final report. The committee's comments were shared with the Division Council in February 2009.

TRIPLE MAJOR REQUEST

UGC considered a student's request to do a triple major. This was discussed during the March 11 and May 13 meetings. UGC decided that at this time UCM will not offer triple majors. The ASUCM was informed of UGC's decision.

WASC ACCREDITATION

Professor Camfield (Chair of the WASC Steering Committee) attended the October 29 UGC meeting to report on the WASC review process. The new WASC accreditation process involves two steps: 1) the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) and 2) the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER). Under the new accreditation regime, WASC will not only evaluate the university's physical infrastructure but also its educational infrastructure.

Professor Camfield asked UGC to consider incorporating learning outcomes and assessment plans into the new online CRF system so that the educational infrastructure of the university is reflexive for all faculty.

SYSTEM WIDE ITEMS REVIEWED BY UGC:

UGC reviewed and provided comments on the following system wide senate items:

- UC Accountability Framework Report (Nov 2008)
- UC Education Abroad Program (EAP) Business Plan (Dec 2008)
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulations Governing Undergraduate Admissions (May 2009)

UGC Invited Guests:

1. German Gavilan, ENG Assistant Dean – CRF presentation

2. Laurie Herbrand, Registrar
3. Professors Van Breugel, Hothem and Ochsner, to discuss General Education
4. Professor Gregg Camfield – to discuss WASC Accreditation
5. SSHA Dean Hans Bjornsson – to discuss the proposal for a School of Management
6. Professor Carlos Coimbra – to present the ABET system (WASC Accreditation)
7. Diana Ralls, Director of Financial Aid – to report on Financial Aid, Scholarships
8. Professors Weffer and Van Dyke – to present the Sociology Major

System wide representation:

BOARS: Professor Susan Amussen* (SSHA)

UCEP: Professor Gregg Camfield* (SSHA)

UCIE: Professor Ariel Escobar (ENG)

UCOPE: Professor Virginia Adan-Lifante* (SSHA)

**Liaison to UGC*

Reports on the activities of BOARS and UCEP were provided at the UGC meetings.

Respectfully Submitted:

UCM Faculty

Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Chair (SSHA)

Andy LiWang, Vice chair and co-chair admissions subcommittee (NS)

Andy Aguilar, Chair CRF subcommittee (NS)

Yihsu Chen, CRF subcommittee (ENG/SSHA)

Ariel Escobar, UCIE representative

Ajay Gopinathan, Policy subcommittee (NS)

Kathleen Hull, Chair Policy subcommittee (SSHA)

Jennifer Lu, Admissions subcommittee (ENG)

Stephen Nicholson, co-chair admissions subcommittee (SSHA)

Dunya Ramicova, CRF subcommittee (SSHA)

Ex officio, Non-voting members

Martha Conklin, Division Council Chair (ENG)

Mike Colvin, Division Council Vice chair (NS)

Jane Lawrence, Vice Chancellor Student Affairs

Christopher Viney, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education

Student Representative

Phillip Marzouk

Staff

Fatima Paul, Analyst