

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

UGC Notes
Tuesday, October 1, 2019
3:30pm – 5:00pm
KL 232

I. Chair's Report – Jay Sharping**A. Divisional Council Meeting, September 18**

- a. Faculty participated in the Chancellor Search Campus Day. Chair Sharping emphasized that our undergraduate research is part of our R1 status and goals. A Town Hall is scheduled for October 2. Participants are welcome to provide verbal comments and an anonymous survey will be distributed.
- b. UCM Staff morale was discussed. A UCOP survey of our campus showed that staff morale is very low, compared to other UCs and it has declined over time. Staff work hard and have no opportunities to advance their careers.
- c. Assistant Vice Chancellor Pollack attended the DivCo meeting to discuss staffing needs at UC Merced.
- d. Provost/EVC Camfield updated members on transfer students and transfer goals as priorities. He reported that the campus is struggling to reach transfer goals. He is working on developing strategies for making cross-faculty connections among institutions. Most of UCM's transfer population comes from 20 of the 114 community colleges. AFAS and UGC will be engaged in reviewing UCM's eligibility criteria to ensure that we are not setting criteria that cannot be met by Community Colleges in our region.
- e. VC for Research and Economic Development Sam Traina reported on the Sponsored Projects Office redesign.

II. Consent Calendar

- A. Today's Agenda was approved as presented.
- B. The [September 17 Minutes](#) were approved as presented.

III. Approval of Courses ¹

The following courses were approved and have been updated on Curriculog.

1. BIO - 159 - Insect Ecology and Evolution
2. ENG - 100 - Engaging Texts: Introduction to Critical Practice
3. ESS - 159 - Insect Ecology and Evolution
4. HIST - 118 - Topics in Environmental History
5. HIST - 120 - Essence of Decision: Case Studies in History
6. HIST - 170 - Law and Society in Early Modern England
7. ME - 141 - Control Engineering
8. SPAN - 100 - Engaging Texts: Introduction to Critical Practice
9. WH - 130 - Introduction to Digital Archaeology

The following courses are pending and will be reconsidered by UGC.

1. BIOE - 124 - Introduction to Biomedical Imaging (conjoined with BIOE 220)
The course is conjoined with a graduate course. UGC request a description of how the undergraduate vs. graduate learning outcomes differ.

¹ Recusals-- BIO, ESS: Mike Beman; BIOE: Eva de Alba; HIST: Susan Amussen

2. BIOE – 140 – Biomolecular Engineering

There is no mention of the lab in the syllabus or how the lab portion figures into the class grade.
Expand the description of the lab component.

Action: AD Paul will send UGC's recommendations to the Registrar, the School Instructional Managers, and will update Curriculog.

IV. Campus Review Items

A. Proposal for a Program of Graduate Studies in Cognitive and Information Sciences

- [Proposal](#)
- [CCGA Degree Program Format for Graduate Program Proposals](#)
- [CCGA Handbook](#)
- [Graduate Council Policy](#)

Members discussed lead readers' comments.

Actions:

UGC recommends approval of the proposal for a Master's in Cognitive and Information Sciences, with the following provisions:

- a) Expansion of the description of the external review referenced in Appendix B; and
- b) Clarification regarding the 5 students mentioned on page 5 vs. the 8 students per year that would be eligible for the M.S. program (please see page 12 of the proposal).

AD Paul will draft a memo and circulate for review.

B. Review Week Proposal (or Reading Review Recitation Week)

Members discussed next steps for the review and implementation of the proposal.

Background: The RRR Proposal was discussed by UGC a few years ago and most recently, last Spring, following a request from the ASUCM. School faculty and the Registrar were invited to comment (comments were included in the agenda). With the summer hiatus, discussions ceased and it was agreed that UGC revisit it this academic year. The RRR program is aligned with the policy at UC Berkeley. It is a five-day period (Monday-Friday), during week 15 of Fall and Spring semesters with the last day of classes on Friday (week 14).

