



**FALL MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2017
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
232 Kolligian Library**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- | | | |
|-------------|---|---------------|
| I. | CHAIR’S REPORT & ANNOUNCEMENTS – Divisional Chair Susan Amussen | 5 MIN |
| II. | CONSENT CALENDAR¹ | 5 MIN |
| | A. Approval of the Agenda | |
| | B. Approval of Draft Minutes of the April 19, 2017 Meeting of the Division (Pg. 4-8) | |
| | C. Annual Committee Reports AY 16-17 | |
| | Divisional Council (Pg. 9-11) | |
| | Committee on Academic Personnel (Pg. 12-18) | |
| | Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (Pg. 19-26) | |
| | Committee on Research (Pg. 27-38) | |
| | Committee on Rules and Elections (Pg. 39-41) | |
| | Diversity and Equity (Pg. 42-48) | |
| | Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (Pg. 49-56) | |
| | Graduate Council (Pg. 57-61) | |
| | Undergraduate Council (Pg. 62-67) | |
| III. | CAMPUS UPDATE – Chancellor Leland & Provost/EVC Peterson | 15 MIN |
| IV. | DISCUSSION ITEM: THREE MAJOR PLANNING INITIATIVES | 30 MIN |
| | A. Academic Planning – Divisional Chair Susan Amussen & Provost Peterson | |
| | B. School Reorganization – Associate Dean, SoE, Paul Maglio & VPF Camfield | |
| | C. Budget Policy – Divisional Vice Chair Schnier & Interim VCPB Mendez | |
| V. | ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DIVISION BYLAW (Pg. 68-106) – Vice Chair Kurt Schnier | 10 MIN |
| | The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) proposes to establish a Reserve CAP (RCAP) in Division Bylaw (Part II. Title III.2). This new standing committee of CAP will address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members ² . Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP), these two actions are addressed by ad-hoc committees established by the Vice Provost for the Faculty. A standing Reserve CAP will place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since the | |

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

² The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

Committee on Committees, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. It will also simplify the review process for these types of cases. The VPF supports this initiative. The revisions also make explicit an existing implicit expectation that all members of CAP must be full professors. The proposal was circulated for comment to all standing committees and school executive committees. Divisional Council discussed committee comments (appended) on November 6, 2017 and endorsed minor revisions to the proposed language. On November 16, 2017, CRE endorsed by email the version approved by Divisional Council on November 6, 2017 and presented here.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Merced Division votes to endorse the proposed revision to Bylaw Part II. Title III.2. If approved, changes are effective January 8, 2017.

VI.	STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS	15 MIN
	Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation , Chair Mukesh Singhal	(oral)
	Committee on Academic Personnel , Chair Ignacio López-Calvo	(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	(written)
	Graduate Council , Chair Teamrat Ghezzehei	(written)
	Undergraduate Council , Chair Anne Zanzucchi	(oral)
	General Education	
	Admissions and Financial Aid	
VII.	PETITIONS OF STUDENTS	5 MIN
VIII.	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 - Division (al) Council

FWAF - 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



**SPRING MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
APRIL 19, 2017**

Pursuant to the call, the Merced Division of the Academic Senate met at 3:00 p.m. on April 19, 2017 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Senate Chair Susan Amussen presiding.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Division Chair Susan Amussen thanked members of the Division for a very successful year, which included effective Senate-administration collaboration on the 2020 Project and workforce planning. The Chair encouraged members to review and comment on both the draft institutional report for reaffirmation of accreditation that was received today and the proposal for a new program of General Education that will be disseminated next week. The Chair announced that candidates for the SNS Deans search will be visiting campus before commencement.

II. SYSTEMWIDE UPDATE

Academic Council Chair Jim Chalfant reported that the Senate continues to work with the administration to develop a policy for non-resident enrollment that does not institutionalize funding inequities driven by differences in non-resident enrollment across the system's ten campuses. Chair Chalfant noted that this is particularly important for Merced, which currently has low non-resident enrollment. Chancellor Leland reported that that the systemwide Senate has been an effective advocate for equity across all ten campuses and, in this regard, for UC Merced. The Senate's support is particularly important to UC Merced because, although the campus contributes significantly to the system's goals for access and affordability, UC Merced's in-state students are not at this time able to benefit from the additional revenues derived from non-resident students.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR¹

Today's agenda and the minutes of the November 28, 2016 Meeting of the Division were approved as presented.

IV. CAMPUS UPDATE

Chancellor Leland reported that President Trump's proposed budget could significantly affect Federal support for UC research. The Chancellor noted that the President's budget is a proposal, and that the actual outcomes depend upon legislation that will be proposed this coming this fall. The ten UC Chancellors have asked Executive Vice President and CFO Nathan Brostrum to develop scenarios projecting the costs of funding cuts, with the intention of planning how the UC could help alleviate campus-level impacts. The Chancellor also reported that Phase I of the 2020 Project is moving forward, despite the record rains.

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

A member asked how the system budget looks for the coming year. The Chancellor responded that the state budget is still being finalized, and so the funding levels for the UC are unclear. The Chancellor anticipated that the release of the state audit of the Office of the President, right before the May revise of the state's revenue projections, has the potential to affect negatively funding for UC. Chair Amussen noted that a concern had been the repeal of Affordable Care Act, which had it passed, would have significantly affected the state's budget through reductions in Medicare funding, which in turn would have impacted significantly the state's ability to fund the UC.

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Peterson encouraged members to RSVP for the upcoming lecture by Ibram Kendi, this year's National Book Award winner for non-fiction as part of the Chancellor's Dialogue on Diversity and Interdisciplinarity. The Provost also updated members on progress on school restructuring and faculty hiring. The Provost and Senate Chair received, and are planning to discuss, the report of the joint work group on school restructuring. The Provost noted the campus is well positioned to move forward on this issue. The Chancellor commented that the intention is to devolve more responsibility and accountability to department chairs, and to free up the deans to focus on external relationships. Regarding faculty hiring, the Provost extended his apologies to the faculty for the workload associated with 40 clusters and 24 foundational hiring currently coming to a close, and noted that the work is almost complete. The Provost reported that yesterday CAPRA provided its review of the FTE proposals submitted by the deans, and that his review is underway. The Provost re-iterated that next year's hires will be exclusively foundational.

V. DISCUSSION ITEM: WORKFORCE PLANNING

The Vice Chair of the Division, Kurt Schnier, provided an [overview](#) of workforce planning, including the problem the effort is intended to address, the initiative's priorities, the goals and constraints specific to each of three workforce planning work groups, and each group's emerging recommendations. The Vice Chair began by acknowledging the considerable work undertaken by the faculty and administrative members of each work group.

Members discussed in detail the model for faculty support proposed by the Organizational Efficiency and Sustainability workgroup. The Chair noted that the model represented a massive rethinking of how work will be managed on campus, and that shifting to a new model of faculty support will take time.

Members reviewed the role of the faculty liaisons, which is to assist faculty in solving problems and in doing so identify support related issues to be addressed institutionally. A member asked whether these liaisons will be organizationally located in schools or if they will remain in the VPF's office with dual reports to the VPF and VCBAS. The Chancellor noted that this is yet to be determined. The Vice Chair noted that, as envisioned, the liaisons would be located physically near to the faculty to facilitate familiarity and interaction. A member asked how different the proposed structure is from the current structure. The Chair responded that ultimately revisions to business practice will involve changes to both staff support and information systems. The VCSBA noted that in the new model faculty liaisons will be the personal point of contact that is ultimately necessary in any system. These individuals will navigate systems on behalf of the faculty. Another meeting on this topic will take place this in a week. Members were encouraged to contact faculty representatives to the individual workgroups.

VI. 2017-2018 DIVISION CHAIR, VICE CHAIR & SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN

The Chair of the Committee on Committees, Rick Dale, announced the Senate leadership for the 2017-18 year. Susan Amussen will return as Chair of the Division, Kurt Schnier as Vice Chair, and Lin Tian as Secretary/Parliamentarian.

VII. STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS

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

Chair Singhal reported that CAPRA has worked on a number of important topics this year, including modifications to the faculty hiring plan (with Provost Peterson) and space planning. CAPRA just submitted its hiring recommendations for the coming year to the Provost. CAPRA has also commented on a number of campus and system review items including, for example, proposals for new bylaw units in the School of Engineering, the proposal for an English Honors Program, the proposal for a major in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, and the proposal for a new General Education program. Over the last year CAPRA was represented on the campus's Physical Planning Committee, Enrollment Management Committee, and the Academic Degree Program Policy Working Group. CAPRA has also developed a model to support instructional planning for a campus of 10,000 students.

[Committee on Academic Personnel](#)

Chair López-Calvo reported that CAP has reviewed 81 cases this year. Following CAP's recommendation, the VPF is modifying the MAPP to delegate to the deans authority for short form advancement cases and the appointment of assistant professors at step 3 and below. CAP has asked the Provost and VPF to request that faculty specify their contributions to publications with multiple authors. CAP has also requested that faculty include in their cases all grant submissions so that CAP can better interpret grant success rates. Finally, units have been asked to no longer use the short form for reviews immediately preceding tenure so that faculty may receive appropriate feedback. CAP endorsed proposed revisions to the LSOE series in the APM, one outcome of which would be to change the title to Teaching Professor. CAP also endorsed proposed revisions to the MAPP regarding the selection and appointment of endowed chairs.

[Committee on Committees](#)

Chair Dale reported that CoC is successfully filling committee rosters for next year. Vice chairs are still needed, however, for the General Education Subcommittee, Privilege and Tenure, and CAPRA. Over the last year, CoC has appointed representatives to the search committee for the SNS dean, the Health Campus Network Committee, and a number of other committees. The Chair urged members to encourage their colleagues to participate on Senate committees, noting how fortunate UC faculty are to have such a substantial say in the direction of the university.

