

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION  
MAY 1, 2014  
MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, May 1, 2014 in Room 232 of the Kolligan Library. Senate Chair Ignacio López-Calvo presiding.

**II. Announcements**

**A. Division Chair Ignacio López-Calvo:** The Senate Chair thanked everyone for attending and welcomed Chancellor Leland and Provost/EVC Peterson. Attendees were advised CRE Vice Chair Peter Vanderschraaf would be serving as the Secretary/Parliamentarian, and CoC Member Karen McCloskey would substitute for CoC Chair LiWang.

- **Division Council Update:** Over the past few months the Division Council (DivCO) has engaged in numerous discussions on campus and systemwide issues, including the Course Buyout Policy, WASC Core Competencies, MAPP revisions, Medical Education, diversity hires, MOU, APM revisions, and Bylaw Revisions.
- **Active Searches:** The Senate is currently participating in several administrative searches including the following: Assistant Vice-Chancellor Finance, Assistant Vice-Chancellor for Real Estate, Vice-Provost for Faculty, and University Librarian.
- **FTE Request:** Due enrollment decreases, only 7-9 faculty FTE lines would be available this year. Therefore, the Chancellor and Provost/EVC, in consultation with the Senate, decided not to launch the FTE proposal process until additional FTE lines were made available.
- **Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative:** Several Town Hall Meetings were held to provide faculty the opportunity to express concerns and make suggestions to the strategic academic focusing initiative committee. Chair López-Calvo and Vice Chair Sun spoke with Chancellor Leland and Provost/EVC Peterson. Senate leadership was assured that the policy would not be implemented until an alternative emergency fund was developed to support faculty financial needs.
- **Start Up Funds:** At the November 19, 2013 Meeting of the Division members expressed concern regarding having to expend start up funds within the first three years of employment. Chair López-Calvo and Vice Chair Sun spoke with the Chancellor and Provost/EVC and were assured the policy would not be implemented until an alternative emergency fund was developed to support faculty financial needs.
- **UC Path & Open Access Policy:** UC Path will be implemented on April 1, 2014 and the Open Access Policy will take affect November 1, 2014.
- **Composite Benefit Rates:** At this time, there are continuing unresolved issues associated with the Composite Benefits Rates. To address these issues Systemwide Chair Jacob plans to provide several recommendations to President Napolitano. Chancellor Leland added she believes the issue will be resolved at the next Chancellor's meeting.
- **Sexual Harassment Officer:** The Senate discussed the need for a Diversity Official and a single point of contact for sexual harassment and diversity issues. Chancellor Leland plans to delegate responsibility to the new Associate Chancellor. The

position will have two components (1) diversity and campus climate and (2) risk management compliance.

**B. Chancellor Dorothy Leland**

Chancellor Leland discussed the new Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that is an internal administrative agreement between the Office of the President (UCOP) and UC Merced. For the past few years the campus has had an MOU with the Office of the President that provided an additional ten thousand dollars per student. The new MOU will continue to provide an additional ten thousand dollars per student and will now also provide seed funding for a start up account. The campus has not had dedicated funds for start up and instead has drawn from vacant positions. This has the potential to create future problems when all positions are filled. The MOU will also include a commitment from UCOP for significant financial funding for Project 2020. Project 2020 would double the physical capacity of the campus through a partnership with private development. The MOU will clearly state that UCOP will provide between 25-50% of necessary funds for Project 2020.

Another new addition to the MOU is significant financial support from UCOP for the various mitigations needed to expand the campus. For example, we have significant roadway mitigation obligations due to the increase in community traffic associated with the campus. Another example involves the disturbance of wetlands from the campus build-out. In order to mitigate the reduction of wetlands we are required to locate additional land and to restore it to productive wetlands.

A faculty member asked if the MOU includes a commitment to the guarantee pool?

Chancellor Leland responded in the affirmative, as UC Merced has always had a commitment to the guarantee pool and will continue to do so. UCOP made a commitment to UC Merced that the guarantee pool is not just a UC Merced problem, but a systemwide issue. We have already outpaced our ability to serve as the only guarantee pool campus. Currently, in order to honor the guarantee pool, we have to defer admissions to the spring for admitted students in the guarantee pool. The deferral process places a number of students off cycle. This is good for campus revenue, but creates academic complications.