Chair Sharping noted that students are looking forward to the implementation of this proposal and asked members whether they would like to move forward with its implementation.

Considerations/Comments:

- A member noted that it would be useful to know whether UC Berkeley had put in place any measurements of the RRR week, post-implementation. As we move forward, UCM faculty need to know what they are trying to accomplish with this proposal and how to design a shared experience that supports student learning.
- Need to identify the rules and limitations with regard to assignments.
- Consider potential impacts on the academic calendar. The VCSA confirmed that the implementation of this proposal would not affect the academic calendar. Teaching will still be delivered during the same period, however, no new materials will be introduced.

- A member expressed some concerns about losing one week of instruction specifically with regards to events scheduled during the proposed RRR week. For example, the School of Engineering Innovate to Grow event typically takes place on the Friday before the finals. There will be some adverse repercussions on some programmatic efforts. An entire week may be difficult to implement.
- A member noted that exceptions for special events are possible.
- Some campuses have a “Dead Week policy” (e.g. [UCSB](#)). A quick search of the website yielded a policy for final exams on the registrar’s [website](#).
- Some faculty are concerned about the implementation of a RRR week at UCM. Although UCM and UCB’s calendars are aligned, the two campuses’ student pools differ.

Next steps:

- Articulate the proposal, include a cover letter with an executive summary, actual policies, goals, and associated timetables. The proposal should include sections related to exceptional circumstances and the process for non-compliance with the RRR week.
- Solicit campus wide feedback (senate/school committees) and the registrar.

Timeline: Finalize the proposal in mid-November.

Action: Members will revisit this topic.

C. [Draft Charge for a Proposed Faculty Advisory Committee for Information Technology](#)

This advisory committee is being proposed by Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and CIO Ann Kovalchick.

Action: Two members were invited to review this proposal and will report their findings at the October 15 UGC meeting.

V. Vice Chair’s Report – Matt Hibbing

On September 30, the Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee discussion items included the following:

- The establishment of AFAS as a stand-alone Senate committee.
- Office of Financial Aid and Scholarship proposal to revise the selection criteria and scoring rubric used for ranking potential incoming Regents Scholars’ recipients.
- Impacted majors policy proposed by UGC (ongoing discussion)
- In the context of the recent CA State Audit of the UC admissions practices, it was found that a few campuses had no documented, or vague, admissions policies and procedures. Several changes that were recommended by the auditor were implemented and other deliverables are due by November 1. AD Paul contacted the Office of Admissions to request an update on the status of the deliverables, per AFAS request.
- The Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee master calendar was approved and has been published on the Senate website.

VI. Consultation with Professor Valerie Leppert, Chair of the GE Executive Committee

A. Draft General Education Bylaws

The General Education Executive Committee (GEEC) has proposed permanent Bylaws for the GE program. The program has been governed under a set of interim Bylaws that will expire in December, 2019. Following extensive deliberation, the GEEC is proposing to adopt the interim Bylaws as permanent, with some modifications that remove outdated information (e.g. references to the GE Subcommittee of UGC), clarify the roles of the GEEC Chair and Members, and change the current requirement of a two-thirds vote of approval for revisions to the GE Program. On September 26, the Bylaws were distributed to Senate and Non-Senate Faculty with a request for comments by October 14. A vote of the faculty is scheduled in early November.

Chair Leppert invited the Senate (UGC and CRE) to comment on the proposed Bylaws.

Action: Two UGC readers were identified for the review of the Bylaws and will provide a report at the October 15 meeting.

Chair Leppert Report:

The current Bylaws are interim and expire in December. The default, if these Bylaws are not approved, is the structure that the campus had for over a decade whereby the GE program was administered by the VPDUE, who is the Dean of College One. The faculty Executive Committee for College One would govern the program. The GEEC is doing the day-to-day faculty oversight of the program. The draft Bylaws build on the interim bylaws that were reviewed and approved on August 2018 by the GESC, the UGC, and the Divisional council. The GEEC has removed some language that is outdated and that referenced the GESC. The GEEC also clarified the roles of the Chair and Members, and is seeking consultation on the mechanism for voting (Article IV). Members of the GEEC represent the three schools and are available for consultation with the faculty, to discuss the proposed Bylaws.