[Committee on Diversity and Equity](#)

Chair Golash-Boza provided a written report. D&E cosponsored with APO this spring's diversity speaker addressing the teaching experiences of under-represented faculty. D&E is reviewing the appointment process for compensated faculty positions. In response to the modified hiring plan, D&E recommended that planning address the need for spousal hires and targets of excellent. This year D&E representatives began meeting with external program review teams to ensure diversity is considered in the review. Finally, D&E has endorsed actions proposed by the VPF to provide support for LGBTQ faculty members.

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

Chair Beaster-Jones reported that FWF has crafted statements responding to the planned campus Police Advisory Board and supporting diversity as a faculty welfare issue. FWF has developed a childcare needs survey that will run this spring. FWF has also been working with the VPF on issues related to academic freedom.

[Committee on Research](#)

Chair Noelle reported that 33 proposals have been received for CoR's annual faculty grants program. Awards announcements will be released in early May. In fall, CoR surveyed the faculty regarding staff support for external mural funding. This spring CoR released a report conveying the survey's results to the faculty and administration. The report has also been provided to the workforce planning workgroups. CoR has initiated investigations into pain points in the procurement process for faculty, as well as the management and use of research funds in general.

The review of the Sierra Nevada Research Institute has been launched. This is the first review of an ORU unit at UC Merced. At the system level, UCORP has been working to restart regular reviews of multi-campus research units, and is encouraging the administration to develop a set of principles to guide the relationship between the UC and the national labs as the contract renewal process approaches.

Committee on Rules and Elections

Chair Tian reported that the committee has been advising the Senate and units on bylaws and voting rights. CRE hopes to complete its voting rights guide, which addresses frequently asked questions, by the end of the semester. CRE is also working on questions related to university honors.

Graduate Council

Chair Balasubramaniam reported that GC has revised the course request policy to address the review and approval of Extension courses; initiated policy development for appointing graduate students as instructors of record for upper division courses; approved the campus's first professional degree program, the Master of Management offered by the MIST graduate group; devised a mechanism to offer, on a pilot basis, a professional development course managed by graduate division; revised the Graduate Advisor's Handbook; and initiated revisions to the policy governing the establishment of new graduate programs.

Undergraduate Council

Vice Chair Sifuentez reported that UGC has met six times thus far this semester. UGC has commented on GC's revision to CRF policy, the establishment of revenue generating masters programs, CAPRA's hiring analyses, and the policy for awarding posthumous degrees. UGC has considered a number of proposals including for an English Honors Program, a minor in Management Analytics and Decision Making, and a major in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies. In addition to review items, UGC approved this semester over 100 CRFs. Before the semester concludes UGC will address a number of systemwide review items, the proposal for a new program of General Education, a proposal for major in Philosophy, and a proposal by ASUCM and the HEROS program to establish a reading period.

VIII. SENATE AWARDS

Chair Amussen announced the recipients of this year's Senate Awards.

IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS

None.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

XI. NEW BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:28 p.m.

Attest: Susan Amussen, Senate Chair

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 - Division (al) Council

FWAF - Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom

GC - Graduate Council

L (A) SC - Library and Scholarly Communication

P&T - Privilege and Tenure

UGC - Undergraduate Council

GES- 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

**DIVISIONAL COUNCIL
MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
ANNUAL REPORT 2016 – 17**

The Divisional Council (DivCo) held a total of 20 meetings with respect to its duties as outlined in the Merced Division Bylaw I.IV.3. This count includes a special meeting held March 14, 2017 on the topic of the Framework for UC's Growth and Support. In addition, DivCo members met with Chancellor Leland, Provost/EVC Peterson, Associate Chancellor and Chief of Staff Klotzbier, Associate Chancellor Putney, VPF Camfield, Interim VCPB Mendez, LASC Chair and UCOLASC Representative Ryavec, the Chairs of the School Executive Committees, Director of Summer Session and Extension Johnson, and Director of Extension Education Programs Reimer. Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate Senate Committees, followed by full Division Council review. The issues that DivCo considered this year are described briefly below.

2020 Project

At the September 9, 2016 meeting Richard Cummings, Director of Strategic Communications provided an update on the 2020 project with a focus on the project timeline and building deliverables. With the support of DivCo, faculty members were identified to participate in the design-review process for translating conceptual-level building designs into construction documents.

Framework for UC's Growth and Support

During its February 2 and March 14 meetings, the Chancellor consulted with Divisional Council regarding the campus' contribution to the Framework for UC's Growth and Support, a systemwide initiative to identify the direction and resources needed to sustain the University as a world-class public research university into the future. Discussions focused on the campus's development of a scenario for submission to UCOP outlining projected enrollments in 2040 and the resources necessary to reach that goal.

School Executive Committees

On May 4, 2017, Divisional Council consulted with the Chairs of the School Executive Committees, following ongoing consideration of the role of these committees in school governance. Topics included the committees' involvement in school-level planning and resource allocation and strengthening information flow and collaboration among the school executive committees and Divisional Council. The latter will be an area for ongoing attention in AY 2017-18.

Library Resources

At its December 15, 2016 and March 2, 2017 meetings, Divisional Council considered the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication's recommendation to endorse the Library's vision for expansion as outlined in its white paper titled UC Merced Library Space: 2020 and Beyond. In the memo transmitting its endorsement to the Provost, DivCo urged that the Library be integrated fully into the campus' emerging integrative planning processes, including for space, budget, and FTE, given the centrality of the library to the success of UC Merced's academic mission.

DivCo reviewed, approved and/or made recommendations on the following items:

- Recommended that proposed changes to the MAPP, regarding the selection and appointment of endowed chairs which were approved in AY 2015-16, be implemented this year (9/27)
- Endorsed UGC's approval of the Proposal to Discontinue the Service Science Minor (9/27)

- Made recommendations to the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) regarding Senate representation on PROC (9/27)
- Endorsed and forwarded to the Chancellor, upon FWAF's recommendation, a letter from a group of faculty expressing concern about a letter sent by President Napolitano, and all ten chancellors, to the American Anthropological Association that was developed without consultation with the faculty (10/28)
- Commented on the Deans' Council's memo to the faculty regarding the cap on summer session salary (11/7)
- Endorsed GC's approval of the Proposal for a Program of Professional Studies with PDST in pursuit of the Master of Management offered by a new Graduate Group in Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology, and approved the Masters of Management degree title, the campus's first professional degree (11/17)
- Approved proposed amendments to the Thondapu Family Chair in Bioengineering (11/29)
- Commented on the proposed Charge to the Police Advisory Committee (11/29)
- Endorsed proposed revisions to Section II.III.6 of the Merced Bylaws (11/29)
- Approved the proposal to establish the UC Merced Foundation Board of Trustees Presidential Chair (12/6)
- Endorsed, with a recommendation, proposed revisions to MAPP 6001, the Policy for the Establishment and Administration of Endowed Chairs (12/15)
- Recommended the organizational relocation of Summer Session and University Extension from the Division of Student Affairs to Academic Affairs (12/16)
- Commented the campus's draft definition of Student Success (12/22)
- Commented on the draft Presidential Policy on Establishing and Maintaining Presidential Policies (1/20)
- Commented on the proposed Incentive Plan for Revenue Generating Master's Degree Programs (2/6)
- Commented on the draft Policy on Access to Student Data (2/9)
- Endorsed D&E's request to endorse the VPF's efforts to determine appropriate ways to collect data to strengthen support for LGBTQ faculty (2/16)
- Endorsed and transmitted the results of CoR's fall 2016 survey, regarding faculty experiences related to the pursuit and management of extramural research funding, to the administration (2/23)
- Recommended to the administration a set of principles to guide the allocation and management of faculty startup and incidental funds (2/27)
- Made recommendations regarding the membership of the Space Planning and Allocation Board (2/27)
- Commented on the Deans' Council's response to DivCo regarding the summer session salary cap (3/2)
- Endorsed UGC's approval of the Proposal for a Minor in World Heritage (3/14)
- Endorsed UGC's recommendation to accept the revised Report of the Task Force on University Honors, and invite submission of a proposal for a University Honors Program (3/17)
- Endorsed the GC's revisions to the Policy on the Posthumous Awarding of Degrees and Certificates (3/24)
- Endorsed the vision for the library's growth outlined in the Library's white paper titled Library Space: 2020 and Beyond (3/28)
- Transmitted to the faculty the Committee on Research's Report on the Fall 2016 Survey Concerning Staff Support for Extramural Funding Efforts (3/29)

- Recommended to CRE to develop Senate Regulations for awarding high and highest honors within the major (4/24)
- Endorsed UGC's approval of the Proposal for an English Honors program (5/1)
- Endorsed UGC's approval of the Proposal for a Program in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (CRES) for the Bachelors of Arts Degree
- Recommended attention to ameliorating the negative impact of increases to postdoctoral scholar salaries on campus research efforts (5/15)
- Endorsed CAPRA's recommendations regarding the decision-making process for determining the home unit of a vacant senate faculty FTE, following a request for guidance on this topic from the SSHA Executive Committee (5/22)
- Endorsed proposed revisions to the Policy for the Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs (5/22)
- Approved proposals for five new academic units in the School of Engineering (SoE) together with a revised set of School bylaws (5/26)
- Transmitted to the administration FWAF, D&E, UGC, and CAPRA statement encouraging intentional planning for faculty lecturing lines, both Senate and Non-Senate, in future academic planning. (5/31)
- Transmitted to the Provost CAPRA's statement of support for I.T. funding (5/31)
- Endorsed UGC's approval of the Proposal for a New General Education Program (6/5)
- Commented to Academic Council on the Activity Based Costing report UC Merced submitted to the Office of the President in 2017 (6/16)
- Approved the Guide to Senate Committee Membership and the Purpose and Practice of Executive Session (6/1)

DivCo also opined on the following systemwide items:

- Proposed revisions to APM 015, APM 016 and Senate Bylaw 336 (11/15)
- Draft new Presidential Policy on International Activities (11/15)
- Recommendations for future equity analyses of faculty salaries (1/6)
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 (1/10)
- Proposed revisions to Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Regarding Academic and Staff Employment and APM 15 (1/10)
- Proposed revised Regental Policy Governing Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (1/10)
- Proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 630.D (3/15)
- Draft Presidential Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Policy (4/17)
- Draft Presidential Policy on Export Controls (5/16)
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336 (5/16)
- Proposed revisions to APM - 285, 210-3, 133 and 740 (5/16)
- Draft revised Presidential Policy on Electronic Information Security (IS-3) (7/14)

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2016-2017.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included four members from UCM and five external members. The UCM members were Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), Michael Modest, Vice Chair (School of Engineering), Heather Bortfeld (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Tom Harmon, who served in spring 2017 (School of Engineering). The external members were Rajiv Singh (UCD, Physics), Mark Wrathall (UCR, Philosophy), J. Lawrence “Larry” Marsh (UCI, Biology), Phil Roeder (UCSD, Political Science), and Joseph Konopelski (UCSC, Chemistry).