Chair López-Calvo added he also brought this issue to the attention of the Academic Council at the beginning of the year. He asked the Systemwide Senate leadership about the issue and both the Chair and the Vice-Chair provided the same responses Chancellor Leland relayed. Systemwide is aware of the issues faced by our campus from lack of space to fairness in accepting guarantee pool applicants.

Chancellor Leland indicated that the campus will continue to be responsible for the majority of the guarantee pool, as all of the other campuses are ramping up their out-of-state and international enrollment because of the increased revenue associated with those students. UC Merced is not increasing enrollment of students paying non-resident tuition due to the historical commitment to the guarantee pool, which will be affecting the campus negatively revenue wise.

A faculty member asked: Has there been any discussion on possibly modifying revenue streams?

Chancellor Leland responded that no discussion on modifying revenue streams has occurred. The official statement continues to be that we are honoring the master plan and the Chancellor's job is to inform them that the way we are currently honoring the plan will not be viable in the future. In the past, the guarantee pool obligation was addressed by UC System requiring every campus to hold a certain percentage of their open slots for students who qualified to attend the University of California, but were not admitted to their school of choice. It is unclear if the recommendation from UCOP will be to go back to the original form of addressing the master plan or to shrink the pool by tightening up some of the qualifications for admittance. The proposal will come from UCOP and, unfortunately, the campuses have not been invited to participate in the conversations.

**C. Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Thomas W. Peterson**

Provost/EVC Peterson stated that it is important to remember the trajectory we have been on with respect to increasing undergraduate enrollment and what that trajectory will look like in the next couple of years. The campus added approximately 600-800 additional undergraduate students over what the enrollment numbers were in previous years. Next year, those numbers will be closer to 100-150 and the year after that, approximately 400. The increase in projected enrollment growth is, in large part, linked to the guarantee pool, the large number of students who placed Merced as their first choice school, and a larger number of students accepting admission to UC Merced. Next year's enrollment is a decrease in a rate of growth, which puts the university back on track with the enrollment projections submitted to UCOP and the MOU.

This year we are recruiting for 35 position, which are a combination of new positions and carryover positions. Additionally, all of the Schools have requested additional lines to address clear needs for spousal hires. The campus agrees that spousal hires are a very important element in our recruiting plan, along with addressing opportunities for developing a more diverse faculty. To grant all of the requested spousal hire positions, it would require an additional 12 positions, which would come out of future allocations for the campus. The approach may sound concerning, but it is the reality given the campus's financial situation and space constraints. The Provost/EVC is asking for a one-year hiatus in faculty recruitment to use this time constructively in order to finish the strategic academic focusing exercise and develop a strategic plan.

A faculty member raised her concern associated with the aspects of Project 2020, which calls for a much more accelerated growth for graduate education than undergraduate education. Given the situation that many faculty have reached their capacity for supporting graduate students, Provost/EVC Peterson was asked to talk more about how the campus will reach 1,000 graduate students.

Provost/EVC Peterson responded that graduate student enrollment will be dependent on the campus revenue and the capacity to hire faculty. Important elements to consider are: (1) the continuing cost associated with salaries and their start-up packages, (2) space, and (3) tuition revenue associated with enrollment. Chancellor Leland added that reaching 1,000 graduate students by 2020 is a stretch goal and through conversations with faculty, it is also clear that it was time to pay attention to the growth of our graduate programs to avoid being perceived as an undergraduate campus. If the development plan had kept pace with enrollment, the campus would not be in this situation. So even though we have additional classroom space, we continue to have a severe deficit of certain teaching laboratory spaces. Space constraints are the main reason for curtailing undergraduate enrollment for two years. This may allow graduate programs to grow in terms of the quality of students we bring into programs, but not in terms of the quantity of students.

Provost/EVC Peterson clarified that the campus has approximately 180 faculty and will be adding a minimum of 35 more faculty who could start next fall. Provost/EVC Peterson conveyed his commitment that if these 35 positions are not filled, they will be carried over until filled.

A faculty member asked about the plans for staff hires.

Provost/EVC Peterson responded that the following Monday, during the first budget meeting, many requests for staff support from across the campus would be discussed.

