



**SPRING MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
MONDAY, APRIL 16, 2018
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
232 KOLLIGIAN LIBRARY**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| I. ANNOUNCEMENTS – Divisional Chair Susan Amussen | 5 MIN |
| II. SYSTEMWIDE UPDATES – Academic Council Chair Shane White & Vice Chair Robert May | 10 MIN |
| III. CONSENT CALENDAR ¹ | 5 MIN |
| A. Approval of the Agenda | |
| B. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the November 28, 2017 Meeting of the Division (Pp. 4-9) | |
| IV. CAMPUS UPDATES – Chancellor Leland & Provost/EVC Peterson | 10 MIN |
| V. DISCUSSION: THE FACULTY ROLE IN BUILDING AN INCLUSIVE CAMPUS – Divisional Chair Susan Amussen | 10 MIN |
| VI. 2018-2019 DIVISION CHAIR, VICE CHAIR & SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN – CoC Chair Tom Hansford | 5 MIN |
| VII. STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS | 10 MIN |
| Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation , Vice Chair Jessica Trounstine | (oral) |
| Committee on Academic Personnel , Vice Chair Nella Van Dyke | (oral) |
| Committee on Committees , Chair Tom Hansford | (oral) |
| Committee on Diversity and Equity , Chair Wei-Chun Chin | (oral) |
| Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom , Chair Sean Malloy | (oral) |
| Committee on Research , Chair David Noelle | (oral) |
| Committee on Rules and Elections , Chair Lin Tian | (oral) |
| Graduate Council , Vice Chair LeRoy Westerling | (oral) |
| Undergraduate Council , Chair Anne Zanzucchi | (oral) |
| General Education | |
| Admissions and Financial Aid | |

¹ 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. Lin Tian, Secretary/Parliamentarian

VIII. ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DIVISION REGULATION (Pg. 10 - 81) – CRE Chair, Lin Tian **5 MIN**
Following a request from Divisional Council, the Committee on Rules and Elections revised [Part II, Section 4: HONORS](#) of the UC Merced Regulations to include standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major. The proposed revision was circulated for comment to all standing committees and school executive committees. Divisional Council discussed committee comments (enclosed) on February 20, 2018, and endorsed minor revisions to the proposed language. On March 13, 2018, CRE endorsed the version approved by Divisional Council on February 20, 2018 and presented here (pp. 12 – 13).

ACTION REQUESTED: The Merced Division votes to endorse the proposed revision to [Part II, Section 4: HONORS](#) of the Division Regulations. If approved, the changes are effective May 28, 2018.

IX. SENATE AWARDS **15 MIN**
The Dr. Fred Spiess Distinguished Service to the Academic Senate Award
Senate Faculty Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award
Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award for Non-Senate Faculty
Senate Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award
Senate Distinguished Early Career Research Award
Senate Distinction in Research Award
Senate Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award
Senate Excellence in Faculty Mentorship Award

X. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS **5 MIN**

XI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS **5 MIN**

XII. NEW BUSINESS **5 MIN**

Glossary of [UC Merced](#) and [Systemwide](#) Academic Senate Committee Acronyms

CAP - Committee on Academic Personnel

CAPRA - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

CoC - Committee on Committees

COR - Committee on Research

CRE - Committee on Rules and Elections

D&E - Diversity and Equity

DivCo - Divisional Council

FCAF - Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom

GC - Graduate Council

L (A) SC - Library and Scholarly Communication

P&T - Privilege and Tenure

UGC - Undergraduate Council

GESC - General Education Subcommittee

AFAS - Admissions and Financial Aid

BOARS - Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

CCGA - Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs

COUNCIL - Academic Council

UCAF - University Committee on Academic Freedom

UCAP - University Committee on Academic Personnel

UCAADE - University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity

UCCC - University Committee on Computing and Communications

UCEP - University Committee on Educational Policy

UCOC - University Committee on Committees

UCFW - University Committee on Faculty Welfare

UCIE - University Committee on International Education

UCOLASC - University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

UCPB - University Committee on Planning and Budget

UCOPE - University Committee on Preparatory Education

UCORP - University Committee on Research Policy

UCPT - University Committee on Privilege and Tenure

UCRJ - University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction



**FALL MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
NOVEMBER 28, 2017**

Pursuant to the call, the Merced Division of the Academic Senate met at 3:00 p.m. on November 28, 2017 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Senate Chair Susan Amussen presiding.

I. CHAIR'S REPORT & ANNOUNCEMENTS

Senate Chair Amussen made the following announcements and updates: The three campus working groups – Academic Planning, Academic Reorganization, and Budget – that were populated with input from the administration and Senate faculty, continue their business. The campus is preparing for its reaccreditation and a site visit will occur at the end of February 2018. In Spring 2017, the Senate faculty voted to approve a General Education program. The program is now in the implementation phase, and it is expected that the administration will take over this portion of the endeavor. The Moreno report pertaining to the UC audit is posted on the Regents' website. In light of this report, Academic Council is discussing how the systemwide Academic Senate can support the UC system. Council has also discussed a possible Memorial to the Regents. Such a document would require a vote of all UC Senate faculty.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR¹

The consent calendar, including today's agenda, the Minutes of the April 19, 2017 Meeting of the Division, and the annual committee reports for AY 2016-17, was approved as presented.

III. CAMPUS UPDATE

Chancellor Leland made the following announcements and updates: The proposed federal tax legislation has serious implications for higher education. There may be taxes on endowments, taxes on programs that have aided low and middle income students, and taxes on graduate student stipends. Chancellor Leland invited faculty to review the analysis of the legislation provided in her November 27, 2017 email to the campus, and encouraged faculty to write to their representatives about this harmful legislation. A group of former UC presidents and chancellors are creating a higher education coalition to focus on immigration reform. It is their position that UC leadership needs to weigh in on how immigration law is impacting students and faculty on the 10 campuses. The Chancellor also encouraged faculty to urge their representatives to retain DACA, particularly given the uncertainty of a deal in Congress regarding the program's future.

Provost/EVC Peterson made the following announcements and updates: The Provost/EVC thanked the Director of Space Planning and Analysis for her work in engaging the faculty on the use of new, and backfill, 2020 Project space. The October 30 space planning retreat was well attended by faculty members. One week after the retreat, the call for proposals for the collaborative use of space was issued to faculty, and the deadline for submission was Monday, November 27. Over 30

¹ 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. Lin Tian, Secretary/Parliamentarian

proposals were received and several involved strategic clusters of interdisciplinary and disciplinary areas. Two proposals called for the establishment of a center for creative engagement. All proposals spoke to the growth of individual programs. A three-stage process will now occur, not necessarily in this order: An analysis of functional scenarios; this involves determining the minimum the campus needs to do in order to accommodate needs like moving faculty from Castle to campus, and changing inappropriate space to appropriate space. These scenarios are the most extensive in terms of moving logistics, but will be the least expensive overall. An analysis of buffer space; programs currently have no room to expand, so new space must be provided for this purpose. Some faculty may have to relocate. Both of the above, plus an accounting for strategic space groupings of faculty/programs/disciplines/functions.

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM: THREE MAJOR PLANNING INITIATIVES

The Co-chairs of the three campus working groups made brief presentations:

A. School Reorganization

Co-chairs Maglio and Camfield stated that their working group has been examining the current challenges facing units, and has held extensive discussions on APM 245 – Duties of Department Chairs. Recognizing that some graduate groups do not align with bylaw units/future departments, the working group discussed the role of graduate group chairs versus department chairs as well as the administrative support that would be required for chairs to carry out their duties. Partial staff support is being developed centrally for the whole campus, but the working group is aware that departmental and school-level staff is needed. The working group is also discussing compensation for department chairs. Its recommendations will be informed by practices across the UC system. Finally, the working group is examining reallocation of revenue, new revenue, and a phased implementation of support structures when such structures are available.

B. Academic Planning

Co-chairs Peterson and Amussen reported that the working group distributed a set of questions and templates to faculty chairs to support planning. The proposed academic planning timeline is: 1) program/unit plans are submitted to the working group by December 15, where they will be uploaded to a Box site; 2) CAPRA works on criteria, consults with school executive committees; 3) school executive committees will review, request revisions, and develop recommendations for the allocation of FTE; 4) school executive committees and deans will submit recommendations to the working group by February 15, and 5) CAPRA and all deans will review recommendations and make recommendations to the Provost/EVC by March 15.

The Provost/EVC announced there will be two workshops for faculty to receive guidance on their proposals: December 1st from 11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. in room KL 362, and December 7th from 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. in KL 232. An email confirming these dates will be issued to faculty shortly. The Provost/EVC also announced that his website, provostevc.ucmerced.edu, contains all relevant data and metrics for these proposals. He encourages faculty to review and send him any questions.

C. Budget

Co-chairs Mendez and Schnier reported that the working group continues to discuss the implementation of a campus instructional budget and carry forward policy. In support of this work, the group is examining a revenue-generating and cost-savings model.

Division members variously inquired about the model the Budget Working Group is analyzing expressed concerns about the campus's budget situation, and raised questions about the use of the graduate student to faculty ratio as a metric in academic planning given disciplinary differences in the number of students faculty typically support.

Budget Working Group Co-chair Schnier responded that the working group is examining the pilot that has been done in the School of Engineering. The focus is on accounting for expenditures. A revenue-generating budget model is likely 3-5 years away.

The Chancellor replied that she will hold a budget forum in January. She noted that the campus has never had a base budget, and that items such as replacing classroom furniture and other such expenses were never budgeted. Nor did the campus, in its early years, create a contingency fund to sustain the campus through a severe financial crisis. With this history in mind, the campus is currently creating a balanced budget that addresses these needs as well as other items that had previously been excluded from budgeting. The campus is addressing the current, anticipated budget deficit by finding cost savings where possible. The campus does not anticipate cutting positions, but open positions may not be filled at this time. The Chancellor emphasized that she is not an advocate of across-the-board budget cuts.

The Provost/EVC emphasized that there will not be any "one-size-fits-all" models for decision-making in academic planning. The working group is taking a holistic approach when reviewing the data, not just one or two metrics. The academic planning process will also not usurp the traditional roles and responsibilities of CAPRA, bylaw units/departments, and the school executive committees in the allocation of space and resources.

V. **ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DIVISION BYLAW**

In the absence of the Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Senate, Senate Vice Chair Schnier summarized the proposed revisions to the Division bylaw that would create a Reserve CAP as a standing committee. This Reserve CAP would serve to review the personnel files of current CAP members, former CAP members who completed their terms one year prior, and faculty appeals.

Action: Due to a lack of quorum, an electronic ballot will be submitted to Senate faculty.

VI. **STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS**

[Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#)

Chair Singhal reported the following: CAPRA has been consulting regularly with Provost Peterson and Interim Vice Chancellor Veronica Mendez on issues related to faculty FTE lines, space allocation, and campus budget. CAPRA has consulted several times with Director of Space Planning and Analysis on the 2020 space allocation process. CAPRA advocates for space allocation decisions to be made at the unit/department level, as faculty members are in the best position to know what types of space are needed for which field. CAPRA is represented on the campus Academic Planning Working Group by Mike Colvin, and represented on the campus Budget Working Group by Kurt Schnier, and receives regular updates on the activities of both working groups. CAPRA members continue to work with IRDS on enrollment numbers as we move toward 2020. CAPRA is also represented on the campus Enrollment Management Committee. CAPRA's main function is

reviewing faculty FTE requests and making recommendations to the Provost. CAPRA has again advocated to the Provost for an earlier timeline in making decisions on next year's faculty FTE lines in order to accommodate disciplines that post job advertisements in late summer. However, CAPRA understands that it must be cognizant of the timeline of the Academic Planning Working Group.

[Committee on Academic Personnel](#)

Chair López-Calvo reported the following: This year, and per its suggestion from last year, CAP will not review short-form advancement cases, nor will it review appointment cases at Assistant Professor III and below or LPSOE appointment cases. These cases will stop at the dean level unless a request for an independent review by CAP is made. All other case files continue to be reviewed by CAP. CAP continues working with the Senate Committee for Diversity & Equity on a request to VPF Camfield to revise the MAPP to make clear the process for evaluating faculty contributions to diversity. CAP is pleased to see that its joint proposal with VPF Camfield from last year with regard to establishing a standing Reserve CAP was endorsed by Divisional Council and was under consideration at today's meeting. CAP is represented, by its vice chair Nella Van Dyke, on the VPF's task force for the evaluation of teaching. CAP continues to conduct its normal business of reviewing cases files related to appointments, advancements, promotions, and mid-career appraisals.

[Committee on Committees](#)

On behalf of Chair Hansford, Chair Amussen reported that CoC has been working to complete the rosters for the standing committees of the Division, as well as appointments to systemwide committees, and are nearly done. CoC has also been addressing requests for Senate representation to non-Senate committees and workgroups, including the new Campus Police Advisory Board, the Information, Privacy and Security Committee, the Committee for the Five Year Review of VPDUE Whitt, the UCM Hearing Board/Academic Honesty Review Board, the Teaching Evaluation Taskforce organized by the Vice Provost for the Faculty and co-chaired by the Vice Chair of CAP, and the Administrative Policy – Academic Degree Programs Working Group. Looking forward, CoC will be issuing its annual Senate Service Preference Survey this December, and will initiate identifying next year's committee leadership in January. The Chair also noted that this is an exciting time to be a member of Senate committees as the Senate has been working closely with the administration on initiatives, policies, and other matters that are central to the ongoing development of the campus. The hope is that faculty will respond favorably to inquiries to serve in the coming year.