The CAP analyst this year was Simrin Takhar.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

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

Policies and Procedures

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

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and Academic Personnel (AP) Chairs. As the MAPP is an evolving resource, CAP presented this Spring’s suggestions for revisions of the document to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Division Council (DivCo).

Review Process

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

campus. Committee members who participate in a prior level of review for a file are recused from CAP's respective review of the file.

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

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

Throughout the UC system, certain categories of academic personnel cases, for example, appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, sometimes require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. In most cases, CAP makes the request for this *ad hoc* review, especially in instances where CAP lacks sufficient expertise in the faculty member's research area or when there are ambiguities in the case file. The *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate and its report is included in the materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate. These *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit.

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2016-2017 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 105 cases during the year, compared to 148 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 98 (93%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). For 6 other cases (6%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case; for 1 case, CAP voted against the recommendation but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step). There were 7 cases this year in which a school dean and his/her school/bylaw unit faculty disagreed with each other and therefore presented different recommendations. Of these, CAP agreed with the faculty/bylaw unit 3 times and agreed with the dean 4 times.

Tables 1A – 1D detail caseloads and their respective outcomes according to the proposed personnel actions. Table 2 provides aggregate recommendations by the academic units.

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

to CAP's recommendations. On rare occasions, the Provost/EVC goes against CAP's recommendation, whereupon, per procedures, he is required to meet with CAP to discuss his decision to overturn. This year, the Provost/EVC disagreed with CAP three times.

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

In keeping with tradition, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review during the academic year. Along with the other Senate standing committees, CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process. This year's proposed revisions to the MAPP involved a procedure for the appointment and renewal of endowed chairs. CAP agreed with the basic components of the endowed chairs proposal, but encouraged the campus to exercise flexibility in the allocation of such chairships for the purposes of faculty recruitment and retention.

To mitigate concerns over delays in appointments and the workload in the schools surrounding the preparation of short-form advancement (routine merit) case files, CAP issued a memo to the VPF this year, offering to relinquish its review of appointments at Assistant Professor I, II, and III, as well as short-form advancements. The VPF made the new appointments procedure effective in spring semester 2017, while the procedure for short-form advancements will go into effect in the next academic year. These two actions will henceforth be handled at the school/dean level, unless there is a disagreement between the school faculty and the dean - in which case, the file in question will be reviewed by CAP as an independent body.

CAP also reiterated its request to the VPF from the last academic year with regard to units providing a delineation of faculty members' contributions on co-authored publications. A clearer presentation of the evidence of both contributions to the work as well as intellectual leadership would benefit CAP's analysis of the overall research profile. Also, CAP reiterated its previous request to see all grant-seeking activity for faculty on the bio-bibliographies, both successful and unsuccessful. CAP believes this information is needed not only to make final recommendations on individual case files, but also to provide meaningful feedback to faculty on their efforts to obtain funding. Finally, while CAP understands the rationale involved in using short forms for normal merit reviews, the committee suggested to the VPF a modification to the procedures currently outlined in Appendix 2014-C of the MAPP for assistant professors: we recommend that the short form should not be used for subsequent reviews preceding promotion to tenure. CAP believes it is imperative for all levels of review to provide meaningful feedback to assistant professors at these points on their career trajectory.

In conjunction with the VPF, CAP submitted to Division Council a proposal to empanel a standing Reserve CAP (termed "Shadow CAP" in the past) of the Academic Senate to address cases of 1) current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each of these types of review. This proposal is under review by the Senate and will be addressed in the next academic year.

IV. Counsel to Provost/EVC

The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendation, with the Provost/EVC and VPF. These discussions mostly focus on individual cases, but there were other general discussions regarding the preparation of academic personnel files, differences

between the Academic Divisions in their recommendations, and CAP procedures.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at UCM, the Provost/EVC and the VPF requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, held on November 16, 2016, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Ignacio López-Calvo, Vice Chair Michael Modest, and an additional external member. The committee participated in three discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. A second meeting was held involving CAP members, Provost/EVC, VPF, AP Chairs, and UCM faculty. This was followed by an afternoon session and was open to all faculty members, School AP Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Detailed minutes from both sessions are available in the Senate office. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for promotion, the evaluation of teaching, and extramural funding success.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The committee was named as the lead reviewer for proposed revisions to the following APM sections: 285, 210, 133, and 740 pertaining to the re-designation of the L(P)SOE series to "Teaching Professor"; and the Revised Presidential Policy on Nondiscrimination and revisions to APM 15." We endorsed both sets of revisions. As mentioned above, CAP also gave feedback on the MAPP.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its positive working relationship with Gregg Camfield in his role as VPF, as well as Provost/EVC Tom Peterson. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the Deans, the AP Chairs, and the AP staff in each school for their dedication to excellence in the personnel review process at UC Merced, and the Senate Analyst assigned to CAP this past year.

Respectfully,

Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair (UCM)
Michael Modest, Vice Chair (UCM)
Heather Bortfeld (UCM)
Tom Harmon (UCM) spring 2017
Rajiv Singh (UCD)
Mark Wrathall (UCR)
J. Lawrence "Larry" Marsh (UCI)
Phil Roeder (UCSD)
Joseph Konopelski (UCSC)

APPENDIX A

**2016-2017 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	98	1	6*	0	105

*Includes one case in which CAP agreed on MCA, but disagreed on advancement

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (includes Adjuncts & Acting)	11	0	0	0	11
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts & Acting)	5	0	0	0	5
Professor	4	0	0	0	4
Lecturer Series (LPSOE/LSOE)	0	0	0	0	0
Endowed Chairs	0	0	0	0	0
Total	20	0	0	0	20
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	10	0	0	0	10
Professor	6	0	1	0	7
Professor VI	1*	0	1	0	2
Above Scale	1	0	0	0	1
LSOE	0	0	0	0	0
Total	18	0	2	0	20
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					90
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					90

*Includes a Career Equity Review

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	5*	0	0	0	5
Assistant (includes Adjuncts)	26**	1	3	0	30
Associate Professor (includes Adjuncts)	17	0	0	0	17
Professor	10***	0	1	0	11
Total	58	1	4	0	63
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					92
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					94

*Includes 2 with MCAs

**Includes 17 with MCAs

***Includes one merit w/in rank Above Scale

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	0	0	0	0	0
Associate	0	0	0	0	0
Professor	2*	0	0	0	2
Total	2	0	0	0	2
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					100
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					100

*Both were Endowed Chair reappointments

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2016-2017**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering	23	22	0	0	1	0	96	96
(MCA)	2							
Natural Sciences	33	31	0	0	2	0	94	94
(MCA)	6							
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts	49	45	1	0	3	0	92	94
(MCA)	11							
TOTALS	105	98	1	0	6	0	93	94
(MCA)	19							

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2017**

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

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Total Cases	63	96	90	98
Total Appointments	13	34	33	30
Total Promotions	10	17	18	13
Total Merit Increases	40	39	38	47
Total Other	0	6	1	0

	2013-2104	2014-2015	2015-2016
Total Cases	128*	92	148
Total Appointments	50	16	38
Total Promotions	16	16	22
Total Merit Increases	58	57	87
Total Other	4 1 MCA only 3 reappointments *1 case pending	3 reappointments	1 reappointment

	2016-2017
Total Cases	105
Total Appointments	20
Total Promotions	20
Total Merit Increases	59
Total Other	6 4 MCA only 2 Endowed Chair reappointments

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2016-2017

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) held a total of 16 regularly scheduled in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw [II.IV.1](#).

While CAPRA conducted normal Senate business, much of the academic year was focused on CAPRA's continuing role in the Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI) process, preparing for the review of requests for "foundational" (traditional, disciplinary, non-SAFI) faculty FTE lines from the schools and deans, and addressing space allocation issues. (For a history of the SAFI process and CAPRA's involvement, please see the [AY 15-16 CAPRA annual report](#).)

CAPRA also benefited from regular consultation with the Provost/EVC who attended several meetings this academic year.

Areas of Focus

Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI)

In this academic year, four SAFI pillars prepared for faculty hiring in AY 17-18: Inequality, Power, & Social Justice (IPSJ), Sustainability, Human Health Sciences (HHS), and Adaptive & Functional Matter (AFM). A fifth pillar, Computational Science & Data Analysis (CSDA), went through the hiring process last year, and hired new faculty who began in AY 16-17.