Chancellor Leland added that there were additional dollars projected to support staff growth, but the Schools have asked for opportunity hires for this year.

A faculty member asked, as the next few years of faculty hiring unfold, about the ratio of ladder rank faculty to LPSOE and LSOE faculty.

Provost/EVC Peterson responded: The simple answer is that if we want to be in the same league as our sister institutions within the UC system, the campus needs to move to a higher ratio of ladder rank faculty. This does not mean that we stop hiring lecturers, as they will continue to play an important role, but we have to move to a higher ratio of ladder-rank faculty. This means that ladder rank faculty will need to assume a larger amount of responsibility for both the undergraduate and graduate teaching load.

Chancellor Leland added that it is important to be aware that comparative ratios between faculty and student FTE are not a pressing concern for UCOP, because they see those ratios at the other campuses. An argument that has been and will continue to be made is that UC Merced cannot grow our graduate and research programs, except with the best ladder-rank faculty that we can find. This means that we need the MOU to support our growth as a graduate research university.

Chair Ignacio López-Calvo added that if we do not want to be known as an undergraduate campus of the UC system, we need to make it clear to UCOP that we need to hire ladder rank

faculty to grow our graduate student numbers. Otherwise, our graduate students will continue to be only 5 percent of the student population.

Provost/EVC Peterson then went on to discuss strategic academic focusing. The deadline to submit round two of the proposal is May 2, 2014. The Provost/EVC has been working with UCSF, who administers the open proposal site, to solve issues that were unanticipated. There is a new button that allows proposal submitters to add a new proposal. If that is done, please indicate in the original proposals' executive summary that the proposal has been replaced. Finally, proposals will not be rejected if the six-page limit is extended, but all proposals should be as succinct as possible and there is a method to add attachments if necessary.

#### **D. Consent Calendar**

- a. The minutes were approved as presented
- b. Revisions to UC Merced Regulation 70.2-Course Drop Policy were approved as presented.
- c. Revisions to UC Merced Regulations-Incomplete Grade Policy were approved as presented.

#### **E. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Chair López-Calvo introduced CRE Vice-Chair Peter Vanderschraaf and GC Chair Valerie Leppert to discuss proposed revisions to Merced Regulations. CRE Vice-Chair Vanderschraaf explained that the campus requested an expedited review form WASC for new CCGA approved programs originating from Interim Individualized Graduate Programs (IIGP). WASC approved the request and made a single recommendation to codify policies for graduate education in the UC Merced Regulations. On April 2, 2014, the Graduate Council proposed basic structural changes to facilitate inclusion of the graduate regulations and unanimously endorsed the proposed changes/additions.

*The Proposed structure for the Merced Regulations is listed below:*

- Part I: General regulations (minor changes):
- Part II: Undergraduate regulations (no substantive changes proposed)
- Part III Graduate regulations (new)
- Part IV: Master's requirements (new)
- Part V: Doctor of Philosophy requirements (new)

*The major proposed changes to existing Regulations are as follows:*

Page 1. Added distinction between undergraduate / graduate and specified credit toward degree requirements

*"Graduates: A course in which the grade A, B or S is received is counted toward degree requirements. A course in which the grade C, D, F, or U is received is not counted toward degree requirements. Grades I and IP are not counted until such time as they are replaced by grades A, B or S."*

Page 2 Specification of resolution of incompletes for graduate students

*“For graduate students, the maximum amount of time that an instructor may allow for making up incomplete work is two semesters of enrollment, but stricter limits may be applied. The procedure is to process such requests with the approval of the Dean of the School in which the course was offered. If not made up within the time allowed, an I grade will be converted to an F or U. Ordinarily, I grades do not affect GPA. However, when computing GPA to determine whether the student meets the minimum GPA requirements for graduation (3.0), I grades are counted as “F.” A graduate student with an I grade may proceed toward a degree only at the discretion of the Dean of the Graduate Division.”*

Page 3. Suggest language that P/NP are not counted towards degree requirements

*“For graduate students, the grade P is not considered as meeting the academic criteria for satisfactory progress, for university-administered fellowships, or for academic appointments/employment. A graduate student may elect P/NP grading for one course only (a maximum of 4 units) per semester. Under no circumstances will courses taken P/NP count toward unit and degree requirements for any graduate degree program.”*