[Committee on Diversity and Equity](#)

Chair Chin reported that this is the second year of the campus's Faculty Equity Advisor (FEA) program. In light of this, D&E is gathering feedback from FEAs and faculty units to improve the program. D&E is also working with the VPF on affirmative action reporting by department chairs. In the future, D&E would like to include in this reporting consideration of student diversity. D&E is working on a joint memo with FWF on diversity in faculty hiring that should go to the administration at the end of the semester. At the start of the year, D&E sent a memo to the Provost asking that diversity be considered in the academic planning process. This semester D&E is also working with the Chancellor's office to develop a diversity statement specific to UC Merced.

[Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom](#)

Chair Sean Malloy reported that tomorrow FWF will consult with Associate Chancellor Luanna Putney, Director of Campus Climate De Acker, and Campus Counsel Elisabeth Gunther on a campus policy on protests and external speakers. Once FWF provides its feedback, the draft policy will be issued for campus-wide review. This semester FWF and D&E submitted to Divisional Council a joint memo and statement on diversity in faculty hiring. Following a recommendation from Divisional Council, FWF will be revising the statement to include language on implicit bias. FWF

continues to consider faculty mental health issues with the goal of ensuring that faculty have ready access to culturally component counselors.

[Committee on Research](#)

Chair Noelle reported that the committee consults regularly with the VCORED. This semester CoR also consulted with the Director of Space Planning and Analysis regarding research space and laboratory plans. CoR has also started a conversation with the Director of Procurement, Joshua Dubroff, concerning problems with research-related purchasing on campus. CoR is in the process of finalizing the annual call for proposals for its Academic Senate faculty research grants program. CoR is in the process of finishing its contributions to the periodic review of Sierra Nevada Research Institute, the very first review of an ORU on campus, and is starting a review of the Center for Humanities. In conducting these reviews, CoR has realized that the governing policy requires revision and so is undertaking that work. CoR's representative to the Budget Policy Working Group keeps CoR apprised on relevant matters. CoR is working with CAPRA on issues of discretionary funding and indirect cost returns.

[Committee on Rules and Elections](#)

On behalf of Chair Tian, Chair Amussen reported that CRE conducts most of its business via email in response to requests from senate committee leads, members, and the Merced faculty. Recent requests have addressed voting procedures for bylaw units, and voting rights for L(P)SOE faculty. This semester, CRE anticipates concluding its work on a voting reference guide for bylaw units, which will be circulated to the Senate for review. CRE has also recently endorsed the revisions to the Honors section of the Division Regulations, revisions to the bylaws governing UGC's duties, and the revisions to CAP Bylaws under consideration today. Finally, CRE Chair Lin Tian has been a member of the working group drafting bylaws for the new General Education program.

[Graduate Council](#)

On behalf of Chair Ghezzehei, Chair Amussen reported that GC has been working with Dean Zatz to address, both immediately and in the long term, the various issues graduate students fully supported by fellowships experience as a result of not being considered university employees. GC has also been working with Dean Zatz and the Acting Dean of SSHA to better understand and permanently resolve the situation of delayed graduate student payment in SSHA this summer and fall. In a memo to graduate group chairs and the graduate dean, GC reaffirmed that policy prohibits Graduate Division from offering courses for credit, but that existing policy does support several routes for offering interdisciplinary courses. Graduate groups were encouraged to pursue these routes for such courses. GC has also been engaged in policy development, including procedures for appointing graduate students as instructor of record for upper division courses, policies and procedures for the review and approval of non-degree programs proposed by UC Merced Extension, and revisions to the Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook. The latter will take effect fall 2018. GC is also in the process of reviewing three CCGA proposals for graduate programs leading to masters and Ph.D. degrees in Bioengineering, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, and Management of Complex Systems. A fourth proposal is expected in the coming month. Finally, GC is represented on the Academic Planning, School Reorganization, and Budget Working Groups.

[Undergraduate Council](#)

Chair Zanzucchi reported that UGC participates in both local and systemwide business, the latter through its representatives to UCOPE, UCIE, and BOARS. UGC representatives also represent the committee's interests on PROC and the Enrollment Management Committee. UGC is partnering with CAPRA and GC on revisions to the policies governing the review and approval of new programs. UGC is also working with the Registrar's Office on the implementation of the new CRF system and associated curriculum management system. The Chair thanked AFAS Chair Viney for his

work continuing to develop the function of this relatively new subcommittee of UGC. UGC is also working undergraduates on their proposal for a rest and recitation period. UGC has also been working on the implementation of the new GE program in collaboration with GESC and thanks GESC Chair Vevea for his work on this initiative.

VII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS

None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest: Susan Amussen, Senate Chair

DRAFT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
LIN TIAN, CHAIR
ltian@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
PH: 209-228-4209

MARCH 14, 2018

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

FROM: LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) – HONORS

At its March 13, 2018 meeting, the Committee on Rules and Elections unanimously approved the revisions to Part II, Section 4 of the Merced Regulations addressing Honors. The Committee on Rules and Elections thanks Divisional Council and the standing committees for their feedback, and the Senate Chair for the opportunity to opine.

cc: CRE Members
Senate Office

Encl. (1)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954

MARCH 5, 2018

TO: LIN TIAN, CHAIR, CRE

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Amussen", is written in black ink.

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) - HONORS

At its February 20, 2018 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed the enclosed revisions to [Section Part II, Section 4](#) of the Division Regulations addressing Honors. Since these revisions alter the text originally drafted by CRE, DivCo asks CRE to review and, as appropriate, approve the appended version for consideration by the Division at the April 16, 2018 Meeting of the Division.

The revisions endorsed by Divisional Council address recommendations made by Undergraduate Council (enclosed). Specifically, UGC suggested that the sentence "Programs may include levels of honors at graduation" could lead to confusion given the existing [University Honors](#) designation at graduation. To address this concern, DivCo endorsed adding "in the major" to the concerning sentence, such that it now reads "Programs may include levels of honors in the major."

Finally, it is important to report the full results of the campus review of this item. Following Divisional Council's review of the original revisions on December 11, 2017, the draft regulation was circulated to the standing committees of the Division and the school executive committees. CAPRA, GC, and UGC responded (enclosed). The remaining committees appreciated the opportunity to opine, but declined to comment. GC endorsed the proposed revisions, while CAPRA suggested a revision that would require CAPRA to approve proposals for honors programs in the major. Following discussion, Divisional Council concluded that CAPRA's request is best addressed by ensuring that CAPRA is invited to comment on proposals for honors programs in the major as part of the process of campus review.

Divisional Council thanks CRE for its consideration of this matter.

CC: Divisional Council
Senate Office

[Merced Division Regulations](#)

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation ([SR 640](#))

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation in the major. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

[Merced Division Regulations](#)

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation ([SR 640](#))

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation in the major. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
MUKESH SINGHAL, CHAIR
msinghal@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

January 26, 2018

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Mukesh Singhal, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
(CAPRA)

Re: Proposed revisions to Section Part II, Section 4 of the Division Regulations - Honors

CAPRA has reviewed the proposed revisions to Section Part II, Section 4 of the Division Regulations addressing Honors. The proposed revisions establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major. As there are resource implications with the establishment of new programs and changes to majors, CAPRA requests that all Honors Program Proposals are reviewed by CAPRA in addition to UGC. Thus, we recommend that the language be changed to read:

D. Honors Programs: Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council(UGC) **and the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)** and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a)defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b)admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c)for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council **and CAPRA**.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

cc: CAPRA
Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

DECEMBER 18, 2017

**TO: CHAIRS OF STANDING SENATE COMMITTEES
CHAIRS OF SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES**

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Amussen".

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) - HONORS

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Section Part II, Section 4](#) of the Division Regulations addressing Honors. The proposed revisions establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major.

As described in the appended correspondence, the revisions were requested by Divisional Council, following its April 24, 2017 endorsement of UGC's approval of *The Proposal for an English Honors Program*. At that time, Divisional Council noted that the Honors Program can be established, and students enrolled to graduate with honors, but that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors requires revisions to the Division's Regulations.

The proposed revisions were approved by the Committee on Rules and Elections at its October 11, 2017 meeting. At its December 11, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed them for campus review.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu **by close of business, Tuesday, February 13, 2018** in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on February 20, 2018.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (3)

Approved by CRE on October 11, 2017.

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation (SR 640)

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
Anne Zanzucchi, Chair
azanzucchi@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7930

February 14, 2018

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

Re: Honors Programs

On January 22, 2018 and most recently on February 12, 2018, the Undergraduate Council considered the proposed revisions to [Part II. Section 4 of the Regulations, Honors](#) proposed by CRE in light of last year's Senate review and approval of the proposal for an English Honors program¹.

UGC recognizes the positive aspect of codifying Honors Programs in the Regulations as a conduit for students to articulate their achievement in specific programs. It was noted, however, that the revisions as-presented could possibly lead to potential confusion with the existing [University Honors](#) at Graduation which are tied to different criteria and GPA thresholds. Separately, although there are no Honors programs in the School of Engineering, some concerns were raised about the GPA threshold. The School of Engineering faculty will engage in further dialogue in the near future.

Following careful discussion and review of the proposed revisions, UGC members unanimously agreed that the language be revised as follows:

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. ~~Programs may include levels of honors at graduation.~~ Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne Zanzucchi".

Anne Zanzucchi
Chair, Undergraduate Council

CC: UGC, Senate Office

¹ Relevant correspondence is appended

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

DECEMBER 18, 2017

**TO: CHAIRS OF STANDING SENATE COMMITTEES
CHAIRS OF SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES**

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Amussen".

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) - HONORS

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Section Part II, Section 4](#) of the Division Regulations addressing Honors. The proposed revisions establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major.

As described in the appended correspondence, the revisions were requested by Divisional Council, following its April 24, 2017 endorsement of UGC's approval of *The Proposal for an English Honors Program*. At that time, Divisional Council noted that the Honors Program can be established, and students enrolled to graduate with honors, but that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors requires revisions to the Division's Regulations.

The proposed revisions were approved by the Committee on Rules and Elections at its October 11, 2017 meeting. At its December 11, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed them for campus review.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu **by close of business, Tuesday, February 13, 2018** in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on February 20, 2018.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (3)

Approved by CRE on October 11, 2017.

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation (SR 640)

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
DAVID C. NOELLE, CHAIR
dnoelle@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4369

February 2, 2018

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: David C. Noelle, Chair, Committee on Research (COR)

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David C. Noelle".

Re: Proposed Revisions to Division Regulations - Honors

At its January 30 meeting, the Committee on Research (COR) discussed the proposed revisions to the Division Regulations that would establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major. COR is pleased to endorse the proposed revisions, and we thank you for the opportunity to provide comments

cc: Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

DECEMBER 18, 2017

**TO: CHAIRS OF STANDING SENATE COMMITTEES
CHAIRS OF SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES**

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Amussen".

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) - HONORS

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Section Part II, Section 4](#) of the Division Regulations addressing Honors. The proposed revisions establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major.

As described in the appended correspondence, the revisions were requested by Divisional Council, following its April 24, 2017 endorsement of UGC's approval of *The Proposal for an English Honors Program*. At that time, Divisional Council noted that the Honors Program can be established, and students enrolled to graduate with honors, but that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors requires revisions to the Division's Regulations.

The proposed revisions were approved by the Committee on Rules and Elections at its October 11, 2017 meeting. At its December 11, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed them for campus review.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu **by close of business, Tuesday, February 13, 2018** in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on February 20, 2018.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (3)

Approved by CRE on October 11, 2017.

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation (SR 640)

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

DECEMBER 18, 2017

**TO: CHAIRS OF STANDING SENATE COMMITTEES
CHAIRS OF SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES**

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Amussen".

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) - HONORS

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Section Part II, Section 4](#) of the Division Regulations addressing Honors. The proposed revisions establish standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major.

As described in the appended correspondence, the revisions were requested by Divisional Council, following its April 24, 2017 endorsement of UGC's approval of *The Proposal for an English Honors Program*. At that time, Divisional Council noted that the Honors Program can be established, and students enrolled to graduate with honors, but that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors requires revisions to the Division's Regulations.

The proposed revisions were approved by the Committee on Rules and Elections at its October 11, 2017 meeting. At its December 11, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed them for campus review.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu **by close of business, Tuesday, February 13, 2018** in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on February 20, 2018.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (3)

Approved by CRE on October 11, 2017.

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation (SR 640)

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
LIN TIAN, CHAIR
ltian@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
PH: 209-228-4209

OCTOBER 12, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

FROM: LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS

RE: REVISED [REGULATIONS II.4](#) - HONORS

The Committee on Rules and Elections held its inaugural meeting on October 11, 2017 and considered UGC's and DivCo's requests to revise the Honors Section of the UC Merced Regulations ([SR 640](#)) to include standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major. Appended to this memo, on page 2, please find the revisions that were unanimously approved by CRE.

Thank you for considering this item at the November 6, 2017 Divisional Council meeting.

cc: Anne Zanzucchi, Chair, Undergraduate Council
CRE Members
Senate Office

Appendices

- Revised Honors Regulations: CRE Approved October 11, 2017
- Senate Approval of the English Honors Proposal May 1, 2017
- VPDUE Memo to Provost May 23, 2017
- Provost and Chancellor Endorsement May 31, 2017

Approved by CRE on October 11, 2017.