In an effort to gauge how well the SAFI process is working with regard to the logistics of recruitment, CAPRA invited the steering committee and search committee chairs of the IPSJ, Sustainability, HSS, and AFM pillars to fall semester meetings to elicit their input on a variety of questions. CAPRA members held robust discussions with the pillar representatives, and the following concerns and themes were raised:

- faculty workload issues with regard to reviewing and ranking hundreds of applications

- the importance of establishing clear voting procedures before reviewing applications
- competing interests among the various disciplines in a given pillar and comparison of candidates that span several disciplines and more than one school
- impact of the proposed SAFI positions on the growth of majors
- the relationship between faculty growth and SAFI/cluster hiring and the future of foundational versus SAFI/cluster hires
- concerns over the allocation of faculty FTE lines to SAFI areas/clusters and confusion over which bylaw units future SAFI faculty hires will be assigned
- timeline of recruiting senior versus junior faculty candidates, as senior candidates have the flexibility to consider offers as late as the end of spring semester before committing to a position.
- Faculty-to-student ratios as a criteria in evaluating candidate applications

Foundational (Non-SAFI) FTEs

As it does each fall semester, CAPRA reviewed and revised its annual process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests in preparation for FTE request review in spring semester. After making minor edits, CAPRA members submitted the revised criteria to the Provost/EVC for consideration on February 22, 2017. The Provost/EVC issued CAPRA's criteria as part of his own call for faculty FTE requests to the deans via email on March 21, 2017.

In April 2017, CAPRA reviewed the FTE requests and rankings it received from the schools and deans. At its April 18, 2017 meeting, CAPRA members finalized their recommended rankings and submitted to the Provost/EVC. On August 21, 2017, the Provost/EVC announced that there will be 14 recruitments for ladder-rank faculty positions, all assigned to specific disciplines, during AY 17-18.

A recurring theme with regard to the review of FTE requests is the short timeline provided to schools and deans, including the delay from the time CAPRA issues its review criteria to the Provost/EVC to the time when the Provost/EVC transmits it to the schools and deans. CAPRA held a frank discussion with the Provost/EVC on this issue and discussed ways to create a more feasible timeline moving forward. CAPRA prefers to give the schools and deans at least one month from the time they receive the Provost/EVC's call to formulate their FTE requests, as the units require sufficient time to meet, consult with the school executive committee, revise if possible, and submit to the deans, who, in turn, need enough time to rank the proposals. CAPRA also

acknowledged, however, the pitfall of issuing the call for FTEs too early: the call would be issued with no knowledge of how current searches are progressing, as decisions about the next round of faculty hiring depends on the current situation.

Space Planning and Allocation

CAPRA's other main function, in addition to advising the Provost/EVC on faculty FTE allocation, is space planning and allocation, and the committee took this role quite seriously this academic year as the campus progressed on its trajectory to 2020.

- **2020 Enrollment Projection**

Following committee discussions in which CAPRA members expressed concern over the lack of classroom seats for students beginning fall 2017 and to 2020, CAPRA undertook an enrollment projections project it nicknamed the "10K by 2020" project. The Provost/EVC was supportive of this endeavor and offered his support to the committee. A subcommittee of CAPRA held meetings with several key stakeholders including the school curriculum managers, Registrar's office, IRDS, 2020 Project team, VPDGE, VPDUE, VCSA, graduate group chairs, and the chairs of GESC and UGC. From information received from these collaborations, the CAPRA subcommittee created a draft model framework for all majors assuming the presence of 9,000 students in 2020. The model mapped this enrollment number to the buildings the campus will have by 2020, and analyzed the point in time where the campus will face significant challenges supporting this number of students. CAPRA members also discussed to what extent classroom size puts pressure on potential faculty hires; this model could tie in to the ongoing campus debate over SAFI and whether hiring through the SAFI pillars are serving the pedagogical needs of the campus.

The CAPRA subcommittee continued to meet during the academic year with stakeholders including IRDS, and came to the conclusion that the campus would benefit from an established process for enrollment and future growth instead of extrapolating numbers. The goal is to have one model and one set of projection numbers in order to place a framework around this large endeavor. Future policy decisions and recommendations would ideally flow from this central model.

At the end of spring semester, the Provost/EVC requested an understanding of the trajectory of faculty hiring over the past 8-10 years and map it to

undergraduate and graduate student growth, in order to examine the trajectory of growth for each bylaw unit. The CAPRA subcommittee will work with the Provost/EVC this summer on a model to distribute to CAPRA this fall.

- Space Planning and Allocation (SPA) board

In spring 2017, the Provost/EVC and the Special Advisor to the Chancellor issued a memo to the campus, announcing the empaneling of a campus space planning allocation board. The membership included the CAPRA chair and the Senate Chair, and CAPRA members benefited from hearing updates that were relevant to their role.

CAPRA emphasized to the Provost/EVC and SPA board representatives that bylaw 55 units should be more involved in the campus conversation around space and pointed out that some faculty are unwilling to forgo their laboratory space to those outside their research group in the absence of any discernible benefit.

CAPRA members appreciated meeting with Director of Space Planning and Analysis Maggie Saunders in spring 2017, where she requested from CAPRA members a list of “pain points” with regard to space on campus. CAPRA members related the following:

- Decisions about space are made at too high a level. It would be more efficient to allocate space to faculty groups, as they are the most informed to make more allocation decisions.
- Decisions about space seem to be made on an ad hoc basis and it is unclear who controls which space.
- Lack of transparency in the allocation of space. In the past, promises were made to some faculty about the types of space they would receive only for these assurances to be broken later. This has led to a lack of trust between faculty and those who make space allocation decisions.
- The campus needs to integrate space planning with academic planning. Space needs vary across disciplines.
- Space planning processes should have more accountability with decisions made in writing. The campus also need a process whereby it is public knowledge how space decisions are made and how that information is shared with the campus.

- Faculty Collaborative Space

At the end of spring semester, CAPRA and the Provost/EVC agreed to explore a joint endeavor whereby, faculty members would be allowed to submit proposals for the use of collaborative space in the 2020 buildings. Proposals would be reviewed by both CAPRA and the Provost/EVC with the latter making the final decision. CAPRA and the Provost/EVC will work together this summer with Director Maggie Saunders and Vice Chancellor of Research and Economic Development Sam Traina on obtaining the required data for available space and information on research units.

In August 2017, CAPRA consulted with Director Saunders and a representative from the international architectural and consulting firm Woods Bagot, in anticipation of the development of the 2020 project and backfill space allocation. CAPRA, as a key stakeholder, provided input to Director Saunders on ways to engage the faculty and graduate students. The committee expects to continue these conversations into the next academic year.

Modified Faculty Hiring Plan

The Provost/EVC recognized the ongoing and controversial debate over the SAFI process. While he stated his wish that the campus would allow itself to run the experiment for a full year before passing judgement, he expressed his willingness to revisit his faculty hiring plan and requested input from CAPRA. The Provost/EVC pointed out that his main concern moving forward is research space, rather than faculty offices, and he will have to conduct an intensive quantitative analysis of how space is currently being used. The lack of a plan for addressing space could pose an impediment to faculty recruitment; moreover, a continuing challenge in faculty recruitment is the most fair way to accommodate spousal hires and targets of opportunity hires.

In fall 2016, CAPRA submitted its proposed hiring plan to the Provost/EVC, Senate Chair, Division Council, Deans Council, and school executive committee chairs and added it to the agenda for the November 28 Meeting of the Division. Comments were received from UGC, D&E, and the Senate Chair.

In February 2017, the Provost/EVC issued to the campus his modified faculty hiring plan. The main component of the plan was that SAFI/cluster hiring would be scaled back in favor of increased foundational/bylaw 55 unit-oriented hiring.

Consultation with Administration

- University Librarian and AVC/CIO of IT.
CAPRA held a discussion with the University Librarian on the state of the Library's budget. The Library has been unable to support faculty requests (particularly those in the arts and humanities) for print and electronic monographs. In order to carry out the mission of Collection Services over the next three years, significant budget increases are required. The AVC/CIO of IT shared with CAPRA that much of the current A/V equipment in the campus buildings is now outdated and requires replacement. CAPRA sent a memo to the Senate Chair, stating its strong support for IT to be provided appropriate resources to further the research, teaching, and service mission of UCM faculty and to foster the learning and growth of students and staff.
- AVC for Enrollment Management Jill Orcutt.
AVC Orcutt provided input on CAPRA's "10K by 2020" project by suggesting the committee take a structural approach whereby the campus would drive student applicants into certain majors to relieve the pressure from impacted programs and majors.
- Office of Planning and Budget.
CAPRA members appreciated hearing budget updates throughout the year and providing its input on future campus budget processes. CAPRA raised the following issues, in response to the Budget Office's request for input:
 - budget decisions timeline, specifically, when budget decisions can be changed.
 - discussion on replacement faculty FTE lines and whether those replacements lines stay in the particular school.
 - complication of ledgers to track expenditures and the erroneous use of ledgers as a budgeting tool.
 - multi-year academic planning and the uncertainty surrounding how many instructors and academic staff support will be received.
 - clarity on budgets for hiring unit 18 lecturers.

- impact of the 2020 Project on the campus budget, and implications if the 10,000 enrollment target is not met.

CAPRA's feedback, as well as that of other campus stakeholders, was used to inform the faculty open forums that the Budget Office hosted in early spring semester 2017.

- School Executive Committee Chairs

The Senate Chair asked CAPRA to consider the need for and/or benefits of input by school executive committees on resource-related and planning aspects of the duties and responsibilities of CAPRA. CAPRA subsequently invited the chairs of the three school executive committees to meetings to consult with them on their priorities and expectations with regard to Senate consultation. Topics that were discussed included the uniformity of the role of the executive committees across the schools with regard to reviewing resource requests; a reexamining of the definitional elements and infrastructural issues as the Senate revises the academic program policy; the executive committees potentially playing a larger role in the review of faculty FTE requests, and the need for the Senate's deadlines connected to systemwide and campus wide review items to be more reasonable given the faculty's workload and other service commitments.

Representation on Campus Committees

- CAPRA had representation on the Campus Physical Planning Committee, the Enrollment Management Committee, and the Academic Degree Program Policy Working Group, and benefited from updates throughout the academic year.

University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) updates

- The CAPRA chair represented the committee on UCPB and kept CAPRA members updated on topics raised by this systemwide committee. The major topics of discussion on UCPB this year were self-supporting graduate degree programs, PDST, AY 17-18 budget, rebenching numbers, non-resident tuition, funding streams, and capital plans.