The graduate specific regulation changes derive from material already in the Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook (formerly Graduate Advisors Handbook). Graduate Council proposed the following organization for these sections:

- Part III, Section 1: Satisfactory Progress
- Part III, Section 2: General Requirements
- Part III, Section 3: Examinations
- Part IV, Section 1: Residency (Master’s)
- Part IV, Section 2: Residency (Doctoral)
- Part V, Section 2: Advancement
- Part V, Section 3: advancement Committee
- Part V, Section 4: Doctoral Committee
- Part V, Section 5: Final Examination
- Part V, Section 6: Dissertation

#### **F. 2014-2015 DIVISION CHAIR, VICE CHAIR, AND SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN**

With no further questions Chair López-Calvo encouraged senior faculty to serve on Senate committees due to our campus’s size and limited number of full professors. Chair López-Calvo then introduced CoC Member Kara McCloskey.

CoC Member Kara McCloskey announced the elected 2014-2015 Division Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary/Parliamentarian below:

- Jian-Qiao Sun, SOE , Division Chair
- Cristián Ricci, SSHA, Vice Chair
- Peter Vanderschraaf, SSHA, Secretary/Parliamentarian

#### **G. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**

- a. **Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA):** No report
- b. **Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)-Vice Chair David Kelley**

CAP has deliberated on routine merit cases, mid-career appraisals (MCA) and promotion cases. The Academic Personnel office (APO) established a November 15, 2014 deadline for the Schools and thanks everyone for their cooperation in meeting the deadline. CAP held its bi-annual meeting with faculty on September 20, 2013 attendees include APO staff, CAP members, the Provost/EVC, AP Chairs, Senate staff and faculty. A variety of concerns were expressed at the meeting, which have been subject to some discussion between APO and CAP.

CAP opined on systemwide request to review proposed revisions to APM. CAP advised and worked with VPAP David Ojcius and APO with regard to preparing bio-bibliographies. APO continues to refine Digital Measures. If there are additional comments or concerns with the process, CAP is interested in receiving them.

At the request of APO and the Provost/EVC, CAP advised on proposed revisions to the MAPP.

CAP's vice-chair continues to serve as the Merced representative to UCAP. One of the most contentious issues involved the voting rights of medical faculty in various bylaw units.

A faculty member asked whether the bio-bibliography will remain or if the use of CVs is sufficient.

CAP Vice-Chair Kelley responded that the bio-bibliography will remain for now and is helpful to CAP in the delineation between review periods.

A faculty member asked if CAP will formally solicit feedback on Digital Measures.

Cap Vice-Chair Kelley responded that CAP provides input to APO staff who maintains ownership of Digital Measures. At the last CAP/Apo meeting, there was considerable discussion on proposed changes to Digital Measures. Faculty are encouraged to contact APO with additional, requested changes to Digital Measures.

CAP Vice-Chair Kelley stated that clarification is needed in regards to which publications were evaluated in previous review periods and which are to be given credit in the present review. Individual faculty members must make their own determination about including work in the pipeline when they complete their bio-bibliographies.

A faculty member inquired about the choice to include work in progress or in print.

CAP Vice Chair Kelley replied that it is at the discretion of individual faculty members.

A faculty member provided a scenario in which faculty request an acceleration, include work in progress, and the acceleration is not granted by the Provost/EVC.

CAP Vice-Chair Kelley explained that depending on the case, some may be evaluated as a normal advancement; some clarification may be needed in instances when accelerations are a year early.

A faculty member expressed concern with the first routine merit review for a new faculty member, when all publications were previously submitted in the appointment year.

CAP Vice-Chair Kelley explained that usually the initial review is very close to being proforma.

**c. Committee on Committees (COC)- Member Kara McCloskey**

Since the last Division meeting CoC has appointed 21 Senate members to various campus committees, sub-committees and working groups, and it is now turning its attention to completing the Senate slate for AY 2014-15. Additionally, CoC encourages all Senate members to complete the Senate preference survey to help CoC align any invitation to serve with your preference for service.