SECTION 4. HONORS

A. Honors at Graduation (SR 640)

To be eligible for honors at graduation, an undergraduate student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08).

B. Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average ¹or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

C. Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

D. Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Programs may include levels of honors at graduation. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for (a) defining the criteria and grade point average to be used in determining the level of honors to be awarded, (b) admitting students to their approved Honors Programs, and (c) for delivering special courses. Any change to the criteria for awarding levels of honors will require review and approval of the Undergraduate Council.

¹ Academic Units in charge of the major may adopt a GPA higher than 3.5

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

MAY 1, 2017

TO: ELIZABETH WHITT, VICE PROVOST AND DEAN FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISION COUNCIL

RE: PROPOSAL FOR AN ENGLISH HONORS PROGRAM

Dear VPDUE Whitt:

At its April 20, 2017 meeting, Division Council unanimously approved the *Proposal for an English Honors Program*, effective fall 2017. In keeping with the [Policy for Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs](#), we forward this decision to you for recommendation to the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Peterson.

In endorsing the proposal, Divisional Council considered comments on the proposal from UGC, CAPRA, the SSHA Executive Committee, and the Provost. UGC approved the proposal. CAPRA endorsed it following an analysis of the associated resource demands. The SSHA Executive Committee supported it. All other standing committees declined to comment.

In discussing the Provost's comments, members felt that the addition of a major specific honors degree would not preclude development of University Honors Program, and instead expect that existing programs, including those in History and Chemistry, could be effectively integrated into such an initiative. Indeed, DivCo looks forward to receiving a proposal for a campus-wide honors program that as desirable unites these major specific efforts into a larger endeavor to the benefit of students, programs, and the campus alike.

In approving the program, Divisional Council noted that the English Honors Program can be established and students enrolled, but that that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors in the major requires revisions to the [Division's Regulations](#). Division Council has asked the Committee on Rules and Elections to revise the Division's Regulations to include the standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major. This will be accomplished as soon as possible.

Thank you for transmitting DivCo's approval of this proposal to the Provost. The English faculty are looking forward to implementing this new element of their curriculum, particularly as there are already English majors who are eager to apply to and complete this program this coming academic year.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Amussen". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "S" and "A".

Susan Amussen
Chair, Divisional Council

CC: Divisional Council

Tom Peterson, Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor Peterson

Jill Robbins, Dean, SSHA

Katherine Brokaw, Associate Professor, English

Holley Moyes, Co-Chair, SSHA Curriculum Committee

Peter Vanderschraff, SSHA Curriculum Committee

James Ortez, Assistant Dean, SSHA

Encl (5)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
Anne Zanzucchi, Chair
azanzucchi@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7930; fax (209) 228-7955

March 19, 2017

To: Susan Amussen Chair, Divisional Council

Re: English Honors Program

At its March 13 meeting, the Undergraduate Council discussed the SSHA proposal for an English Honors program. UGC recognizes the positive values and contributions of this program as it will nurture and recognize academically successful students.

As stated in the proposal, the English Honors is inspired by and based on the existing History Honors program. In preparing background materials to guide UGC's discussion of the English Honors proposal, it was brought to the attention of Council members that during the Senate review of the History Honors proposal in AY 2008-2009, UGC had then approved¹ revisions to the UCM Regulations to include an Honors section. The revisions were subsequently approved by the Committee on Rules and Elections and the Assembly of the Academic Senate². It was noticed that the current language in the [UCM Regulations](#) (Part II. Section 4) does not include a clause related to Honors programs.

In light of this context, and to ensure consistency between academic policies and UCM Regulations, UGC encourages the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) to revisit the relevant UCM Regulations and revise them to include language for both Honors and Highest programs.

UGC unanimously voted³ in favor of approving the English Honors program with the caveat that CRE clarify the corresponding Regulations.

We thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne Zanzucchi".

Anne Zanzucchi
Chair, Undergraduate Council

¹ Please see appended UGC revisions dated December 3, 2008

² Please see item V in the appended Minutes from the October 14, 2009 Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

³ The proposal co-author recused himself

Cc: UGC
Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION
MUKESH SINGHAL, CHAIR
msinghal@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

April 3, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Mukesh Singhal, Chair, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
(CAPRA)

Re: Review of the English Honors Program Proposal

CAPRA appreciates the efforts to start an English Honors program at UC Merced. This program will give the top students in the English major the opportunity to demonstrate higher levels of achievement and receive a recognition for it.

CAPRA reviewed the proposal from the point of view of academic planning and resource implications. The institution of the proposed English Honors program will require a faculty member to act as the Honors Director who will be responsible for any administrative and managerial tasks related to running the Honors program. The program will also require Honors students to take ENG 193 and ENG 194, which are basically Honors Thesis courses and will not increase faculty's teaching load beyond their regular teaching load of 2:1. Moreover, it is expected that the English program faculty members will be willing to offer ENG 193 and ENG 194 to the best students in the program on projects related to their research areas.

Given the relatively small size of the English major, it is expected that in the foreseeable future, approximately 2-4 students will complete the Honors program every academic year. Therefore, the impact of program-related responsibilities on the Director will be low and he/she need not be compensated with a stipend or course release for his/her work towards the Honors program.

CAPRA concludes that institution of the proposed English Honors program will place a very minimal demand on UCM's resources and services. We are pleased to endorse the proposal.

cc: CAPRA members
Senate Office

Laura Martin

From: Jeffrey Gilger
Sent: Thursday, April 6, 2017 9:20 AM
To: Laura Martin
Subject: SSHA EC comments on gen ed, CRES and English proposals

Hi Laura-

Like I said, the SSHA EC has been a bit buried in stuff, but here are some comments on several of the items/programs we were asked to review. Please forgive the informality of this email as I wanted to get something to ASAP.

GE: External review and internal experience both indicate that the GE program at UC Merced is in need of an overhaul. Faculty and administration have dedicated a substantial amount of effort in formulating an overhaul that has pedagogical value consistent with UCM, while minimizing costs. The proposed GE program is 4 years, and has four new components: Spark seminars, educational portfolio, crossroads courses, and an integrative culminating experience. The proposal appears to be pedagogically sound and consistent with UCM. However, the resource needs were not expressed clearly enough for faculty to be able to understand what the costs of the program might be. In general, the proposal is vague or mute on resourcing the program in several respects, leaving the impression of an implicit hope that it can be implemented mostly by reframing what is already being done on campus. Specifically:

- The cost of Spark seminars is most clearly estimated, and it assumes that many faculty will teach an extra course for off-scale pay. There is an expected increase in administrative costs that seems commensurate with the effort.
- The portfolio costs are unclear, for faculty and staff as well. Who will ensure that portfolios are maintained and adequate for purposes of assessment? How will they add it to their workload, or will it take the place of something else and therefore be “resource neutral”?
- Staffing the crossroads course is unspecified. The preference is to have these courses team taught, but that would require significant time and effort for both faculty and staff, given that very few courses are currently team taught. It seems that current courses might be reframed to count as crossroads courses without being team taught, but this is not clear. Reframing is the path of least resistance and therefore likely to be the primary way this requirement is satisfied.
- Staffing the integrative culminating experience is also unspecified. Again the hope seems to be to reframe current courses, but it is not clear what course may or may not count for this purpose. Can independent studies (195/199) count towards this requirement? Will there be some vetting of courses for this purpose? Who will do this work and what will be the process?
- The proposal is ambitious and in some ways a bit less bolted down than one might expect, but that likely facilitates necessary flexibility. On the plus side, some see this as a rightly ambitious agenda as we are after all trying to build UCM’s brand, to make a place for ourselves in the world of the UC. Having a robust GE program helps us to make ourselves distinct. It builds rigor into the curriculum for all students regardless of major. Ultimately, this should help our students succeed when they graduate, and that is the metric that matters. A program like this will attract better applicants to UC Merced. It’s a way to actually prepare students for their future and to practice what we preach. The cost, therefore, may be worth it (on the surface). Once we factor in what WASC will do if we fail to act, in terms of pain, time, brand tarnish and the money to fix all of that, it may be cheaper in the long run than picking a fight we won’t win with WASC.

English Honors: We support this. Seems resource neutral.

CRES: Faculty in SSHA voted in support of this proposal. And we want to again state our support (see also support letters from other SSHA constituents). Also noteworthy is that the major correlates nicely with recently passed legislation that will teach Ethnic Studies in secondary schools in the state. Such a major is in growing demand by students at this campus, and campuses nation-wide.

Thanks,
jeff

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4439

April 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL
FROM: THOMAS W. PETERSON, PROVOST AND

EVC

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Thomas W. Peterson".

RE: PROPOSAL FOR ENGLISH HONORS PROGRAM

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposal for an English Honors Program. The proposal is thorough and thoughtful, and proposes a discipline-specific program not unlike others (e.g., History and Chemistry) already in existence on this campus.

While I am reluctant to simply say "I disapprove" of this program, I believe it is imperative that we stop developing and launching major-based honors programs until we can affirm our commitment to and launch a well-developed University Honors Program, open to all students of all majors with standards and expectations that are consistent across the board.

The resources for this program are limited. Faculty resources have been raised as a concern in creating a University Honors Program, and the same concern is relevant to major-based programs, such as the one proposed by English. The SSHA dean has pointed out that the honors courses related to this program will be taught by senate faculty and will not count toward their regular 2:1 teaching load. The English honors program consists of two courses.

A clearer articulation of the program's relationship to the above-mentioned concerns and questions needs to be provided. Is it possible that you and I are of a same mind on this, and could we stand together in appealing for some advancement of the University Honors Program first?

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions you may have.

CC: Susan Sims, Chief of Staff to the Provost
Elizabeth Whitt, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Laura Martin, Executive Director, Academic Senate



SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. Lake Rd. Building A
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-SSHA
FAX (209) 228-4007

March 1, 2017

To: Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposal for an English Honors Program

On February 14, 2017, the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts Curriculum Committee unanimously voted to approve the *English Honors Program Proposal*.

On February 26, 2017, the voting period to consider the *English Honors Program Proposal* concluded with the proposal being approved by the SSHA faculty (64 votes for; 0 vote against; 1 abstention; 43 ballots not returned).

My office has determined that this program is resource neutral. The program does not require additional faculty or lecturer hires, and all honors course will be taught by academic senate faculty and will not count toward their regular 2:1 teaching load.

On behalf of the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, I submit to you the *English Honors Program Proposal* for your review and approval. The SSHA assessment specialist and other SSHA undergraduate curriculum specialists supported the faculty efforts in the creation of the *English Honors Program Proposal*. We request that the proposal be approved effective Fall 2017.

Thank you for your consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jill Robbins".

Jill Robbins
Dean, SSHA

CC: Peter Vanderschraaf, Chair, SSHA Curriculum Committee
Holley Moyes, Associate Dean, SSHA
James Ortez, Assistant Dean, SSHA
Megan Topete, Manager of Instructional Services, SSHA

Enclosure

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 724-4400
FAX (209) 724-4499

Date: February 9, 2017
To: SSHA Curriculum Committee
From: Kathleen Hull, AP Chair HWC
Re: Approval of Proposed English Honors Program

At the February 8, 2017 HWC meeting, English Program representative Matthew Kaiser (on behalf of English Program Chair Katherine Brokaw) presented the case for the proposed English Honors Program (and associated CRFs for ENG 193 and ENG 194) previously unanimously approved by the faculty in English. Electronic documents in support of this case—a copy of the proposal and cover memo indicating the English faculty vote—were made available to HWC faculty five days prior to the meeting. In discussion, HWC faculty raised no concerns about the proposal, although HWC faculty who sit on UGC did note that a campus-wide Honors College was being considered by UGC. Thus, subsequent discussion focused on if or how this campus-wide initiative might impact the proposed English Honors Program. Since the former would not necessarily be impacted by the latter and the timing of roll-out for a campus-wide initiative was uncertain, HWC faculty did not express any concerns with respect to the English proposal.

As quorum was present (i.e., 24 of 35 faculty in residence/eligible voters), a hand (and voice, for those calling in) vote was taken to approve the proposed program and accompanying CRFs. The vote was unanimous in favor of the proposal (with one abstention for administrative conflict).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7742
FAX (209) 228-4007

January 31, 2017

Dear Curriculum Committee members:

Attached please find the proposal for the English honors program, which is inspired by and based on the History honors program at UC-Merced. The English teaching faculty—Gregg Camfield, Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Jan Goggans, Matthew Kaiser, Humberto Garcia, Nigel Hatton, and Katie Brokaw—unanimously approved this proposal last spring, and it was approved by the HWC faculty on February 8, 2017. We are eager to see it implemented in order to give our best students this opportunity to do more in-depth research in their final year at UCM.

Best,

Katie Brokaw, on behalf of the English faculty of HWC

PROPOSAL FOR ENGLISH HONORS PROGRAM

Overview

Beginning in AY 2017-18, UC Merced English majors may petition to join the English Honors Program, which will have additional requirements beyond the standard English major, culminating in a 50-to-75-page Honors thesis. Undergraduate majors who are accepted and successfully complete the Honors Program will receive a notation to that effect upon their diploma, and on their undergraduate transcript thereafter.