Campus Review Items

- The SSHA executive committee requested input from the Senate on the jurisdiction of Senate FTE lines. At the request of the Senate Chair, CAPRA took

the lead in responding. In its memo, CAPRA recommended that if the loss of an FTE line is due to the denial of tenure, then that line should remain with the unit and no justification should be necessary. For other FTE line losses (separation, retirement), a process should be established between the school dean, bylaw unit chair, or undergraduate chair of the affected program that includes written justification and an appeals process.

- CAPRA opined and made several suggestions for revisions on the proposal to establish a General Education program, and the proposal to create a Management Analytics and Decision-Making minor.
- CAPRA endorsed the following: Philosophy major proposal; the Critical Race & Ethnic Studies major proposal; the School of Engineering proposal to create five new bylaw units; the QSB Proposal for Concentration in Molecular and Cell Biology; the English Honors program proposal; committee membership guide; revised Honors Task Force report, and the revised Heritage Studies minor proposal.

Systemwide Review Items

CAPRA endorsed the proposed revisions to APM 285, 210, 133, 740 pertaining to the re-designation of the L(P)SOE title to “Teaching Professor”, and the proposed revisions to the G-28 travel policy to make them more-family friendly.

Respectfully submitted:

CAPRA members:

Mukesh Singhal, Chair (SOE) – UCPB representative.

Mike Colvin (SNS)

Jessica Trounstine (SSHA)

Kurt Schnier (SSHA)

Student Representative:

Katie Butterfield, Graduate Student Representative, GSA (fall 2016)

Senate Staff:

Simrin Takhar

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2016-2017

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Research (COR) held a total of 16 regularly scheduled in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Academic Senate [Bylaw II.III.7](#). Some additional business was completed via electronic mail discussions.

Areas of Focus

Administering the Academic Senate Annual Faculty Research Grants Program

One of the main responsibilities of COR is administering the faculty research grants program, and it is a task that requires a great deal of attention and effort. The Committee devoted a portion of several meetings this year to discussing ways to improve the program and the processes leading to the competitive assignment of awards. As in the previous year, \$175,000 was made available for the program.

In keeping with previous years' practice, COR members agreed to employ a two-step process whereby, school executive committees conduct a quality assessment review of the proposals and then submit their top-ranked proposals to COR for final review and selection of awardees. COR members debated throughout the year whether the school executive committees should be provided with a reviewing guidance template or other means of instruction for their review. However, the COR membership ultimately decided not to include any further guidance beyond what is explicitly stated in the call for proposals.

Thirty-three proposals were received and COR elected to fund twenty-six. All funds allocated to this program were distributed as awards.

Survey of Faculty Concerning Staff Support for Extramural Funding Efforts

During AY 2015-2017, COR identified a gap between the grant functions supported centrally from Research Development Services (RDS) and what support was provided by the schools. In AY 2016-2017, there were substantial changes in staff support from

RDS, and school staff were given more substantial roles in supporting faculty in the pursuit and use of extramural research funding. Also, a major workforce planning effort was underway, focused on how staff resources, including those dealing with extramural research funding, were to be allocated in the immediate future. In hopes of providing faculty input into these staff reorganization processes, the COR membership agreed to construct and issue a survey to all Academic Senate faculty concerning the support that they have received on topics related to research grant preparation and award administration. The results of this survey were specifically intended to help inform the Research Excellence and Academic Distinction workgroup, one of three work groups created by the Chancellor to address campus workforce planning. This work group was tasked, among other duties, with considering support staff for faculty academic and research activities.

One COR member was tasked, on behalf of the Committee, with analyzing the survey results and presenting them in a summary form for review and approval by the Committee. The report was shared with ex-officio member Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development (VC-ORED) Sam Traina, who was also a member of the Research Excellence and Academic Distinction workgroup. The survey summary and data report were transmitted to Division Council with a request to endorse the subsequent transmission of the survey results to the Academic Senate faculty, Chancellor, Provost/EVC, and the workforce planning workgroups. The survey provided a wealth of quantitative and qualitative data on the experience of the faculty with extramural funding staff, and this information was distributed, as requested.

Formal Review of the Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI)

Since the Academic Senate approved the policies drafted by the AY 2013-2014 COR membership on the establishment and review of research units, COR focused on beginning the implementation of review policies during AY 2014-2015. The SNRI, the campus's first organized research unit (ORU), was scheduled for a five-year review at that time, so COR began to collaborate with VC-ORED Traina to launch this review, with the goal of evaluating SNRI's research contribution to the campus. While the review process was clarified by early planning, the actual review of SNRI was postponed until AY 2015-2016 and the process was not completed until AY 2016-2017.

COR worked closely with VC-ORED Traina on launching the review of SNRI. COR's responsibility in this process was to review the SNRI's self-study, as provided by VC-ORED Traina. The Academic Senate Committee on Committees was tasked with populating part of the review team by identifying the UCM representatives; VC-ORED Traina was responsible for identifying one non-UCM member.

In May 2017, at the conclusion of the SNRI site visit, VC-ORED Traina emailed the review team's report to the COR Chair, indicating that COR could review it at the beginning of AY 2017-2018. SNRI would be allowed some time to formally respond to the report.

ORU Proposal Process

COR received a proposal from a current Center on campus to re-establish themselves as an ORU. There were an array of issues surrounding this proposal, including complexities surrounding the initiation of the review process by the Dean of the relevant school. The Center requested that the Senate provide advice concerning how to move forward. COR discovered that there was no systemwide guidance on this matter. Moreover, there is just a single paragraph in the current policy document regarding what a proposal document must contain, though systemwide policy provides more detailed requirements for ORU proposals. The proposal for the Center was found to be out of compliance with this systemwide policy. COR opted to postpone review of the proposal until the missing items are provided. In Spring 2017, the COR Chair submitted a memo to the ORU lead author in order to communicate systemwide policy requirements, which were not referenced in campus procedure documents, as well as to make observations concerning areas where the proposal could be improved. The Committee noted that the currently published UCM policy document will need to be revised to clearly communicate systemwide requirements for proposals to establish a new ORU.

At the time of this writing (July 2017), the Periodic Review Oversight Committee recommended to the Center that it undergo external review. The Center and the school Dean agreed with this recommendation. In AY 2017-2018, both COR and the VC-ORED will be engaged in this review process.

Senate Awards for Distinguished and Early Career Research

COR is responsible for the review of nominations for the annual Academic Senate awards for Distinguished Research (tenured) and Distinguished Early Career Research (untentured). In order to execute this duty, COR formed two subcommittees, and these subcommittees each selected one nominated individual for receipt of one of the two awards. The awardees were recognized at the April 2017 Meeting of the Division.

2020 Project

As the Academic Senate committee charged with attending to matters pertaining to the research mission of the university, COR kept abreast of the campus's 2020 Project, particularly with regard to the construction of buildings intended to support research. This activity involved participating in and/or tracking the array of meetings intended to update the faculty on the progress of the new buildings.

In Fall 2016, a COR member attended a three-day review of "Building 2A" to review modifications that were being made to the building design to minimize negative effects on research facilities. The COR member related to the Committee that faculty expressed concern in these meetings about access control to laboratories and equipment, as well as emergency power and related topics. These issues were identified as requiring careful attention when renderings of the new spaces were to be made available at future meetings.

COR members were also kept informed about classroom space layout in the new buildings. It was noted that the aspect ratio of some currently available classrooms introduces significant challenges, and these sometimes translate into negative student evaluations. In addition, COR was particularly interested in the Technology Enabled Active Learning (TEAL) rooms; two additional such rooms are planned for the 2020 Project, with one being divided to produce a 45 student capacity, more closely matching current class sizes.

Purchasing Issues and Effects on Research

During the academic year, COR members discussed the systematic problems in the workflow governing purchasing, grant accounting, and central budgeting. These issues were concurrently discussed in the meetings of one of the campus workforce planning

workgroups, convened by the Chancellor. COR members suggested that the workforce planning workgroups may benefit from input by COR on identifying faculty pain points surrounding purchasing and grant accounting, as well as from general Academic Senate consultation on how a future workflow system would interface with systems currently in place by schools and other offices.

At the end of the Spring semester, COR members agreed to invite the newly-hired Chief Procurement Officer to a future COR meeting, hoping that he would be able to inform the ongoing Committee discussion about challenges faculty face with regard to purchasing. COR looks forward to consulting with him at the beginning of AY 2017-2018.

Composite Benefit Rates

In Spring 2017, Controller & AVC Michael Riley, Business & Financial Services Cost Standards and Policy Analyst Mark Perez, and Business & Financial Services Vice Chancellor for Business & Administrative Services Michael Reese attended a COR meeting and made a presentation to COR (who was identified by AVC Riley as a key stakeholder) on composite benefit rates (CBR). Each UC campus will ultimately adopt the CBR model as the UC system transitions to UC Path. For UCM, that change is expected to occur December 1, 2017. CBR should prove beneficial for faculty members in that they will be able to accurately predict the cost of benefits for research staff when creating grant proposal budgets. In this way, CBR will simplify the grant budgeting process pre-award, and it also bring some financial stability post-award.

In response to the CBR presentation, COR members raised a variety of issues, including: the hiring of postdocs above the prescribed rate (assurances were given that there will be a process whereby the rate can be adjusted over time), potential changes to faculty benefits as a result of CBR (assurances were given that all faculty benefits will remain intact), and the recent rise in minimal postdoctoral scholar salary and benefits (the CBR mitigation program was described as offering means to defray such additional costs in the short term).

Postdoctoral Scholar Salaries & Current Grants

In the course of the academic year, COR was contacted by several faculty members to express concerns with regard to changes in the costs needed to support postdoctoral scholars using extramural funds. A recent contract negotiation resulted in increased pay rates for postdoctoral scholars, and this resulted in increased costs to grants that contained support for such scholars but did not budget for the unexpected increased pay rates. As a result, some faculty members have found it quite challenging to carry out their funded research projects.