**d. Committee on Research (COR)- Chair Ruth Mostern**

This is the inaugural year for the Committee on Research (COR). Last year's Graduate and Research Council split into the Graduate Council and Committee on Research, because graduate business is extremely pressing and time consuming, and research issues were not addressed. In its first year, COR has identified the development of policies for the establishment and the review of research units as a top priority. Although there has never been a full review process, in the past there have been two occasions, in 2009 and 2011, when the Senate considered policies for the Senate to approve Organized Research Units, Centralized Research Units, and other research entities on the campus.

This year, COR reviewed previous proposals and identified where they were not aligned with systemwide procedures. After deliberating, COR proposed new policies and procedures which are currently under review by DivCo. The goal is to put in place a formal procedure by AY 2014-2015 for existing research units to undergo a formal review process recognized by the Senate. Once the procedures are in place it will help trigger formalized request for budgets and periodic reviews. It is essentially bringing the ecosystem of research units into the full scrutiny of the Senate evaluation process.

COR also completed the annual faculty grants review process where 17 grants were awarded from 51 proposals received. A few changes were made to the criteria and the committee is considering additional changes to the process and criteria for funding next year. The significant underlying issue is that the amount of money allocated for these faculty grants has not increased since the opening of the university. Consequently, the rate of funding is becoming increasingly lower and at some point it will not be worth the

time to submit or review the proposals. COR wrote a memo to DivCo addressing this issue with the goal of working with the administration to address future fund allocations.

Additionally, COR is tracking lab safety issues and has assigned a committee member to provide ongoing updates.

COR is also examining indirect cost return policy and rate models. The committee is just starting this process and there is no formal policy that explains how indirect costs have been allocated and what amounts are returned to faculty research in a visible and transparent way. The committee plans to meet with VC Reese and VCPB Feitelberge to begin discussions on the topic.

COR reviewed the Public Health Major and Chair Mostern co-chaired with Interim Head Librarian Donald Barclay an ad-hoc committee called the Senate-Administration Library Working Group. The Working Group recommended that the Senate form a permanent Library Advisory Committee. This is a committee that exists at other UC campuses and it has not been perceived as a top priority on our campus due to the small size of our faculty. It has now been identified as a priority especially with the new Open Access Policy.

Provost/EVC Peterson asked if COR would be willing to bench mark some indirect cost return models with regard to sharing with the faculty, departments, and Schools so that we have some examples review.

Chair Mostern replied that COR has just begun reviewing examples and the challenge has been that elsewhere in the UC system it is hard to even find tangible models.

Chancellor Leland stated that VCR Traina has been working on a model and hopes he is involved in the process.

Chair Mostern replied VRC Traina attends all COR meetings as he is an ex-officio member and has been extremely helpful in providing information to help understand how indirect cost return operates on campus.

Chancellor Leland went on to say that she found it interesting UC Berkeley does not provide funds back to the faculty or provides a flat sum every year. Some campuses control it centrally and others allow for more control at the dean level. Our campus can develop a policy that works best for our situation.

A faculty member stated I think we proposed in the past for the amount of funds to be allocated for research per faculty member. That proposal does exist somewhere in the records.

Chair Mostern replied that it could be related to the indirect cost return conversation and increasing the size of funding for faculty grants.

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

The Committee on Rules and Elections opined on a number of issue including the following: Online cross campus course offerings; Bylaw 55 revision; clarify of MAPP procedures for career equity reviews; Self-Supporting Graduate Degree Programs; MCB Proposal; CIS emeritus voting issue and School Bylaw Update.

Additionally, CRE issued a request for a review of the draft revisions to Regulations of the Merced Division which Chair Dale presented on earlier today. CRE also submitted the call for nominations to fill vacancies for four CoC members and on at-Large Member. Nomination petitions are available today and we encourage you to nominate your colleagues for these important positions. Petitions should be received in the Senate office by tomorrow May, 2 2014.

**f. Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom (FWDAF)-Chair Rudy Ortiz**

The Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom committee similar to the Committee on Research is close to completing its inaugural year. The committee has representation on the Senate-Administration Faculty Salary Equity study which every campus is undertaking. The committee has had regular discussions regarding UC health plans and will be meeting with a campus representative on health care issues next week to discuss this further.

FWDAF meets regularly with the campus Ombuds and partnered with APO to establish the faculty professional development series. This series provides opportunities for training junior faculty. Four workshops have been completed since the series' inception. The next workshop topic will be The Road to Tenure. Members of CAP including the CAP Chair will be in attendance.