Students apply to join the Honors Program in the Spring of their Junior year. To be eligible for the Honors Program, an English major must achieve an overall GPA of 3.3 and a minimum GPA of 3.7 in the major. A student with a GPA in the major between 3.5 and 3.69 must petition the Honors Committee for an exemption.

The Application Process

Students who meet the minimum requirements may apply to the English Honors Program in the Spring semester of their junior year. The application consists of the following items:

1. Application form (including overall GPA, GPA in the major, list of English courses taken or in progress)
2. Transcript
3. Cover letter formally requesting entry into the Honors Program
4. 1-2-page proposal for thesis research project to be undertaken if admitted
5. Writing sample (preferably a 10-15-page paper from a previous UCM English course)
6. Brief note of endorsement (sent under separate cover) from an English faculty mentor indicating a willingness to serve as the student's Honors Thesis Advisor

Applications from qualified students will be considered by the English Honors Committee (composed of Academic Senate faculty in English and chaired by the English Honors Program Director. The director, also a member of English's academic senate faculty, will be appointed in a meeting of the English faculty; an election will be held should more than one faculty member be interested in the position). Admission decisions will be based on the following criteria:

- Evidence of ability to succeed in the Honors Program.

The most important quantitative measures of this will be the student's GPA within the major, and their completion of at least seven courses (28 units) in English (which may include courses taken at other institutions for major credit). The English Honors Committee will also take into account the student's ability to work independently on an extended research project (based on work in previous English courses, including the writing sample). A thoughtful, well-written research project proposal is also important in assessing the student's readiness for the Honors Program.

- Ability of student to secure a thesis advisor committed to mentoring the student.

As one-on-one faculty mentoring is a key component of the English Honors Program, the endorsement of the student by an Academic Senate member in English is crucial to any admissions decision. The English Honors Committee will make this judgment based on the student's research project proposal, as well as on the proposed faculty advisor's availability and/or willingness to work with the student in the forthcoming academic year. When necessary, the Honors Program Director will assist talented students in reaching out to prospective mentors, and will assist all students in reaching out to new faculty members. However, it is the responsibility of the student to secure an advisor before applying to the Honors Program. As faculty and undergraduate populations grow, it may become necessary to revisit this procedure, to switch to a system in which the Honors Committee pairs students with advisors.

These criteria are nearly identical to those currently used for admissions in the UCM History Honors Program, and are very similar to those currently used for admissions in the Interdisciplinary Humanities Graduate Program. The application process is designed not only to select the most promising students, but to ensure that they are well-matched with a committed mentor willing to guide the student's research, while protecting the English faculty from being collectively or individually overloaded with Honors students. The application process should prompt students to get a head start in thinking about a potential project (by way of the research proposal requirement). It is also a good exercise for students preparing to apply to graduate school programs. All admissions decisions will be communicated to students before the end of the Spring semester so that they have time to register for ENG 193 for the following Fall, and potentially (and optionally) begin reading for their project over the summer.

The Honors Program

Students admitted to the English Honors Program will be required to enroll in the two-semester Honors Senior Thesis sequence, English 193 and English 194. For purposes of satisfying the requirements of the major, ENG 193 and 194 will count as two of the five upper-division seminars required of all English majors, with one of the courses replacing ENG 190. In ENG 193, offered each fall, they will initiate their research project and produce smaller, research-related writing pieces, such as annotated bibliographies, literature reviews, and early outlines and drafts, and they will be assessed on these products. In ENG 194, offered each spring, they will draft and complete their projects, and will be assessed on both their process and final thesis.

A course map for English Honors students, then, totals 56 units (as it does for all English majors) and looks like this (all but the boldface is the same as a "regular" English degree):

Lower Division English Major Requirements

- One lower division seminar course drawn from ENG 50-89 [4 units]
- Two lower division course[s] drawn from ENG 10-89 or WRI 025 [4 or 8 units]
- Two semesters of college-level foreign language [8 units]

+ One course may be substituted with a course drawn from ENG 105-189; see "upper division electives" below.

Upper Division English Major Requirements

- Engaging Texts: Introduction to Critical Practice: ENG 100 (4 units)
- English Survey of Literature courses: ENG 101, ENG 102, ENG 103 and ENG 104 (16 units).
- Two or three upper division electives from ENG 105-189 [8-12 units]
- Honors Thesis sequence: ENG 193 and 194 [8 units]

To graduate with Honors in English, students must complete the second part of the Honors Thesis course (ENG 194) with a minimum grade of A- and achieve an overall GPA of 3.3 and a GPA of 3.7 in the major.

The Honors Committee will also have the option of awarding High Honors and Highest Honors in the major. To be eligible for graduation with High Honors in English, a major must achieve an overall minimum GPA of 3.3, a minimum GPA of 3.7 in the major, and a grade of A in the final portion of the Honors Thesis sequence (ENG 194). To be eligible for graduation with Highest Honors in English, a major must achieve an overall minimum GPA of 3.3, a minimum GPA of 3.7 in the major, a grade of A in both semesters of the Honors Thesis sequence (ENG 193 and 194), and nomination by the student's thesis advisor. The decision to award High Honors and Highest Honors rests with the English Honors Committee.

Resource Implications

The institution of the English Honors program at UCM is resource neutral. For the foreseeable future, the program will be small enough that its Directorship will have a low impact responsibility, and will thus not need to be compensated with a stipend or course release. The English Honors Director will be in charge of raising awareness of the program among English majors, soliciting applications from students each spring, working with faculty to identify thesis advisors for students who are accepted into the program, following up with advisors throughout the academic year to make sure those students are meeting their learning goals and deadlines, being a resource for Honors students who may have questions or concerns about the program, and working with the faculty advisors to award high and highest honors each spring.

The teaching of ENG 193 (offered every fall) and ENG 194 (offered every spring) will be administered by English Academic Senate faculty members willing to work with our most excellent students on a project that is most likely somewhat close to their own research area. As is the case for Directed Independent Studies and Group Studies (ENG 195 and 199), which several English Academic Senate faculty already direct, the reward will be in mentoring these most excellent students, and will not be part of our regular 2:1 teaching load.

Based on the popularity of the History Honors program and our sense of eligible and interested English students, we anticipate there will be approximately 2-4 students completing the Honors sequence each academic year, which means that it will not place an undue burden on the Director or the advisors.

Rationale for the English Honors Program

The decision by the English faculty to create an Honors Program is motivated

- 1.) by an earnest desire to improve English education at UC Merced for all our majors (those eligible for Honors, as well as those ineligible);
- 2.) by the need to make our undergraduate program more competitive within the University of California system, as well as at UCM; and
- 3.) by a philosophical and pedagogical commitment to increased curricular flexibility, that is, our determination to provide our diverse and growing population of students with telic options, replacing our current one-size-fits-all capstone experience, which none of us like, with a variety of capstone experiences, enabling our students to develop different skill sets in preparation for life after UC Merced.

The UCM English program is currently the only English program in the UC system without an Honors track. Studies show that gifted college applicants are less likely to attend schools without Honors programs, and once there, are less likely to choose majors that do not offer an Honors track.¹ An Honors track would make our program more competitive, giving our most talented majors the option of working closely with Senate faculty. The ability to award students Honors, High Honors, and/or Highest Honors incentivizes excellence. Honors students are more competitive on the job market and more attractive to graduate programs, for not only do they have stronger writing samples, they have experience conducting independent research over the course of one year. The proposed English Honors Program replaces ENG 190 for these students.

Our majors have a broad range of academic interests and professional aspirations. Those headed to graduate school in literary studies, or to law school, are ideal candidates, of course, for an Honors Program, and eagerly anticipate its implementation. Others, double majors, or science or social science minors, may not be able to commit to a lengthy year-long Honors thesis, talented though they may be. Additionally, our most educationally disadvantaged students, those for whom the former ENG 190 proved a dispiriting experience, are better served, we believe, in the more structured environment of a topical research seminar (the experience we are importing into ENG 190 starting in Fall 2017), producing one of many kinds of research projects and graduating with a sense of accomplishment.

¹ Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: a developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40 (5), pp. 518-529.

Ford, D.Y., Baytops, J.L., Harmon, D.A. (1997). Helping gifted minority students to reach their potential: recommendations for change. *Peabody Journal of Education* 72 (3/4). pp 201-216.

ENG 193: Honors Thesis Research

Course Title	Honors Thesis Research
Abbreviated Course Title	Honors Thesis Research
Course Subject	ENG
Course Number	193
School Submitting Request	SSHA
Division	Upper Division
Effective Term	Fall 2017
Discontinuance Term	----
Lower Unit Limit	4
Upper Unit Limit	
Prerequisites	Consent of Instructor. Must be enrolled in English Honors Program.
Prerequisites with a Concurrent Option	
Corequisites	
Major Restrictions	English
Class Level Restrictions	Senior
	First half of the English Honors thesis sequence (ENG 193-4). Students research a topic in preparation for producing an Honors thesis. Enrollment restricted to students admitted to the English Honors program.
Course Description	
TIE Code	E: Individualized Instruction
Reasons for Request	New Course
Brief Explanation of Change(s)	
	Lecture: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Lab: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Seminar: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Discussion: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Tutorial: 1 contact, 11 non-contact Field: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Studio: 0 contact, 0 non-contact
Total Contact/Non-contact Hours Per Week	
	12
Total Hours Per Week	
Grading Options	Letter Grade Only
In Progress Grading	
Maximum Enrollment	10
Maximum Enrollment Reason	----
Cross-listing	
Conjoined	
Cross-listed Schools	----
Can this course be repeated?	No
How many times?	
Resource Requirements	None--and no room needed.
Does this satisfy a General Education Requirement?	No

Course Outline and/or Additional Documentation  [ENG 193 Course Outline.pdf \(122Kb\)](#)

English 193: Honor Thesis Research Course Outline

English 193 is the first half of the two-semester English Honors thesis sequence.

Students taking English 193 (which will be restricted to those admitted to the Honors program) will spend the first weeks of class working with the instructor to identify a research topic that will form the basis of 50-100 page thesis produced over the course of two semesters. Much of the students' work during the semester will involve meeting individually with their faculty mentor to discuss and implement a research strategy appropriate to their chosen topic. At the end of the semester, students will submit a written prospectus and annotated bibliography outlining the research they have conducted in preparation for writing their thesis.

By design, there will be relatively few texts assigned to the class as a whole. Instead, readings are to be tailored for each individual student in consultation with their faculty mentor. Common books assigned to the class might include such general texts as:

- Wayne C. Booth et. al., *The Craft of Research*
- Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for the Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*
- Roy Peter Clark, *Writing Tools: 50 Essential Strategies for Every Writer*

Course Learning Outcomes:

The main learning outcome for this two-part course sequence is to demonstrate students' ability to apply what they have learned throughout their course of literary study, but in a way that is more advanced than is done in ENG 190 (senior thesis). In that sense, the learning outcomes for this course are the same as the outcomes for the major. That is to say, literature and literary criticism are significant parts of an ages old, continuing conversation about what it means to be human and what value humanity has. Unlike scientific or social scientific approaches to this conversation, literary discourse emphasizes the particular in the dialogue between particular and universal. It always arises out of specific times, places, and cultural traditions, and it often gives powerful voice to cultural differences and individual differences against the backdrop of larger, homogenizing forces. Moreover, literature has traditionally fore-grounded questions of value over questions of definition, or rather, sees questions of value as central to the definition of humanity itself.

The successful student majoring in English will be able participate in this larger conversation, and this course's outcomes will allow them to demonstrate that ability in a particularly advanced way, befitting of an honors student.

Course Learning Outcomes:

1. **Identify** a literary research topic that is specific, focused, and offers opportunities for genuinely original research.
2. **Locate** primary and secondary sources found in books, articles, and databases related to the topic using digital tools and librarian assistance, practicing advanced, independent research skills. (Addresses PLOs 1, 4, 5)

3. **Interpret** the primary literature related to their proposed topic as well as the secondary literature written about their topic, sensitive to textual and contextual cues. (Addresses PLO 1)
4. **Organize, document, and synthesize** primary and secondary sources to support an argument (Addresses PLO 1)
5. **Propose** an argument using those sources (Addresses PLOs 1 and 4 and 5)

Potential Assignments:

- Blogged writing assignments based on students' independently conducted research
- Research Proposal
- Annotated Bibliography

Every instructor has different methods of evaluation, but a **Sample Grading Rubric** (out of 100 possible points) for the Research Proposal could be:

- Introduction to and establishment of topic (20 points):
It should be clearly written, and hook the reader's interest. The introduction should describe which text, writer, historical-literary period, or perhaps sub-genre will be the topic on which you will focus.
- Establishment of research questions and significance of project (30 points):
Student answers the following questions: What are you doing? What specific issue or question will your work address? Explain how you will approach the work, and what we might learn from it.
Student explains why this work is important. What are the implications of doing it? How does it link to other knowledge, to other research on the topic? Why will the reader be interested in this topic?
- Description of Methodology (20 points):
This section should make clear to the reader *how* you intend to approach the research question. Will you be doing historical/archival research, engaging with critical theories, and/or engaging in close-reading?
- Description of Previous Work (Literature Review) (20 points):
Describe the most important work that has been done on your topic, and the various critical debates that continue to be discussed.
- Expected Conclusions (10 points):
At this very early stage, what do you think you might end up concluding about your topic? And what might you conclude is the significance of your research?