At the end of the academic year, COR issued a memo to the Academic Senate Chair, requesting that the Senate work with the Office of Research and Economic Development, as well as the Graduate Division, to pursue options for ameliorating the negative impact on research of these recent cost changes.

Consultation and Monitoring

Consultation with VC-ORED

Throughout the academic year, COR members benefited from updates on various research-related issues from ex-officio committee member, VC-ORED Traina.

One such research-related issue was export control regulations. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) established a policy of contacting faculty and requesting interviews regarding “deemed exports”. This is when a piece of technology that has export control placed on it (it is restricted from export to specific countries identified by the federal government) is “deemed exported” by exposure to a citizen from one of those countries, including individuals working for the UC. Violations of export control regulations involving “deemed exports” had recently generated heavy fines for another UC campus. The Committee was informed that the DHS interviews, thus far, were voluntary. Also, if a faculty member agrees to be interviewed, he/she has the right to schedule such an interview at his/her convenience and to request that other parties be present, such as Campus Counsel.

Another major issue that VC-ORED brought to COR's attention was an initiative between UCOP and NASA Ames involving the leasing of approximately 16 acres at Moffett Field, with the intent to develop new opportunities for UC researchers, including creating new space for both research and industrial collaboration. The systemwide working group that was convened to assess this initiative include both the VC-ORED and the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education, Marjorie Zatz. VC-ORED Traina related to COR that, despite requests for representation by the Academic Senate, no contact with the Academic Senate had been made.

In March 2017, COR transmitted a memo to Division Council, requesting the delivery of a formal statement to Christine Gulbranson, UC Senior Vice President of Innovation & Entrepreneurship at UCOP, the leader of this initiative, requesting that consultation with the Academic Senate be sought. The Academic Senate Chair opted, instead, to issue an electronic communication to systemwide Senate Chair Jim Chalfant and to the Chair of the University Committee on Research Policy, Isaac Martin.

Meeting with Arthur Ellis, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies, UCOP

At the invitation of the UCM Graduate Division, Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies Arthur Ellis visited UCM, and he met with COR members to learn about the campus's aspiration to quickly become a modern research campus, focusing on the challenges faced in pursuit of this goal. COR members shared with VP Ellis how resource constraints had motivated central control of funds supporting research, distributing very little into discretionary budgets that might support faculty research while extramural grants were pursued, including bridge funding between awards. It was noted that the campus is growing faster than any other UC campus in history, causing tension with the distribution of physical space, with research space allocations to faculty often failing to meet what was promised or planned for. Compounding these issues is the geographic isolation of UCM and the lack of appropriate social gathering space on campus, both of which having introduced lasting negative impacts on faculty and graduate students.

Upon hearing COR members' ideas for increasing collaborations between campuses and national labs, VP Ellis indicated that he would pursue this approach by speaking

with the leadership of the national labs. With regard to furthering collaboration, including joint programs and degrees with international partners, he stated that this would require Academic Senate consultation, but there should be no challenge in identifying interested partner universities.

University Committee on Research Policy Updates

The COR Chair represented UCM at UCORP meetings, and he kept the COR membership informed of UCORP activities through the academic year:

- systemwide effort to establish and grow innovation centers across all ten campuses with \$2.2 million being allocated to each campus.
- the role of faculty in contributing patents and other intellectual property to the UC portfolio focusing on making the patent process easier for faculty
- the funding cycle for Multicampus Research Programs and Initiatives (MRPI) concluded, with 97 proposals received and 14 selected for funding. \$17 million was awarded. UCM had the highest representation of any campus across the set of funded proposals
- UCOP has contacted those Multicampus Research Units (MRU) that lack systemwide funding to inquire if they wish to be reviewed so as to be considered for renewed MRU status. Just four of the fifteen units elected to maintain their status in the face of the absence of UCOP funding. The remainder of the units opted to dissolve or convert into ORUs.
- modifications to policy on “openness in research”: some faculty would like to do research with agencies on confidential or sensitive subjects. Such research projects would provide additional sources of income to the campuses and opportunities for the training of graduate students for government and industry positions. There was great concern, however, that these efforts may collide with established University policy regarding open access to the results of UC research.
- UCORP requested that members submit their respective campus’ policies on the establishment and review of research units to be aggregated into a central repository. Extensive variance was found in the policies used by different campuses. Indeed, it was found that different campuses had different goals for the establishment of ORUs.

- UC Vice President for National Laboratories debriefed UCORP on issues surrounding the renewal of contracts for the labs
- concerns about UC campus' extramural funding portfolios if federal funding to the UCs is cut under the current presidential administration
- A call for a white paper was issued regarding UC's relationship with the national labs. Before bidding to renew its management contract for the labs, UCOP would be required to outline general policies on what they would or would not do in their relationship with a lab, as well as provide a description of the expected benefits of such a relationship.

Campus Review Items

- Draft UCM policy on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) and Model Aircrafts. COR generally found the policy to provide a reasonable balance between the interests of the research community, public safety, and civil liberties. Only a few issues of concern were raised: 1) policy could be improved by some general description of the criteria for approval and 2) purchasing restriction needs to be clarified.
- Research Data Storage interim procedures, distributed for comment by Chief Information Officer Ann Kovalchick. COR strongly recommended that these procedures be either abandoned or substantially revised prior to implementation. As written, the current procedures impose strong constraints that could undermine the research productivity of the faculty.
- Faculty start-up and incidental funds. The Senate Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF) committee issued its "Principles for the Allocation and Management of Faculty Start-Up and Incidental Funds" to Division Council. COR recommended adding the assertion that the use of start-up funds might best be managed at the School level or lower. Similarly, variation across fields in the importance of incidental funds for academic success should guide allocations and policies. FWAF agreed with this addition and submitted a revised Principles document to the Division Council for eventual transmittal to the Provost/EVC, Vice Provost for the Faculty, and the Interim Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget.
- Revised Report from the Task Force on University Honors. While COR members found the proposal beneficial, they raised concerns about the resources needed to

implement such a program. The Committee requested that a realistic assessment of how a University Honors program would affect resource availability, particularly in the form of faculty research time.

- General Education Program proposal. COR asserted that the proposal did not adequately address the resource implications for the additional educational demands that would be placed on faculty through the offering of Spark seminars and the integrative culminating experience. If adequate additional resources for this program are not forthcoming, COR recommended that the undergraduate research element of the proposal be made optional.
- Incentive Plan for Revenue Generating Master's Degree Programs. COR endorsed the plan, contingent on the following recommendations: 1) the structure of a seed funding program for the development of such Master's programs should be described in the plan, 2) to support long term planning by graduate groups, disbursed revenue should roll over from one year to the next, and 3) the standards for the length of Master's programs vary from field to field, so uniform duration requirements should not be adopted by the incentive plan.
- Open Access 2020 Expression of Interest (EoI). COR supported UCM signing the EoI, but raised the following concerns for subsequent discussion: 1) free access and unrestricted use and re-use of scholarly work places the financial responsibility of publishing on authors and 2) under the open access model, publishers establish prices directly with the authors. Authors with the financial means to do so may be willing to pay higher prices for their work to appear in prestigious journals, while authors who lack sufficient funds are disadvantaged. This may dramatically compromise the integrity of the literature.
- Policy for Access to Student Data. COR offered the following modifications and observations: 1) the policy should explicitly address requests for data from graduate groups and/or the Academic Senate, 2) the document is not completely clear concerning requests for data for research purposes, and 3) in an effort to avoid individual identification from aggregated data, the document sometimes places minimum restrictions on the number of students contributing to an aggregated statistic, but it is not clear that this is done in a reasonable way.
- COR also reviewed and endorsed the following: the School of Engineering's proposal to create five new departments and the proposed presidential policy on export controls.

Systemwide Review Items

- Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities. COR members expressed concern about the way in which “risk” is defined in this document. The policy could interfere with academic freedom by allowing vague concerns over potential future political or financial effects of an international activity to raise unreasonable approval barriers to standard research activities that involve an international component. COR strongly suggested that these more nebulous forms of risk be more clearly described and operationalized.
- Proposed Revisions to APM 285, 210, 133, 740 pertaining to re-designating the L(P)SOE series to “Teaching Professor.” COR members found the policy revisions unclear with regard to whether the renaming of this series implies shifts in teaching expectations such that Academic Senate faculty with these titles would be able/expected to teach at the graduate level.
- Systemwide Unmanned Aircraft System Policy. The COR membership supported the effort to establish minimum standards for the safe use and operation of UAS, but was unclear whether individuals can initiate applications with the systemwide authority and the local authority simultaneously. The Committee also indicated that it was not clear if UAS users would be allowed to pursue an application with one authority after receiving a denial from the other.
- COR reviewed and endorsed the proposed revisions to the G-28 travel regulations, which were made more family-friendly, and the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 pertaining to expanding the duties of the University Committee on International Education.

Respectfully submitted:

COR members:

David C. Noelle, Chair (SSHA) – UCORP representative

Michael Scheibner (SNS)

Ramendra Saha (SNS)

Stephen Nicholson (SSHA)

Stephen Wooding (SSHA)

Anand Subramaniam (SOE)

Sungjin Im (SOE)

Miguel Carreira-Perpinan (SOE)

Ex officio, non-voting members:

Samuel J. Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development

Staff:

Gregory Fellin

Simrin Takhar (from March 2017)

**COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

In academic year 2016-2017, the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) conducted business via teleconference, email, and in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw [II. III. 7](#). The Divisional Council received regular updates on CRE activities from CRE Chair Lin Tian. Chair Tian also served on the following ad-hoc committees:

- General Education Bylaw Work Group (July – October, 2017)
- Committee on the Establishment or Revision of Academic Units (April 2017)
- Committee on Senate Rules Regarding Librarians and Non-Senate Faculty (April 2017)

The issues that CRE considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

GENERAL PROCEDURES

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

ELECTIONS

- The call for nominations for two positions on the Committee on Committees and one At-large member of the Divisional Council was distributed to the Senate membership on January 30, 2017. Nominating petitions required five signatures including the signature of the candidate showing willingness to serve. Complete forms were due to the Senate on February 10, 2017.
- Due to the number of Senate faculty, the Divisional Council membership required three At-Large Member positions. One was already filled by Patti LiWang (School of Natural Sciences), with two remaining positions left to be filled by election. At the time of writing, the Senate Office had received two nominations for At-Large Members, both from the School of Natural Sciences. To meet the requirement as listed in bylaw [I.III.5.B](#), on March 6, 2017 the CRE requested the assistance of the Committee on Committees) in identifying one additional CoC nominee, and two At-Large Member nominees, for inclusion in the ballot for the 2017 Senate Election, bringing the total number of nominees on the ballot to four. Additionally, to provide balanced representation for all faculty, CRE requested that nominees for the two At-Large Member positions be identified from outside of the School of Natural Sciences.