Chair Leppert noted that she still receives questions as to why GE is required at UCM and noted that the program is required by [Regents Policy 2107](#), which states that:

”Resolved that the Board of Regents affirms the historic commitment of the University of California to a basic educational policy of providing to undergraduates a broad general education, emphasizing humanistic values and intellectual breadth and including the required study of science, technology, social sciences, the arts and humanities”.

GEEC would like to emphasize the following points:

- The vote on the proposed Bylaws is on the governance structure for GE.
- Spark seminars have been positively received by the students.
- The Committee is aware that there are lingering faculty concerns about the GE program and is working on addressing those concerns. For example, the GEEC is conducting analyses to identify ways to reduce the cost for delivering Spark for all students. Suggestions were made to consider utilizing the Engineering Service Learning program to build a form of Spark seminars. This could engage more STEM faculty and potentially reduce costs for delivering Spark. The NS faculty suggested to GEEC that it consider the Living Learning Communities (LLC) academic activities for Spark seminars. All these considerations are all high-impact practices, particularly for first-generation and minority students and will necessitate further consultation.
- A GEEC work group is working on analyzing writing support for Spark seminars (a lecturer from the MWP is doing some preliminary work). The GEEC has identified faculty from the Schools to work with the lecturer on assessing the support required to deliver Spark seminar.
- An AAC&U consultant (the Assistant Vice President for assessment at AAC&U) is collaborating with the GEEC to advise on assessment and implementation of the program. The consultant will visit in the Spring to help with the development of an assessment plan and provide general feedback on the program.
- Lastly, for campus constituents who would like to see the program further improve, a permanent governance structure will serve as a conduit for improvement of the program.

Members’ Comments:

- The program was approved by a narrow majority. The GEEC thought it would be useful to implement a voting system similar to the super majority system.
- The VPDUE is an ex-officio member of UGC and cannot attend any of the meetings this semester. He sent an email to UGC in support of the GE program. Chair Sharping read the message to members.
- Chair Sharping encouraged members to respond to the survey on the GE program and feedback on the proposed Bylaws. A preliminary reading of the Bylaws did not clearly describe whether the Chair of the GE program has to be a Senate faculty member.
- GEEC would welcome feedback on the unit 18 lecturers who are members of the GEEC but share one vote. This was a prime source of contention in coming to an agreement on the interim Bylaws. The hope is that, moving forward, it won't be.

B. Expanded Descriptions of the Intellectual Experiences Badges and Approaches to Knowledge

This was provided as an informational item by Chair Leppert, but members are welcome to provide feedback.

During consideration of GE designations last academic year, the GEEC struggled with using the short descriptions of these designations found in the General Education proposal to determine whether or not courses and co-curricular activities met the criteria for approval. The GEEC CRF subcommittee, which recommends GE designations for approval to the GEEC, and has members from each of the three schools, the Merritt Writing Program and Student Affairs, consulted with colleagues in corresponding disciplines across campus in developing more complete descriptions of the designations to help guide the review process. They were then approved by the GEEC at the end of the last academic year.

It is expected that in the next few years, the Catalog will be slightly revised for each of these categories until the right language is identified.

UGC envisions the process as follows:

- Program provide the information to UGC and ask for feedback
- Changes and recommendations to be reflected in an updated version of the designations
- This would come to UGC as a revised copy of the Catalog in the spring.

Action: Jay Sharping and David Kaminsky will serve as reviewers. This topic will be revisited in the Fall.

VII. Other Business

The Academic Activity Proposal meeting is scheduled for Thursday. The proposal was developed in response to a request from Provost Brown that each campus develop a proposal on how to confirm student academic activity each term in order to comply with financial aid requirements. A proposal was previously submitted in early Fall to the Senate and had to be rescinded as it was not comprehensive. A revised proposal will be distributed to the Senate.