ENG 194: Honors Thesis

Course Title	Honors Thesis
Abbreviated Course Title	Honors Thesis
Course Subject	ENG
Course Number	194
School Submitting Request	SSHA
Division	Upper Division
Effective Term	Fall 2017
Discontinuance Term	----
Lower Unit Limit	4
Upper Unit Limit	
Prerequisites	Consent of instructor. Student must be enrolled in English Honors program.
Prerequisites with a Concurrent Option	
Corequisites	
Major Restrictions	English
Class Level Restrictions	Senior
Course Description	Second half of the English Honors thesis sequence (ENG 193-4). Students write a 50-100 page thesis under the supervision of a faculty mentor. Enrollment restricted to students admitted to the English Honors program.
TIE Code	E: Individualized Instruction
Reasons for Request	New Course
Brief Explanation of Change(s)	Course required to support proposed English Honors Program.
Total Contact/Non-contact Hours Per Week	Lecture: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Lab: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Seminar: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Discussion: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Tutorial: 1 contact, 11 non-contact Field: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Studio: 0 contact, 0 non-contact
Total Hours Per Week	12
Grading Options	Letter Grade Only
In Progress Grading	
Maximum Enrollment	10
Maximum Enrollment Reason	----
Cross-listing	
Conjoined	
Cross-listed Schools	----
Can this course be repeated?	No
How many times?	

Resource Requirements

None, and no room needs to be assigned.

Does this satisfy a General Education Requirement? No

Course Outline and/or Additional Documentation  [ENG 194 Course Outline.pdf \(149Kb\)](#)

English 194: Honors Thesis Course Outline

English 194 is the second half of the two-semester English Honors thesis sequence.

Students taking English 194 (which will be restricted to those admitted to the Honors program) will have previously identified a thesis topic and been assigned a faculty mentor to help guide their research as part of English 193. They will come to this course with a completed prospectus and annotated bibliography. In this class, they will write and revise a 60–100 page thesis. As with English 193, much of the work will involve independent reading and writing under the direction of a faculty mentor. Students will be expected to submit drafts of their work to their faculty mentor and fellow Honors Thesis students so they can benefit from the process of editing and revision before submitting the final product. At the end of the semester, students will make a final oral presentation before their fellow Honors Thesis students in addition to submitting their written thesis and a reflection on their learning from their English major classes including the Honors Thesis sequence.

By design, there will be relatively few texts assigned to the class as a whole. Instead, readings are to be tailored for each individual student in consultation with their faculty mentor. Common books assigned to the class might include such general texts as:

- Diana Hacker, *A Writer's Reference*
- *The Chicago Manual of Style*
- Charles Lipson, *How to Write a BA Thesis*
- Steven Lynn, *Texts and Contexts: Writing about Literature With Critical Theory*

Course Learning Outcomes:

The main learning outcome for this two-part course sequence is to demonstrate students' ability to apply what they have learned throughout their course of literary study, but in a way that is more advanced than is done in ENG 190 (senior thesis). In that sense, the learning outcomes for this course are the same as the outcomes for the major. That is to say, literature and literary criticism are significant parts of an ages old, continuing conversation about what it means to be human and what value humanity has. Unlike scientific or social scientific approaches to this conversation, literary discourse emphasizes the particular in the dialogue between particular and universal. It always arises out of specific times, places, and cultural traditions, and it often gives powerful voice to cultural differences and individual differences against the backdrop of larger, homogenizing forces. Moreover, literature has traditionally fore-grounded questions of value over questions of definition, or rather, sees questions of value as central to the definition of humanity itself.

The specific course learning outcomes for the second part of the honors thesis sequence are:

1. **Interpret** the primary and secondary literature related to the student's thesis topic and found and read by the student independently, sensitive to textual and contextual cues. (Addresses PLO 1)
2. **Synthesize** primary and secondary sources in formal writing those sources to support an argument a paper supported by research (Addresses PLOs 1 and 4 and 5)
3. **Articulate evaluations of and arguments about** primary and secondary literature in writing and in speech, cogently and at a level befitting an advanced, honors undergraduate or early career graduate student. (Addresses PLOs 1 and 2 and 5)
4. **Document** all research according to professional standards.
5. **Reflect** on your ability to **apply** interpretive strategies and research skills developed in historical literary study to other academic and professional contexts. (Addresses PLO 4)

Potential Assignments:

- Active participation in peer draft workshops with other enrollees in 194 (if applicable)
- Outline of Paper
- Draft of Paper
- Final Honors Thesis
- Reflective Essay
- Oral Presentation

Every instructor has different methods of evaluation, but a **Sample Grading Rubric** (out of 100 possible points) for the Final Honors Thesis could be:

- An **argument** that is truly arguable, focused, and original. 10 points
- **Support** from thoughtful analysis of and extensive array of primary and secondary sources that are thoroughly researched and properly documented. 50 points.
- **Organization** that is clear and well sign-posted throughout, with proper transitions between sections and paragraphs. 10 points.
- **Style and Voice** that is clear, concise, and subtle, including consistent verb tenses, formal tone befitting published essays, and a lack of wordiness. 10 points
- **Grammar** conforming to standard English conventions, including subject and verb agreement, pronoun and antecedent agreement, and no sentence fragments or run-ons. 10 points.
- **Mechanics** as befitting scholarly work, including proper spelling, punctuation, word choice, MLA or Chicago documentation, and no typos. 10 points.



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N LAKE RD, Student Services Building 310
MERCED, CA 95343
PH: 209-228-7951

THE OFFICE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

TO: Thomas W. Peterson, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
FROM: Elizabeth J. Whitt, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education
DATE: May 23, 2017
RE: Proposal for an Honors Program in English

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Elizabeth J. Whitt".

At its meeting April 20, 2017, the Division Council unanimously approved the proposal for an Honors Program in English, effective Fall 2017; I received their recommendation on May 1. Recall that your comments to the Senate (dated April 10, 2017 and which you and I discussed) expressed concerns about faculty resources for such a program (e.g., English faculty will teach proposed Honors courses outside their normal teaching load). In addition, you advocated delaying consideration of additional major-related Honors programs until a final decision is made about a University Honors Program that would be “open to students of all majors, with standards and expectations across the board.” In her endorsement memo, Senate Chair Amussen said the Division Council discussed your comments and concluded the proposed English Honors Program would not preclude a University Honors Program. She also noted that CAPRA approved the proposal “after an analysis of resource demands”; CAPRA stated that student enrollments in the program would be so small as to be manageable without straining existing resources. In addition, Dean Robbins referred to the proposed program as “resource neutral” in her memo endorsing it.

I have spent a lot of time thinking about this proposal, the Senate’s decision, and my responsibility for communicating that decision to you. In the past, I have conveyed Senate decisions with my endorsement for your approval, albeit, on occasion, with ongoing concerns. In this case, however, I can’t endorse the Senate’s decision because I don’t believe that decision addresses your “big picture” concerns about competing demands on faculty resources and faculty workloads. My reasons follow.

In your memo to the Senate you stated, correctly, that concerns about faculty workload and scarce faculty resources have been raised in opposition to the proposal for a University Honors Program. The same concerns have been a significant barrier to the proposed General Education Program. They also are cited as challenges to maintaining quality undergraduate education as our enrollments increase (e.g., student-faculty ratios, coverage of lower- and upper-division courses in the major). One reaction I have to expressions of concern that (in the words of one colleague) “We just don’t have enough faculty members to cover even the basic undergraduate courses, let alone as we grow,” is that’s a very serious assertion in need of serious immediate examination, a task CAPRA and you and others are tackling.

I’d also argue that means we’re at a place in our institution’s development where we need to question labeling any proposal such as the English Honors Program as too small to have a significant impact on faculty resources or even as resource neutral. Seemingly small programs, including major-based honors programs and new majors with limited projected enrollments, taken together have an impact on faculty resources. I believe we need to stop making these apparently small decisions piecemeal until bigger questions of faculty resources and workloads, such as with regard to enrollment growth, General Education, University Honors, and others, are resolved. In sum, I don’t think the Senate’s decision about the proposed program adequately addresses the broader resource context or the broader resource implications of that decision.

My comments here are not intended to keep you from recommending your approval, only to let you know my concerns about the proposal. Please let me know if you have questions or need additional information.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4439

May 31, 2017

TO: DOROTHY LELAND, CHANCELLOR

FROM: THOMAS W. PETERSON, PROVOST AND EVC

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Thomas W. Peterson".

RE: PROPOSAL FOR AN HONORS PROGRAM IN ENGLISH

With this memo I am recommending your approval of the proposal for an Honors Program in English.

The attached correspondence documents the unanimous support from the Dean of SSHA, Divisional Council, and Senate standing committees. Also attached is the memo from Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education Whitt, who has declined to endorse the proposed program.

While I share the concerns expressed by Dean Whitt in her memo of May 23, 2017, based primarily on our common desire to see an *integrated Honors Program* available for *all* students, I am nonetheless recommending your approval of the program effective fall 2017.

I concur with the recommendation presented by the Provost, Dean, and represented faculty groups.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Dorothy Leland".

Dorothy Leland
Chancellor

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7954; fax (209) 228-7955

APRIL 24, 2017

TO: LIN TIAN, CHAIR, CRE

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Susan Amussen".

RE: REVISIONS TO DIVISION REGULATIONS TO ADDRESS HIGH AND HIGHEST HONORS

At its April 20, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed UGC's approval of the *Proposal for an English Honors Program* (appended) for transmittal to the administration for approval for implementation. In approving the program, Divisional Council noted that the Honors Program can be established, and students enrolled to graduate with honors, but that the program's desire to award High Honors and Highest Honors requires revisions to the [Division's Regulations](#). With this memo, Divisional Council asks CRE to revise the Division's Regulations to include the standards for awarding High and Highest Honors in the major.

CC: Divisional Council
Senate Office

Enc (1)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
Anne Zanzucchi, Chair
azanzucchi@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7930; fax (209) 228-7955

March 19, 2017

To: Susan Amussen Chair, Divisional Council

Re: English Honors Program

At its March 13 meeting, the Undergraduate Council discussed the SSHA proposal for an English Honors program. UGC recognizes the positive values and contributions of this program as it will nurture and recognize academically successful students.

As stated in the proposal, the English Honors is inspired by and based on the existing History Honors program. In preparing background materials to guide UGC's discussion of the English Honors proposal, it was brought to the attention of Council members that during the Senate review of the History Honors proposal in AY 2008-2009, UGC had then approved¹ revisions to the UCM Regulations to include an Honors section. The revisions were subsequently approved by the Committee on Rules and Elections and the Assembly of the Academic Senate². It was noticed that the current language in the [UCM Regulations](#) (Part II. Section 4) does not include a clause related to Honors programs.

In light of this context, and to ensure consistency between academic policies and UCM Regulations, UGC encourages the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) to revisit the relevant UCM Regulations and revise them to include language for both Honors and Highest programs.

UGC unanimously voted³ in favor of approving the English Honors program with the caveat that CRE clarify the corresponding Regulations.

We thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Anne Zanzucchi".

Anne Zanzucchi
Chair, Undergraduate Council

¹ Please see appended UGC revisions dated December 3, 2008

² Please see item V in the appended Minutes from the October 14, 2009 Meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate

³ The proposal co-author recused himself

Cc: UGC
Senate Office

Rationale: Last year UGC discussed a proposal for Honors for SSHA and for the History Major. In the absence of policies or guidelines for these types of awards, the committee recommended that SSHA contact the Division Council and the current UGC. This was discussed at the October and November 2008 UGC meetings. The policy subcommittee was charged with drafting a set of guidelines for these awards.

75. UNDERGRADUATE HONORS AT GRADUATION (SR 640)

Each School may establish criteria for Honors to Date, Honors at Graduation, and Honors Programs subject to the following minimum limitations and to any additional regulations which may be adopted by the Faculties for the various Schools.

Honors to Date

Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average or better with no grade of I or NP. Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

Honors at Graduation

To be eligible for honors at graduation, a student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of

Honors Programs – UGC – December 3, 2008

recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08)

Honors Programs

Each program offering an undergraduate major curriculum may establish an Honors Program including special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Such programs must be approved by the Undergraduate Council (UGC) and require at least: (a) a GPA of 3.5 in the major as a prerequisite; and (b) 8 units of special courses, or supplementary and advanced directed study, or both. Members of the Academic Senate who are members of the program or group in charge of each major are responsible for admitting students to their approved Honors Programs and for delivering special courses.

Approved by UGC, December 3, 2008

MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

October 14, 2009
MINUTES OF MEETING

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, October 14, 2009. Academic Senate Chair Henry Powell presided and called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Senate Executive Director Martha Winnacker called the roll of Assembly members. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of the June 17, 2009 meeting with one correction.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

- Henry Powell

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

- President Yudof began by noting that an article in the October 13th issue of the *Wall Street Journal* yesterday stated that the University of California has produced more Nobel prize winners—37—than any other university.
- The president reiterated his statement to the Regents that the state is an unreliable partner. State per-student appropriations have been cut in half; in 1990, the state spent \$15,000 per student (dollar-adjusted), and today it spends only \$7,780. He noted that the university has controlled costs, which have risen roughly at the rate of inflation, but that because of the reduction in state support, fees must be raised. He emphasized that the problem is not spending or cost control, it is decreased revenue.
- President Yudof will present a budget plan to stabilize the University, and then fight in both Sacramento and Washington for additional financial support. The plan includes ending furloughs in the summer of 2010.
- The budget plan requests \$900 million more from Sacramento than the University received last year. This includes the restoration of \$305 million that the state made last year in one-time cuts, \$160 million for 14,000 unfunded students, and \$106 million in state funds to restart contributions to the retirement fund.
- The president stated that students have a right to be angry, but that he must defend and protect the University. He also noted that the burden is being shared across a broad spectrum of the university community through furloughs, program cuts, layoffs, restructuring debt, and increasing student fees.
- President Yudof noted that the furlough plan was far different from what he initially proposed. His original plan called for salary reduction. But in response to faculty and staff input, he decided to enact furloughs because a) staff preferred them; b) furloughs seem more temporary; and c) furloughs do not reduce base salary in calculating service credit for the retirement program. But, in essence, especially for faculty, the effect is the same as a salary reduction. He noted that the University has laid off 2,000 employees, but without the furlough program, an additional 3,000 to 4,000 people probably would have been laid off.