On March 16, 2017, CoC provided nominations for two DivCo at-large members and one CoC member.

- ***Online Voting System:*** CRE transitioned from the CIS system to Qualtrics.

FORMAL LEGISLATIVE RULINGS ISSUED

CRE was asked to address a question raised by a faculty member regarding the process by which the proposal for a UC Merced General Education Program is approved. Specifically, the faculty member asked if approval required a vote of the Senate faculty. Because the process by which the General Education program at UC Merced is approved is not addressed in either of the two campus policies governing the establishment of new academic programs, CRE sought to answer the following questions in addressing this request:

- 1) Is a vote of the faculty required?
- 2) If yes, what is the voting unit?
- 3) What vote is required to approve the program (majority or other)?
- 4) What level of faculty participation in the vote is required for approval?
- 5) At what point in the approval process should the vote take place?

In reaching its conclusions, CRE drew on existing Undergraduate Council and administrative policies related to the approval of new undergraduate programs, as well as Division Bylaws, the Bylaws of all three schools, and those of College One, to which all faculty belong, as per [Part III. Title II. 2.C](#) of the Division Bylaws, and which historically has been the home of General Education at UC Merced. CRE ruled as follows:

The approval of General Education curriculum will require the following:

- A vote of the Senate faculty of the Merced Division.
- Approval requires a majority of votes cast, not counting abstentions.
- The vote of the faculty must take place before UGC votes on the proposal, and in turn before Divisional Council votes to approve the proposal.

CRE also recommended that the Division revise the appropriate policies to address the process by which a campus-wide curriculum is approved.

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM DIVCO

CRE opined on the following items:

Campus Review Items

- Draft Definition of Student Success
- Guide to Senate Committee Membership & Executive Session
- Revised Report from the Task Force on University Honors
- Proposals for Five New Academic Units in the School of Engineering
- Amended Chair Terms – Thondapu Family Chair
- Proposed Revisions to SR related to Honors Programs

Systemwide Review Items

CRE endorsed the proposed revisions to SR 630.D

CRE commented on:

- The Presidential Policy on Establishing and Maintaining Presidential Policies
- Proposed Revisions to APM 015 and APM 016
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336
- Presidential Policy on Establishing and Maintaining Presidential Policies (systemwide Item)

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM THE SCHOOLS

- Review of the Writing Center Report
- HWC's request for clarification of Bylaw-55 regarding the right to express an opinion on a case for which a faculty member does not have voting rights.

CRE responded that units have the right to express opinions at the units' discretion. The units should follow proper procedure to implement the extension of the voting rights.

- Review of HWC Bylaws with particular consideration to the following questions:
 - a. Can untenured faculty comment on personnel cases of tenured faculty
 - b. If not, can that right be granted by full professors (for full cases) and full and associates (for associates) just as untenured faculty are granted the right to opine (and vote) on hiring cases.

CRE responded that units are welcome to provide untenured faculty the ability to comment on personnel, however CRE has historically recommended against granting rights to junior faculty members to vote on tenure cases and granting rights to associate professors to vote on promotion to full professors. CRE also recommended that all changes made to voting rights be properly documented and distributed among all faculty in the unit.

- CRE reviewed the proposed revisions to the SSHA Faculty Bylaws and had no questions or concerns with the proposed revisions.

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- Request from Diversity & Equity (D&E) – DE requested that CRE review the requested modification to the Senate Bylaws for D&E to allow for an additional D&E committee member. The CRE membership agreed that this was a good idea, and having a representative from each school, possibly not just one but many if possible, would be important.

The following items will be revisited in AY 17-18

- a) Reserve CAP (RCAP) - CRE recommended establishing the RCAP as a standing committee of CAP in CAP Bylaw.
- b) CRE reference document on voting rights
- c) Conflict of Interest Policies
- d) As a member of the Academic Governance Cabinet, CRE Chair will keep CRE members apprised on planning activities

Respectfully submitted,

Lin Tian, Chair (SNS)

Peter Vanderschraaf, Chair (SSHA)

Lilian Davila (SOE)

Staff: Fatima Paul

COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUITY (D&E)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2016-2017

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

In AY 2016-2017, D&E held a total of 6 regularly scheduled in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw [II.IV.6](#). Some additional business was completed via electronic mail discussions.

Areas of Focus

Faculty Equity Advisors

At the end of the last academic year (June 2016), the Division Council endorsed D&E's proposal to establish faculty equity advisors (FEA) and submitted a statement to this effect to the Chancellor, Provost/EVC and school deans. The FEA program was established, in conjunction with the Academic Personnel office, for the purpose of providing guidance during faculty recruitment with the overall goal of recruiting and retaining under-represented faculty members in an effort to more fully diversify the faculty as a whole. The FEA program was made effective August 2016. Four individuals – one from each school plus one assigned to faculty searches under the Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI) – were identified to serve as FEAs and underwent diversity and implicit bias training at UC Irvine or UC Davis. Upon completing the training, the FEAs officially began serving.

In spring 2017, D&E invited all FEAs to attend the final committee meeting of the year to share their experiences in working with faculty searches. While some searches were still open at this time, FEAs reported that the preliminary data was encouraging with regard to gender diversity in the faculty applicant pools. There was less progress than expected in the area of underrepresented minorities. FEAs also shared that diversity numbers are discipline-specific. While overall, the FEAs reported a positive experience in their respective schools and that their input was welcomed by their colleagues, they also acknowledged the downside, namely, that the FEA role is not backed up with resources or any legal and enforceable language on diversity. UCM abides by federally-mandated affirmative action targets that must be met, but it is debatable as to

whether the FEAs are the proper individuals to enforce this. Going forward, it may be worthwhile to provide FEAs with legal advice and a legally-protected mandate.

D&E members also benefited from the FEAs' input on the expectations of their role and their functions with regard to working with unit chairs and deans to constitute search committees. Clarity in the schools is needed on this topic; in the next academic year, D&E will work on clarifying the role and function of the FEAs.

Selection and Reappointment of Endowed Chairs

In the last academic year, D&E members, in consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), reviewed the endowed chairs section 6001 of the Merced Academic Policies & Procedures (MAPP) and recommended a set of revisions that became the committee's proposal for the selection and reappointment of endowed chairs.

The main points of D&E's proposal regarding the recruitment and appointment of endowed chairs stated that 1) A search committee, with multi-disciplinary (unit) representation, shall be appointed by the appropriate Dean(s) after consultation with the relevant Academic Personnel Chair(s) and should be charged with searching for and recommending an appointment for an Endowed Chair. 2) An Endowed Chair may be used either as a recruitment tool during the faculty appointment negotiation process or an Endowed Chair appointment can be made to existing faculty members. 3) The search committee shall conduct a search taking all reasonable steps to ensure the widest possible range of qualified candidates are included in the pool of potential candidates. 4) Appointments to Endowed Chairs shall be made in accordance with regularly established procedures for faculty appointments as currently outlined in MAPP section 2013. 5) The committee shall file a report with the Chancellor or designee describing the procedures followed and including its ranked list of candidates with explanation as to why the recommended candidate was judged superior to others on the list. 6) Departmental and campus appointment procedures applicable to advancement to the higher steps of the professor rank will be followed. The Chancellor or designee, upon recommendation of CAP, has final approval authority for appointment.

D&E's proposal also recommended the following criteria to be used when reviewing requests for renewal of endowed chair appointments: 1) The degree to which activities specific to the Endowed Chair as designated by the donor and approved by the University as well as goals to which the Endowed Chair holder committed, were fulfilled. 2) The activities of the Chair holder in support of the scholarly activities,

teaching, and University and public service activities of the department and campus. 3) The quality of the intellectual leadership provided to the department and campus by the Chair holder. 4) The degree of enhancement of the academic life on campus as a whole. 5) The progress of the Chair holder in scholarly activities, teaching, and University and public service as expected for faculty at the same academic rank.

In April 2016, the D&E committee submitted a formal proposal to Division Council. The proposal underwent a campus review after which Division Council endorsed it in May 2016 and transmitted the proposal to the Chancellor, Provost/EVC, VPF, and school deans. However, the transmittal was too late to be included in the new version of the MAPP which would have gone into effect on July 1, 2016.

At the beginning of this academic year in September 2016, Division Council re-submitted D&E's proposal to the administration and deans with a request that the proposed language on endowed chairs be enacted immediately. The VPF consented, and as of July 1, 2017, the new version of the MAPP will include the new procedures on the recruitment, appointment, and renewal of endowed chairs.

Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty Administrative Positions

In November 2016, D&E reviewed the AY 15-16 list of faculty appointments that include additional compensation. D&E submitted a memo to Division Council with the conclusion that the administration develop a fair and transparent process for all compensated positions, as that may help with issues related to diversity and equity.

At a January 2017 Division Council meeting, the Council requested that D&E articulate what the recruitment and appointment process should be for each position. In conjunction with the VPF, who advised the committee that UCOP issued guidelines for administrative positions, specifying which positions require a waiver or a recruitment, or neither, D&E members suggested drafting a policy on the recruitment and appointment of department chairs, associate deans, graduate chairs, and undergraduate chairs.