Chancellor Leland asked to attend a FWDAF meeting to discuss the Campus Climate Survey Report and requested a FWDAF member to serve on the committee she formed to address the survey.

From a diversity perspective Chair Ortiz held several roundtable discussions with Provost/EVC Peterson, Senate Chair López-Calvo, and COR Chair Mostern. In addition, Chair Ortiz delivered presentations to the deans to discuss the potential for developing a mechanism to address campus diversity issues.

Chancellor Leland requested to be kept informed of any health plan issue and asked for a copy of the information that Human Resources submitted to FWDAF.

**g. Graduate Council (GC)- Chair Valerie Leppert**

The main issue the Graduate Council is undertaking are the changes to the Merced Regulations. Several Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) proposals were submitted and the committee is actively reviewing them. Sociology, EECS and ME have all been through review and nearing completion for final review and approval by CCGA. Molecular Cell Biology was reviewed by standing committee, the graduate dean, ALO, and the Provost/EVC.

For systemwide issues the committee has opined and contributed to policies that are being drafted on Self-Supporting Programs and Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition.

A rather important item that the Graduate Council and the CCGA participated in was an all UC campus meeting discussing graduate student support. Topics discussed include: non-residence tuition, multiyear offers, professional development, graduate student diversity and UC offering competitive graduate student support. A number of ideas were generated from the discussions which will need to be put forth at the campus level. For example, one of the proposals put forward is recycling residence tuition funds which we are already doing on our campus.

Graduate Council is also developing policies for graduate student guidelines for graduate groups to use as well as templates for new programs for policies, procedures, and bylaws.

FWDAF Chair Ortiz commented there is a growing sentiment in IH to do away with allowing graduate student support from traditional research awards. The idea is that they want to force campuses to use their T T and U awards to support students and they want research funding to go to research and not graduate student support.

Graduate Council Chair Leppert responded she would add the item to a future agenda as she was unaware of the sentiment but it would certainly affect the campus.

**h. Undergraduate Council (UGC)- Chair Jay Sharping**

The Undergraduate Council has been very busy this year with a near record number of course request forms coming through the committee. UGC approved the Public Health SSHA Major and will be considering the Community Research and Service Minor.

Program Review has been quite active as well. One of the main program reviews the committee completed was the review of Management. The committee also approved changes to the Undergraduate Management Major which is now the Management and Business Economics Major. The change continues to provide interaction between the management graduate and the undergraduate program. Additionally, there are several

other program reviews taking place including General Education, Chemistry, History, Phycology, and Spanish are all on the way. To more efficiently address program review, a new subcommittee of the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council was created. One of the challenges with Program Review is to ensure robust conversations between the administration and the faculty during the process to ensure insightful information is received and acted upon. The committee is considering a joint faculty administration committee and this is a policy that is being drafted in collaboration with the Graduate Council.

Chair López-Calvo asked if he was talking about putting together SACAP and the Senate Program Review Subcommittee of UGC and GC?

Chair Sharping replied affirmatively.

For systemwide issues the University Committee on Education Policy Committee (UCEP) discussed Innovative Learning Technology( ILTI) infrastructure and the UC online related activities. An important item deriving from UCOP as well as UCEP is the Blue Ribbon Panel Evaluation of online education. The Governor provided ten million dollars to offer online education activities and as part of that, there was a study completed on its effectiveness. The study was not perceived favorably by many, but there are important lessons learned that should be gathered.

Chair López-Calvo added as a carry forward item from AY 2013-2014 was the proposal to split UGC into two committees as was done with GRC. The Chancellor has been very generous in offering stipends for both committee chairs next year and possibly a Senate analyst.

Chair López-Calvo ended the meeting by thanking everyone who served this year, including standing committee chairs, vice-chairs and especially the Senate staff, who provide an amazing job every year. He then thanked Chancellor Leland and Provost/EVC Peterson, who have been very supportive of the Senate this year and were pleasant to work.

**H. PETITIONS FROM STUDENTS**

None

**I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

**J. NEW BUSINESS**

None

There be no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Attest: Ignacio López-Calvo, Senate Chair