- President Yudof stated that despite the budget situation, he has developed good relations with many legislators. He has made more than 20 visits to Sacramento. Lobbying helped to save Cal Grants and countered several bills that threatened UC. Over 130,000 people have signed up to be UC advocates, and in the past six weeks, 20,000 letters were written to the legislature in support of the University.
- President Yudof stated that UC's uniqueness is in the conjunction of a world class faculty doing world class research, made accessible to low-income students. Over 32% of students attending UC meet the low income definition. UC enrolls roughly double the number of low-income students as its closest competitors at research universities.
- President Yudof stated that the University could enroll some additional non-residents, but that it is not feasible to significantly increase non-residents without reducing opportunities for California students. He noted that 84% of California high school students who go on to higher education in the state go to public institutions.
- The president stated that he made a mistake in the timing and handling of the issue of whether to allow furloughs on instructional days. He stated that he feels setting the calendar should be a faculty matter. But unfortunately, the decision implementing furloughs was simultaneous with the planned 32% fee increase; he had been treating them as separate issues. He began hearing from the legislature and parents that this was unacceptable and decided that it would cause enormous public relations problems for the University, and potentially be disastrous to the University's relationship with the legislature. He made the decision to protect the University. The president stated that to his knowledge, it was the only major division of opinion that he has had with the Senate.

Questions and Comments

Q: Could you discuss the UC Commission on the Future? What kind of university will emerge?

A: The faculty will play a large role in determining the future shape of the University. Only the faculty fully understand the problems and only the faculty can carry out the solutions. Most of the Working Groups will be majority faculty. The Commission's aim is to set priorities. Universities do everything *seriatum*—there are many good ideas, but they are not prioritized, and there is little overall planning. The Commission will make recommendations, which will then go through the process of shared governance before being presented to the Board of Regents.

Q: Should the University respond to current budgetary problems by cutting enrollment?

A: The plan is to reduce 2,500 students per year for four years, which is the number of students for whom we do not receive funding from the state (10,000). Further enrollment cuts would be unpopular with the public and reducing the size of the University most likely would impact the underrepresented populations most. While I would not eliminate this option, I would prefer to raise fees and offer financial aid to those who need it. On October 23, the University will announce a \$1 billion scholarship campaign to help students impacted by the fee increase.

Q: The *Los Angeles Times* has written two editorials against the fee increase and differential fee proposal, even suggesting that the furlough program be extended in order to protect fees.

A: I have not received a single letter from the legislature in opposition to the fee increase. When Regent Island announced that he would support the fee increase, it was a watershed moment; he has never before voted for a fee increase. It was a recognition of the dire straits in which the University finds itself. Between the May and September Regents' meetings, we demonstrated that we have done everything possible to cut costs. We had the chancellors make their case. But we can not sustain continued faculty salary cuts or furloughs. We will begin to lose faculty and it will gut the heart of the University. The fee increase should not be juxtaposed to the furlough program; they are both part of a broad strategy to reduce costs and raise revenues.

Q: I appreciate your efforts to restart contributions to the retirement program as soon as possible. But I heard you say that *if* the budget is adopted, we will restart contributions.

A: The Board of Regents approves the budget; I can not guarantee anything.

Q: Can you comment on your view of the potential cost savings of online education? Online courses are complex to put together and administer. Also, 20% of courses produce 80% of the student course hours.

A: Online education will be addressed by the Education and Curriculum Working Group of the UC Commission on the Future. It is co-chaired by Senate representative Keith Williams of UC Davis and Dean Chris Edley of UC Berkeley Law School. In addition, a group at UCOP is working on a proposal to solicit funds for a pilot project that will support UC faculty who want to design online courses. But the faculty have to decide where online education is appropriate and where it's not and the Senate is in charge of approving all courses.

Comment: Professor Williams added that a Senate special committee on remote and online education is about to issue a report.

Q: What support do you need from the faculty?

A: I really need your participation in the Commission on the Future. We need good ideas. We are not hiring consultants; you are the consultants. Second, I need you to be effective advocates. I need you to communicate information to your colleagues and to listen to them. Reach out to your colleagues and bring them into the faculty governance process. We need to promote shared governance and faculty participation. We are not reaching all the troops and I can not do it alone. Third, you should be advocates to Sacramento and the media. Many of you have done this. A large number of the advocacy letters came from the faculty. After the November elections we will conduct a statewide advocacy campaign in support of higher education. We especially have to convince those who do not have children that they benefit from the University of California. Finally, support my budget plan to stabilize the University.

Q: Can you comment on the Torrico bill to tax oil production in order to support higher education?

A: While it is an interesting idea, the bill is deeply flawed. There is no provision requiring maintenance of effort, which means that the state could reduce our appropriations by the same amount. A separate Board—not the Board of Regents—would allocate the money separately. Also, it is probably a declining revenue source. If there is going to be a set aside, it should be tied to a different revenue stream. The University has not formally opposed it. We have said that we would work with Senator to improve it.

Q: I appreciate that you removed the differential fee item from the November Regents' agenda. I am curious about your strategy. Why was it presented before the analysis was completed and before it went through the deliberative process of shared governance?

A: It probably was a mistake to put it on the agenda. I was trying to figure out where we could find more revenue in these difficult times, and wanted to get a sense of what the Regents thought about the idea.

Comment: At UC Merced over 50% of the student body are first generation students and they pick business and engineering because they want a practical degree. We need to reconcile the uniqueness of low-income students and research with our actions.

A: The data I have seen so far does not support the notion that differential fees makes a difference in students' choice of major.

Q: Would you be receptive to increasing block grant allocations for graduate students or allocating additional money in the Humanities in order to alleviate the fee increases? The Humanities, in particular, will suffer because they do not have as much access as the sciences to external funding.

A: Yes, I would consider that idea. Historically, we have set aside 50% for a return-to-aid program. I would like your advice on how to administer it, as well as a definition of the Humanities.

Comment: The University needs an advertising campaign.

A: A plan is being developed. The California media market is complicated and expensive. We are beginning to use new media sources such as Facebook. We need to do focus groups to see how Californians react to different messages and we need to be sophisticated.

Q: I urge you to visit all of campuses and speak directly to the faculty; it will help shared governance.

A: I intend to make visits and am working on organizing a tour, but there are logistical issues. I am concerned that the events will get shut down.

Q: The Academic Senate is working with the other segments to work on a coordinated advocacy plan. Are the administrations coordinating with each other and should the Senates and the administrations also work together?

A: Yes, I am thinking about coordinating with CSU to advocate for more support for higher education. It is an excellent way to multiply your advocates.

Q: What are your strategies to retain an excellent faculty?

A: If the budget is funded, merit increases for faculty will continue, the furloughs will end and contributions to UCRP will be restarted. It is critical that we protect the retirement system because it helps us to retain faculty. I am also going to Washington to advocate for more federal funding.

Q: Chancellor Birgeneau of Berkeley recently published an op-ed on federal funding for universities. Do you think this proposal is feasible?

A: I drafted a white paper. Chancellor Birgeneau's proposal selects certain universities for funding, so I don't think it will come to fruition. I recently drafted a white paper on federal funding for higher education that will be circulated soon. Funding for higher education is a national problem that requires a national solution. My proposal is to add on to Pell grants extra money for research and education in proportion to the percentage of Pell grant recipients that a University enrolls. This would reward behavior that the federal government wishes to promote by providing incentives for universities to enroll more low-income students and perform more research. It is a viable possibility, but the biggest impediment is federal distrust that states will pull out money. Also, Washington is focused on health care right now.

Q: Have you received any backlash about shifting income from higher income to lower income students, given the magnitude of the fee increase?

A: I do get negative feedback, mostly from the middle class, but the mail I receive favors this approach by 10 or 15 to 1.

Q: What will happen if the unions do not agree to the furlough plan?

A: We will have to have layoffs. The campuses must meet their targets for savings. If they do not, they will have to do layoffs.

Q: Do you think that the state legislators understand the role of the University in the state and the impact of the budget cuts?

A: The legislators focus on undergraduate education; they do not understand the research mission and national labs and the complexities of the institution. They don't understand our relationship to job creation, culture, or the well-being of California's families. The leadership understands the University's role, but unfortunately, many of them are reaching term limits. The legislature also sees the fact that they have reduced our budget and the University is still great. Also, given making hard choice between children's health services and the University, they will choose children.

Q: Is the increase in student fees correlated with the increase in debt service for construction projects, as argued by the head of the Council of UC Faculty Associations?

A: No. Five years ago, the University expanded the security pledge in its bonds. Bond holders now evaluate the financial position of the University as a whole, not at the particular project under construction. This approach has allowed us to expand the University's borrowing capacity. But no funds from student fees or from the state are used for debt service. Some student-approved registration fees for specific purposes are used, e.g., fees supporting a recreation center. Debt service is paid through indirect cost recovery funds, auxiliary income, etc.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Amend Merced regulation 75 (SR 640), Undergraduate Honors at Graduation
2. Amend Senate Bylaw 140, Affirmative Action and Diversity

ACTION: The consent calendar was unanimously approved.

VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

1. **Report on Implementation of RE 89 [INFORMATION]**
2. **Presentation on Budget Reserves**
 - **Peter Taylor, Executive Vice President and Chief Executive Officer**

CFO Peter Taylor made a presentation on the University's unrestricted net assets. Some have asserted that these are "reserves" that could be tapped into to mitigate the budget crisis and make up for massive reductions in state support. Taylor stated that the University is required to list these monies as "unrestricted" under the requirements of the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB). However, unrestricted does not mean uncommitted. Rather, it means that these funds are not restricted by external parties, such as federal research grants for specific purposes or endowments with terms attached. The funds are in 76,000 separate accounts. They include some endowment funds to be used for specified purposes such as scholarships, but with no further restrictions, capital project funding, medical centers funds, operating funds to support academic programs on a multiple-year basis, lien funds for authorized equipment purchases and services that were not been expended by the end of the fiscal year, etc.

The financial statement about to be released summarizing UC's financial condition as of June 20, 2009 will show a substantial drop in the University's unrestricted net assets to an amount below \$4 billion. Much of that is due to documentation, for the first-time, of liability for retiree health care in response to a new GASB regulation, but is also due to market loss. It is important to note that the amount of unrestricted net assets on the books varies tremendously over the calendar year. So any figures represent a snapshot in time. In FY09-10, unrestricted net assets include (in approximate dollars) \$820 million for capital projects (Regents' policy requires projects to have cash in hand before starting to build, so these funds are for projects that already have been started or approved); \$700 million for operating funds (Moody's would prefer to see \$3 billion in operating reserves; the University carries lower cash reserves than credit agencies want); \$1.8 billion in endowment income or income from funds functioning as endowments (half of this amount is controlled on campuses); \$35 million for debt service; and \$640 million for student fee and auxiliary payments.

VIII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

A. Presentation on UCRP Funding Status

- **Bob Anderson, Chair, UCFW's Task Force on Investment and Retirement**
- **Peter Taylor, Executive Vice President and Chief Executive Officer**

CFO Taylor and Professor Robert Anderson, Chair of UCFW's Task Force on Investment and Retirement, made a joint presentation on the funding status of UCRP and of the progress of the president's Post-Employment Benefits (PEB) Task Force. The PEB will develop a comprehensive, long-term approach for all post-employment benefits. It will make recommendations to the president this summer for his review and endorsement before submission to the Regents. It will soon begin public visits to campuses to gather information. Information about the task force and its schedule can be found at: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/ucrpfuture/emp_task.html.

Professor Anderson stated that the University is legally obligated to pay all pension benefits that have been accrued to date. There is a clause, the impairments of contracts clause, in both the state and federal constitutions that protects state employees' pensions. Unlike private companies, state entities can not declare bankruptcy as a mechanism to walk away from its commitments. According to law, all revenue must go to pay bonds and pensions before salaries. The University may be able to reduce future accrual for current employees, but this would result in litigation. It clearly can reduce pension and retiree health benefits for newly hired employees. It also can probably reduce health benefits for all retirees; it has more flexibility to change these programs.

He stated that UCRP is less than fully funded partly because of market losses, but mostly due to the fact that no one has paid into the system for 19 years. If the University booked all of last year's market losses, UCRP currently would be only about 70% funded; but it is about 95% funded on an actuarial basis, which smoothes gains and losses over five years. For every year of service credit, the unfunded liability ("normal cost") is 17% of the employee's covered compensation.

He stated that retiree health benefits also are under pressure. In 2009, the University had \$14.3 billion in unfunded liability for retiree health. When retirees reach age 65, Medicare begins to cover the bulk of costs, and the cost to the University falls dramatically.

Restart of UCRP contributions. In September 2008, the Regents adopted a funding policy for UCRP. If the University had followed this, there would have been an 11.5% contribution starting on July 1, 2009. However, the University received no funding from the state for this purpose. So, instead, a plan to slowly ramp up contributions was proposed, but has not yet been adopted formally by the Regents. The plan is to resume contributions on April 15, 2010. The slow ramp-up means that it will take 20 years to catch up to the Regents' September 2008 funding plan and contributions will be in excess of 50% of covered compensation. Deferring contributions now means that 7.5% earnings on those contributions are foregone. Deferring \$1 now will require over \$4 twenty years from now, and means that the fund loses an additional \$2 in contributions from non-state salary sources such as federal grants, hospitals, etc. In contrast, the September 2008 funding policy would have peaked at 37% of covered compensation in 2014, but then would have slowly declined.

The University can not renege on accrued benefits. Cutting pension benefits will not fix the problem because if the University freezes the accrual of additional benefits, it would be difficult to collect employee contributions or funds from federal grants. The best thing for a plan with unfunded liability is to keep as many people as possible in the plan so that the base of earners making contributions is large. Additionally, the University must be competitive for faculty, so it can not cut benefits much, particularly since salary compensation is not competitive. For many staff categories, however, the plan is more generous than in the private sector. The Task Force will examine whether the University should consider different benefits packages for different employee groups. But that will be controversial. One important function of UCRP is its role in retaining mid-career faculty and staff.

What would mitigate this situation? If employees retired later, they would draw a somewhat larger pension, but over the course of fewer years, so the cost to UCRP declines. The most expensive retirees are

those in their late 50s to 65 due to the cost of health benefits. New employees could be given a choice of retiring later with full benefits, or earlier with reduced benefits. This would help the University in the long term, but it will not help UCRP immediately. It may be possible to provide incentives to current employees to retire a little later. Faculty retire at an average age of 66 years old. Staff retire at an average age of 59, which is a burden on UCRP. There is a clear difference in behavior.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest: Henry Powell, Academic Senate Chair

Minutes Prepared by: Clare Sheridan, Academic Senate Analyst

Attachment: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of October 14, 2009

Appendix A – 2009-2010 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of October 14, 2009

President of the University:

Mark Yudof

Academic Council Members:

Henry Powell, Chair

Daniel Simmons, Vice Chair

Christopher Kutz, Chair, UCB

Robert Powell, Chair, UCD

Judith Stepan-Norris, Chair, UCI

Robin Garrell, Chair, UCLA

Martha Conklin, Chair UCM

Anthony Norman, Chair, UCR

William Hodgkiss, Chair, UCSD

Elena Fuentes-Afflick, Chair, UCSF

Joel Michaelsen, Chair, UCSB

Lori Kletzer, Chair, UCSC

Sylvia Hurtado, Chair, BOARS

Farid Chehab, Chair, CCGA

Ines Boechat, Chair, UCAAD (absent)

Alison Butler, Chair, UCAP

Keith Williams, Chair, UCEP

Shane White, Chair, UCFW

Gregory Miller, Chair, UCORP

Peter Klapp, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (6)

Daniel Boyarin

Suzanne Fleiszig

James Hunt

Anthony Long

Mary Ann Mason

Fiona Doyle (alternate for Pablo Spiller)

Davis (6 – 3 TBA)

Brian Morrissey

Krishnan Nambiar (absent)

John Oakley

Irvine (3)

Hoda Anton-Culver (absent)

Kenneth Chew

David Kay

Los Angeles (9 - 1 TBA)

Paula Diaconescu

Malcolm Gordon (absent)

Jody Kreiman (absent)

Timothy Lane

Duncan Lindsey (absent)

Susanne Lohmann

Purnima Mankekar (absent)

Joseph Nagy
Natik Piri

Merced (1)
Nella Van Dyke

Riverside (2)
Manuela Martins-Green (absent)
Albert Wang

San Diego (5)
Hans Paar (alternate for Salah Baouendi)
Timothy Bigby
Carlos Waisman (alternate for Sandra Brown)
Steven Plaxe (alternate for Stephen Cox)
Jason X-J Yuan

San Francisco (3)
David Gardner
Wendy Max (alternate for Deborah Greenspan)
Sandra Weiss

Santa Barbara (3 – 1 TBA)
Chuck Bazerman
Richard Church

Santa Cruz (2)
Mark Carr
Susan Carter (alternate for Marc Mangel)

Secretary/Parliamentarian
Peter Berck

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. Lake Rd. Building A
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-SSHA
FAX (209) 228-4007

March 1, 2017

To: Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposal for an English Honors Program

On February 14, 2017, the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts Curriculum Committee unanimously voted to approve the *English Honors Program Proposal*.

On February 26, 2017, the voting period to consider the *English Honors Program Proposal* concluded with the proposal being approved by the SSHA faculty (64 votes for; 0 vote against; 1 abstention; 43 ballots not returned).

My office has determined that this program is resource neutral. The program does not require additional faculty or lecturer hires, and all honors course will be taught by academic senate faculty and will not count toward their regular 2:1 teaching load.

On behalf of the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, I submit to you the *English Honors Program Proposal* for your review and approval. The SSHA assessment specialist and other SSHA undergraduate curriculum specialists supported the faculty efforts in the creation of the *English Honors Program Proposal*. We request that the proposal be approved effective Fall 2017.

Thank you for your consideration.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jill Robbins".

Jill Robbins
Dean, SSHA

CC: Peter Vanderschraaf, Chair, SSHA Curriculum Committee
Holley Moyes, Associate Dean, SSHA
James Ortez, Assistant Dean, SSHA
Megan Topete, Manager of Instructional Services, SSHA

Enclosure

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 724-4400
FAX (209) 724-4499

Date: February 9, 2017
To: SSHA Curriculum Committee
From: Kathleen Hull, AP Chair HWC
Re: Approval of Proposed English Honors Program

At the February 8, 2017 HWC meeting, English Program representative Matthew Kaiser (on behalf of English Program Chair Katherine Brokaw) presented the case for the proposed English Honors Program (and associated CRFs for ENG 193 and ENG 194) previously unanimously approved by the faculty in English. Electronic documents in support of this case—a copy of the proposal and cover memo indicating the English faculty vote—were made available to HWC faculty five days prior to the meeting. In discussion, HWC faculty raised no concerns about the proposal, although HWC faculty who sit on UGC did note that a campus-wide Honors College was being considered by UGC. Thus, subsequent discussion focused on if or how this campus-wide initiative might impact the proposed English Honors Program. Since the former would not necessarily be impacted by the latter and the timing of roll-out for a campus-wide initiative was uncertain, HWC faculty did not express any concerns with respect to the English proposal.

As quorum was present (i.e., 24 of 35 faculty in residence/eligible voters), a hand (and voice, for those calling in) vote was taken to approve the proposed program and accompanying CRFs. The vote was unanimous in favor of the proposal (with one abstention for administrative conflict).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, HUMANITIES AND ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7742
FAX (209) 228-4007

January 31, 2017

Dear Curriculum Committee members:

Attached please find the proposal for the English honors program, which is inspired by and based on the History honors program at UC-Merced. The English teaching faculty—Gregg Camfield, Manuel Martin-Rodriguez, Jan Goggans, Matthew Kaiser, Humberto Garcia, Nigel Hatton, and Katie Brokaw—unanimously approved this proposal last spring, and it was approved by the HWC faculty on February 8, 2017. We are eager to see it implemented in order to give our best students this opportunity to do more in-depth research in their final year at UCM.

Best,

Katie Brokaw, on behalf of the English faculty of HWC

PROPOSAL FOR ENGLISH HONORS PROGRAM

Overview

Beginning in AY 2017-18, UC Merced English majors may petition to join the English Honors Program, which will have additional requirements beyond the standard English major, culminating in a 50-to-75-page Honors thesis. Undergraduate majors who are accepted and successfully complete the Honors Program will receive a notation to that effect upon their diploma, and on their undergraduate transcript thereafter.

Students apply to join the Honors Program in the Spring of their Junior year. To be eligible for the Honors Program, an English major must achieve an overall GPA of 3.3 and a minimum GPA of 3.7 in the major. A student with a GPA in the major between 3.5 and 3.69 must petition the Honors Committee for an exemption.

The Application Process

Students who meet the minimum requirements may apply to the English Honors Program in the Spring semester of their junior year. The application consists of the following items:

1. Application form (including overall GPA, GPA in the major, list of English courses taken or in progress)
2. Transcript
3. Cover letter formally requesting entry into the Honors Program
4. 1-2-page proposal for thesis research project to be undertaken if admitted
5. Writing sample (preferably a 10-15-page paper from a previous UCM English course)
6. Brief note of endorsement (sent under separate cover) from an English faculty mentor indicating a willingness to serve as the student's Honors Thesis Advisor

Applications from qualified students will be considered by the English Honors Committee (composed of Academic Senate faculty in English and chaired by the English Honors Program Director. The director, also a member of English's academic senate faculty, will be appointed in a meeting of the English faculty; an election will be held should more than one faculty member be interested in the position). Admission decisions will be based on the following criteria:

- Evidence of ability to succeed in the Honors Program.

The most important quantitative measures of this will be the student's GPA within the major, and their completion of at least seven courses (28 units) in English (which may include courses taken at other institutions for major credit). The English Honors Committee will also take into account the student's ability to work independently on an extended research project (based on work in previous English courses, including the writing sample). A thoughtful, well-written research project proposal is also important in assessing the student's readiness for the Honors Program.

- Ability of student to secure a thesis advisor committed to mentoring the student.

As one-on-one faculty mentoring is a key component of the English Honors Program, the endorsement of the student by an Academic Senate member in English is crucial to any admissions decision. The English Honors Committee will make this judgment based on the student's research project proposal, as well as on the proposed faculty advisor's availability and/or willingness to work with the student in the forthcoming academic year. When necessary, the Honors Program Director will assist talented students in reaching out to prospective mentors, and will assist all students in reaching out to new faculty members. However, it is the responsibility of the student to secure an advisor before applying to the Honors Program. As faculty and undergraduate populations grow, it may become necessary to revisit this procedure, to switch to a system in which the Honors Committee pairs students with advisors.

These criteria are nearly identical to those currently used for admissions in the UCM History Honors Program, and are very similar to those currently used for admissions in the Interdisciplinary Humanities Graduate Program. The application process is designed not only to select the most promising students, but to ensure that they are well-matched with a committed mentor willing to guide the student's research, while protecting the English faculty from being collectively or individually overloaded with Honors students. The application process should prompt students to get a head start in thinking about a potential project (by way of the research proposal requirement). It is also a good exercise for students preparing to apply to graduate school programs. All admissions decisions will be communicated to students before the end of the Spring semester so that they have time to register for ENG 193 for the following Fall, and potentially (and optionally) begin reading for their project over the summer.

The Honors Program

Students admitted to the English Honors Program will be required to enroll in the two-semester Honors Senior Thesis sequence, English 193 and English 194. For purposes of satisfying the requirements of the major, ENG 193 and 194 will count as two of the five upper-division seminars required of all English majors, with one of the courses replacing ENG 190. In ENG 193, offered each fall, they will initiate their research project and produce smaller, research-related writing pieces, such as annotated bibliographies, literature reviews, and early outlines and drafts, and they will be assessed on these products. In ENG 194, offered each spring, they will draft and complete their projects, and will be assessed on both their process and final thesis.

A course map for English Honors students, then, totals 56 units (as it does for all English majors) and looks like this (all but the boldface is the same as a "regular" English degree):

Lower Division English Major Requirements

- One lower division seminar course drawn from ENG 50-89 [4 units]
- Two lower division course[s] drawn from ENG 10-89 or WRI 025 [4 or 8 units]
- Two semesters of college-level foreign language [8 units]

+ One course may be substituted with a course drawn from ENG 105-189; see "upper division electives" below.

Upper Division English Major Requirements

- Engaging Texts: Introduction to Critical Practice: ENG 100 (4 units)
- English Survey of Literature courses: ENG 101, ENG 102, ENG 103 and ENG 104 (16 units).
- Two or three upper division electives from ENG 105-189 [8-12 units]
- Honors Thesis sequence: ENG 193 and 194 [8 units]

To graduate with Honors in English, students must complete the second part of the Honors Thesis course (ENG 194) with a minimum grade of A- and achieve an overall GPA of 3.3 and a GPA of 3.7 in the major.

The Honors Committee will also have the option of awarding High Honors and Highest Honors in the major. To be eligible for graduation with High Honors in English, a major must achieve an overall minimum GPA of 3.3, a minimum GPA of 3.7 in the major, and a grade of A in the final portion of the Honors Thesis sequence (ENG 194). To be eligible for graduation with Highest Honors in English, a major must achieve an overall minimum GPA of 3.3, a minimum GPA of 3.7 in the major, a grade of A in both semesters of the Honors Thesis sequence (ENG 193 and 194), and nomination by the student's thesis advisor. The decision to award High Honors and Highest Honors rests with the English Honors Committee.

Resource Implications

The institution of the English Honors program at UCM is resource neutral. For the foreseeable future, the program will be small enough that its Directorship will have a low impact responsibility, and will thus not need to be compensated with a stipend or course release. The English Honors Director will be in charge of raising awareness of the program among English majors, soliciting applications from students each spring, working with faculty to identify thesis advisors for students who are accepted into the program, following up with advisors throughout the academic year to make sure those students are meeting their learning goals and deadlines, being a resource for Honors students who may have questions or concerns about the program, and working with the faculty advisors to award high and highest honors each spring.

The teaching of ENG 193 (offered every fall) and ENG 194 (offered every spring) will be administered by English Academic Senate faculty members willing to work with our most excellent students on a project that is most likely somewhat close to their own research area. As is the case for Directed Independent Studies and Group Studies (ENG 195 and 199), which several English Academic Senate faculty already direct, the reward will be in mentoring these most excellent students, and will not be part of our regular 2:1 teaching load.

Based on the popularity of the History Honors program and our sense of eligible and interested English students, we anticipate there will be approximately 2-4 students completing the Honors sequence each academic year, which means that it will not place an undue burden on the Director or the advisors.

Rationale for the English Honors Program

The decision by the English faculty to create an Honors Program is motivated

- 1.) by an earnest desire to improve English education at UC Merced for all our majors (those eligible for Honors, as well as those ineligible);
- 2.) by the need to make our undergraduate program more competitive within the University of California system, as well as at UCM; and
- 3.) by a philosophical and pedagogical commitment to increased curricular flexibility, that is, our determination to provide our diverse and growing population of students with telic options, replacing our current one-size-fits-all capstone experience, which none of us like, with a variety of capstone experiences, enabling our students to develop different skill sets in preparation for life after UC Merced.

The UCM English program is currently the only English program in the UC system without an Honors track. Studies show that gifted college applicants are less likely to attend schools without Honors programs, and once there, are less likely to choose majors that do not offer an Honors track.¹ An Honors track would make our program more competitive, giving our most talented majors the option of working closely with Senate faculty. The ability to award students Honors, High Honors, and/or Highest Honors incentivizes excellence. Honors students are more competitive on the job market and more attractive to graduate programs, for not only do they have stronger writing samples, they have experience conducting independent research over the course of one year. The proposed English Honors Program replaces ENG 190 for these students.

Our majors have a broad range of academic interests and professional aspirations. Those headed to graduate school in literary studies, or to law school, are ideal candidates, of course, for an Honors Program, and eagerly anticipate its implementation. Others, double majors, or science or social science minors, may not be able to commit to a lengthy year-long Honors thesis, talented though they may be. Additionally, our most educationally disadvantaged students, those for whom the former ENG 190 proved a dispiriting experience, are better served, we believe, in the more structured environment of a topical research seminar (the experience we are importing into ENG 190 starting in Fall 2017), producing one of many kinds of research projects and graduating with a sense of accomplishment.

¹ Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: a developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40 (5), pp. 518-529.

Ford, D.Y., Baytops, J.L., Harmon, D.A. (1997). Helping gifted minority students to reach their potential: recommendations for change. *Peabody Journal of Education* 72 (3/4). pp 201-216.

ENG 193: Honors Thesis Research

Course Title	Honors Thesis Research
Abbreviated Course Title	Honors Thesis Research
Course Subject	ENG
Course Number	193
School Submitting Request	SSHA
Division	Upper Division
Effective Term	Fall 2017
Discontinuance Term	----
Lower Unit Limit	4
Upper Unit Limit	
Prerequisites	Consent of Instructor. Must be enrolled in English Honors Program.
Prerequisites with a Concurrent Option	
Corequisites	
Major Restrictions	English
Class Level Restrictions	Senior
	First half of the English Honors thesis sequence (ENG 193-4). Students research a topic in preparation for producing an Honors thesis. Enrollment restricted to students admitted to the English Honors program.
Course Description	
TIE Code	E: Individualized Instruction
Reasons for Request	New Course
Brief Explanation of Change(s)	
	Lecture: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Lab: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Seminar: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Discussion: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Tutorial: 1 contact, 11 non-contact Field: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Studio: 0 contact, 0 non-contact
Total Contact/Non-contact Hours Per Week	
	12
Total Hours Per Week	
Grading Options	Letter Grade Only
In Progress Grading	
Maximum Enrollment	10
Maximum Enrollment Reason	----
Cross-listing	
Conjoined	
Cross-listed Schools	----
Can this course be repeated?	No
How many times?	
Resource Requirements	None--and no room needed.
Does this satisfy a General Education Requirement?	No

Course Outline and/or Additional Documentation  [ENG 193 Course Outline.pdf \(122Kb\)](#)

English 193: Honor Thesis Research Course Outline

English 193 is the first half of the two-semester English Honors thesis sequence.

Students taking English 193 (which will be restricted to those admitted to the Honors program) will spend the first weeks of class working with the instructor to identify a research topic that will form the basis of 50-100 page thesis produced over the course of two semesters. Much of the students' work during the semester will involve meeting individually with their faculty mentor to discuss and implement a research strategy appropriate to their chosen topic. At the end of the semester, students will submit a written prospectus and annotated bibliography outlining the research they have conducted in preparation for writing their thesis.

By design, there will be relatively few texts assigned to the class as a whole. Instead, readings are to be tailored for each individual student in consultation with their faculty mentor. Common books assigned to the class might include such general texts as:

- Wayne C. Booth et. al., *The Craft of Research*
- Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for the Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*
- Roy Peter Clark, *Writing Tools: 50 Essential Strategies for Every Writer*

Course Learning Outcomes:

The main learning outcome for this two-part course sequence is to demonstrate students' ability to apply what they have learned throughout their course of literary study, but in a way that is more advanced than is done in ENG 190 (senior thesis). In that sense, the learning outcomes for this course are the same as the outcomes for the major. That is to say, literature and literary criticism are significant parts of an ages old, continuing conversation about what it means to be human and what value humanity has. Unlike scientific or social scientific approaches to this conversation, literary discourse emphasizes the particular in the dialogue between particular and universal. It always arises out of specific times, places, and cultural traditions, and it often gives powerful voice to cultural differences and individual differences against the backdrop of larger, homogenizing forces. Moreover, literature has traditionally fore-grounded questions of value over questions of definition, or rather, sees questions of value as central to the definition of humanity itself.

The successful student majoring in English will be able participate in this larger conversation, and this course's outcomes will allow them to demonstrate that ability in a particularly advanced way, befitting of an honors student.

Course Learning Outcomes:

1. **Identify** a literary research topic that is specific, focused, and offers opportunities for genuinely original research.
2. **Locate** primary and secondary sources found in books, articles, and databases related to the topic using digital tools and librarian assistance, practicing advanced, independent research skills. (Addresses PLOs 1, 4, 5)

3. **Interpret** the primary literature related to their proposed topic as well as the secondary literature written about their topic, sensitive to textual and contextual cues. (Addresses PLO 1)
4. **Organize, document, and synthesize** primary and secondary sources to support an argument (Addresses PLO 1)
5. **Propose** an argument using those sources (Addresses PLOs 1 and 4 and 5)

Potential Assignments:

- Blogged writing assignments based on students' independently conducted research
- Research Proposal
- Annotated Bibliography

Every instructor has different methods of evaluation, but a **Sample Grading Rubric** (out of 100 possible points) for the Research Proposal could be:

- Introduction to and establishment of topic (20 points):
It should be clearly written, and hook the reader's interest. The introduction should describe which text, writer, historical-literary period, or perhaps sub-genre will be the topic on which you will focus.
- Establishment of research questions and significance of project (30 points):
Student answers the following questions: What are you doing? What specific issue or question will your work address? Explain how you will approach the work, and what we might learn from it.
Student explains why this work is important. What are the implications of doing it? How does it link to other knowledge, to other research on the topic? Why will the reader be interested in this topic?
- Description of Methodology (20 points):
This section should make clear to the reader *how* you intend to approach the research question. Will you be doing historical/archival research, engaging with critical theories, and/or engaging in close-reading?
- Description of Previous Work (Literature Review) (20 points):
Describe the most important work that has been done on your topic, and the various critical debates that continue to be discussed.
- Expected Conclusions (10 points):
At this very early stage, what do you think you might end up concluding about your topic? And what might you conclude is the significance of your research?

ENG 194: Honors Thesis

Course Title	Honors Thesis
Abbreviated Course Title	Honors Thesis
Course Subject	ENG
Course Number	194
School Submitting Request	SSHA
Division	Upper Division
Effective Term	Fall 2017
Discontinuance Term	----
Lower Unit Limit	4
Upper Unit Limit	
Prerequisites	Consent of instructor. Student must be enrolled in English Honors program.
Prerequisites with a Concurrent Option	
Corequisites	
Major Restrictions	English
Class Level Restrictions	Senior
Course Description	Second half of the English Honors thesis sequence (ENG 193-4). Students write a 50-100 page thesis under the supervision of a faculty mentor. Enrollment restricted to students admitted to the English Honors program.
TIE Code	E: Individualized Instruction
Reasons for Request	New Course
Brief Explanation of Change(s)	Course required to support proposed English Honors Program.
Total Contact/Non-contact Hours Per Week	Lecture: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Lab: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Seminar: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Discussion: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Tutorial: 1 contact, 11 non-contact Field: 0 contact, 0 non-contact Studio: 0 contact, 0 non-contact
Total Hours Per Week	12
Grading Options	Letter Grade Only
In Progress Grading	
Maximum Enrollment	10
Maximum Enrollment Reason	----
Cross-listing	
Conjoined	
Cross-listed Schools	----
Can this course be repeated?	No
How many times?	

Resource Requirements

None, and no room needs to be assigned.

Does this satisfy a General Education Requirement? No

Course Outline and/or Additional Documentation  [ENG 194 Course Outline.pdf \(149Kb\)](#)

English 194: Honors Thesis Course Outline

English 194 is the second half of the two-semester English Honors thesis sequence.

Students taking English 194 (which will be restricted to those admitted to the Honors program) will have previously identified a thesis topic and been assigned a faculty mentor to help guide their research as part of English 193. They will come to this course with a completed prospectus and annotated bibliography. In this class, they will write and revise a 60–100 page thesis. As with English 193, much of the work will involve independent reading and writing under the direction of a faculty mentor. Students will be expected to submit drafts of their work to their faculty mentor and fellow Honors Thesis students so they can benefit from the process of editing and revision before submitting the final product. At the end of the semester, students will make a final oral presentation before their fellow Honors Thesis students in addition to submitting their written thesis and a reflection on their learning from their English major classes including the Honors Thesis sequence.

By design, there will be relatively few texts assigned to the class as a whole. Instead, readings are to be tailored for each individual student in consultation with their faculty mentor. Common books assigned to the class might include such general texts as:

- Diana Hacker, *A Writer's Reference*
- *The Chicago Manual of Style*
- Charles Lipson, *How to Write a BA Thesis*
- Steven Lynn, *Texts and Contexts: Writing about Literature With Critical Theory*

Course Learning Outcomes:

The main learning outcome for this two-part course sequence is to demonstrate students' ability to apply what they have learned throughout their course of literary study, but in a way that is more advanced than is done in ENG 190 (senior thesis). In that sense, the learning outcomes for this course are the same as the outcomes for the major. That is to say, literature and literary criticism are significant parts of an ages old, continuing conversation about what it means to be human and what value humanity has. Unlike scientific or social scientific approaches to this conversation, literary discourse emphasizes the particular in the dialogue between particular and universal. It always arises out of specific times, places, and cultural traditions, and it often gives powerful voice to cultural differences and individual differences against the backdrop of larger, homogenizing forces. Moreover, literature has traditionally fore-grounded questions of value over questions of definition, or rather, sees questions of value as central to the definition of humanity itself.

The specific course learning outcomes for the second part of the honors thesis sequence are:

1. **Interpret** the primary and secondary literature related to the student's thesis topic and found and read by the student independently, sensitive to textual and contextual cues. (Addresses PLO 1)
2. **Synthesize** primary and secondary sources in formal writing those sources to support an argument a paper supported by research (Addresses PLOs 1 and 4 and 5)
3. **Articulate evaluations of and arguments about** primary and secondary literature in writing and in speech, cogently and at a level befitting an advanced, honors undergraduate or early career graduate student. (Addresses PLOs 1 and 2 and 5)
4. **Document** all research according to professional standards.
5. **Reflect** on your ability to **apply** interpretive strategies and research skills developed in historical literary study to other academic and professional contexts. (Addresses PLO 4)

Potential Assignments:

- Active participation in peer draft workshops with other enrollees in 194 (if applicable)
- Outline of Paper
- Draft of Paper
- Final Honors Thesis
- Reflective Essay
- Oral Presentation

Every instructor has different methods of evaluation, but a **Sample Grading Rubric** (out of 100 possible points) for the Final Honors Thesis could be:

- An **argument** that is truly arguable, focused, and original. 10 points
- **Support** from thoughtful analysis of and extensive array of primary and secondary sources that are thoroughly researched and properly documented. 50 points.
- **Organization** that is clear and well sign-posted throughout, with proper transitions between sections and paragraphs. 10 points.
- **Style and Voice** that is clear, concise, and subtle, including consistent verb tenses, formal tone befitting published essays, and a lack of wordiness. 10 points
- **Grammar** conforming to standard English conventions, including subject and verb agreement, pronoun and antecedent agreement, and no sentence fragments or run-ons. 10 points.
- **Mechanics** as befitting scholarly work, including proper spelling, punctuation, word choice, MLA or Chicago documentation, and no typos. 10 points.