In spring 2017, D&E members discussed the current practices at other UC campuses with regard to the recruitment and appointment of the aforementioned positions. Due to UCOP's waiver of certain recruitments, campuses are no longer required to hold a recruitment for faculty administrative positions that are less than 100%. However, the

campus can still draft a policy that requires school deans to issue a communication to all faculty and request nominations for given faculty administrative positions, thus lending the process some transparency and equity.

In the next academic year, D&E looks forward to drafting a proposed policy to be reviewed by the Senate and to ultimately be included in the MAPP.

Second Annual Faculty Mentoring Event

Following the success of last year's speaker event, D&E again partnered with the Academic Personnel office to invite an external speaker to the campus to speak about issues of diversity. In spring 2017, the campus hosted Professor Chavella Pittman, Associate Professor of Sociology at Dominican University. Professor Pittman held three, well-received sessions with UCM faculty: first, with deans, AP chairs, and members of review committees on the topic of bias in teaching evaluations; second, a luncheon with all faculty on the topic of teaching experiences of faculty with marginalized statuses; and finally, with graduate student instructors on the topic of strategies for addressing incivility in the classroom.

Program Review

D&E members participated in recent site visits for the academic program review of the majors in political science, sociology, and biology, as well as the philosophy minor. Members reported that external site teams were quite interested in the issue of UCM faculty diversity and that members' participation was useful.

Expansion of D&E Membership - Approved Change to Senate Bylaws

In the last academic year, D&E requested a change to the D&E section of the UCM Senate bylaws to expand the committee's membership to at least four members, and at least one from each school. This proposed amendment was reviewed and approved by a faculty vote at the end of the spring semester. The Senate bylaws were formally changed, and in the next academic year, D&E will have an additional committee member.

Enhancing Faculty Diversity in the UC System

At the end of the academic year, D&E submitted a memo to Division Council, highlighting various issues surrounding faculty diversity in the UC system: 1) Only

7.2% of ladder-rank faculty across the UC system are domestic underrepresented minorities; 2) The net number of faculty of color, at both the junior and senior ranks, is critical for fostering a culturally inclusive environment for staff and students from historically underrepresented groups on each campus; 3) A culture of inclusion must be fostered at each campus in order to meet the University of California's commitment to campus diversity and retain faculty of color, and 4) In order to fulfill the goal, this commitment to hiring faculty must come from senior leadership - at the system-wide and campus levels. D&E offered several best practices for implementation at UCM: 1) create and support target of opportunity hires; 2) enhance and monitor the search process; 3) tie resources to affirmative action goals, and 4) create a culture of diversity and equity. D&E requested that the memo be forwarded to the Provost/EVC for consideration and anticipates further discussion in the next academic year.

Consultation with Vice Provost for the Faculty

D&E benefited throughout the year from consultation with the VPF, who serves as an ex-officio member. In addition to valued input regarding D&E's main initiatives this year regarding the workflow of the FEAs, the appointment and renewal of endowed chairs, and the recruitment and appointment of certain faculty administrative positions, the VPF also consulted with D&E on the following:

- VPF's ongoing efforts to provide support to LGBTQ faculty members. In consultation with LGBTQ faculty, university counsel, and IRDS, VPF Camfield is determining appropriate ways to collect demographic data for reporting purposes in order to ascertain utilization of benefits and improved representation for LGBTQ faculty members. D&E looks forward to its collaboration with VPF Camfield as we seek to create an equitable and welcoming environment for LGBTQ faculty. D&E submitted a memo to Division Council, voicing its support of the VPF's efforts in this regard.
- Last year, the campus began requiring all three schools to require a diversity statement from faculty candidates. The VPF advocated for more thoughtful evaluation by review committees' scoresheets and rubrics. In addition, he would like to establish clearer guidelines and expectations for the evaluation of contributions to diversity in faculty advancement and promotion cases.

- In the next academic year, he wants to empanel a task force on the evaluation of teaching, and requested a member of D&E to serve (as well as representatives from D&E, CAP, UGC, and GC).

Consultation with Administration

D&E benefited throughout the academic year from consultation with key members of the administration who provided valuable updates and information:

- Associate Chancellor Luanna Putney provided an update on the Police Advisory Board. Originally suggested by the Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF), and in consultation with that committee, a draft board membership has been reviewed by several campus stakeholders representing faculty, staff, students, and the Chancellor. Once the Chancellor approves the draft, Associate Chancellor Putney will work with the future AVC of Public Safety on next steps.
- Director of Campus Climate De Acker provided D&E members with resources such as the contact information for the UCM Behavioral Intervention Team; a document on classroom etiquette and disruption; and updated the committee on the UCM policy on Prohibition of Abusive Conduct and Acts of Violence by University Employees and Non-Affiliates.
- Ombuds Callale Concon shared with D&E that this year, she opened 179 cases, 13% of which were faculty. Seven mediations were conducted this year, approximately half of which involved faculty. Three more cases or mediations are expected to be opened before the end of the academic year, and one of these is faculty-related.
- There was a 50% increase in faculty members consulting with the Ombuds in spring semester over fall semester. Broadly speaking, the issues of concern to faculty are educational opportunities with regard to raising awareness on implicit bias, hiring and promotion implicit bias, an increase in historically oppressed people becoming the oppressors, and inter-cultural communication issues.

Campus Review Items

D&E opined and endorsed the following campus review items:

- School of Engineering's proposal to establish five bylaw units with the recommendation that the School pay close attention to race and gender equality in those units;
- Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases document as drafted by the Committee on Rules and Elections;
- SSHA proposal to create an English Honors program with the caution that the School be attentive to ensuring that the program reflects the diversity of the broader student population;
- SSHA proposal to create a major in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies;
- Guide to Senate Committee Membership and the Purpose and Practice of Executive Session,
- Honors Task Force Report.

Systemwide Review Items

D&E opined and endorsed the following systemwide review items:

- Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336; endorsed the revisions to APM 285, 210, 133, 740 pertaining to the renaming of the L(P)SOE series to "Teaching Professor";
- Revisions to the G-28 travel regulations, making them more family-friendly;
- Revisions to Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 15,
- Proposal to establish a campus writing center.

Respectfully submitted:

D&E members:

Tanya Golash-Boza, Chair (SSHA)

Wei-Chun Chin, Vice Chair (SOE)

Clarissa Nobile (SNS), UCAADE representative

Ex officio, non-voting member:

Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

Staff:

Simrin Takhar

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE & ACADEMIC FREEDOM (FWAF)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2016-2017

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

In AY 2016-2017, FWAF held a total of 4 regularly scheduled in-person meetings in order to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw [II.IV.5](#). Some additional business was completed via electronic mail discussions.

Areas of Focus

Start-Up Funds and Incidental Funds

FWAF devoted a significant amount of attention to this issue, as a number of faculty members across the three schools expressed concern about their start-up funds being sequestered by the Provost/EVC if not spent in a prescribed manner and without permission of extension by their schools' deans. FWAF submitted a memo to Division Council in the last academic year with recommended alternatives for the use of start-up funds. FWAF requested the Council's endorsement and for the recommendations to be forwarded to Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Gregg Camfield and Provost/EVC Tom Peterson.

In September 2016, FWAF reiterated its recommendations in a second memo submitted to the Senate Chair. The recommendations were: 1) All new hires to get access to start-up funds for six years, with an additional year possible by application to the dean in extraordinary circumstance (similar to stop-the-clock provisions). 2) Allow new faculty hires to map out blocks of their start-up funds to be released for particular purposes over the period of 6 years (or up until tenure, should there be extenuating circumstances such as family or sick leave, or accelerated advancement). 3) If faculty are required to relinquish start-up funds because of an expiration date, the funds relinquished, either 100% or some reasonable percentage, will be returned at a later date such as when the faculty advances to tenure in the form of a mid-career award or at promotion to full as an established career award. FWAF also stated that regardless of the which recommendations can be implemented, it advocates for flexibility in how and when faculty can spend out their funds.

Concurrently with the discussion about start-up funds, FWAF also addressed the issue of

faculty incidental funds; at the end of the last academic year, many faculty reported the lack of notification before their incidental funds were to be swept and re-deposited. In September 2016, FWAF submitted a memo to the Senate Chair (with a request that it be forwarded to the administration) that asserted that the faculty would like to maintain an environment of predictability, transparency, and stability in the handling of their incidental accounts irrespective of disciplinary needs. Faculty depend on these funds each year in order to carry out an array of scholarly-related activities, especially given the lack of bridge funding or other sources of funding offered by the campus, with the exception of the Senate faculty grants program. FWAF added that if the administration does not find this suggestion feasible, then the administration should consult with the Senate to find an acceptable alternative.

After discussions on these two separate but related topics at Division Council, FWAF elected to draft “Principles for the Allocation and Management of Faculty Start-Up and Incidental Funds”. In consultation with the Senate Committee on Research, FWAF submitted the following set of principles to the Senate Chair: 1) If UCM is committed to remaining a research university, faculty must have regular and predictable access to the funds necessary to conduct research activities and disseminate their findings as discretionary funds are essential to the scholarly and educational mission of UCM. 2) When determining appropriate policies for faculty discretionary funds, comparisons between institutions must be done with great care. UCM currently differs from its sister campuses in its relative lack of sources for discretionary funding for faculty. Policies concerning the use of start-up funds might best be specified at the School level or lower. 3) In the interests of both staffing efficiency and faculty productivity, access to start-up and incidental funds should be made as predictable and uncomplicated as possible.

In February 2017, the Senate Chair transmitted FWAF’s principles to the Provost/EVC, the VPF, and the Interim Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (the Chancellor was also copied on the correspondence).

Child Care Survey

In the last academic year, FWAF recognized the need for after-school programming at the campus Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC) and for similar options for the multiple, traditional breaks such as Thanksgiving and Spring Break, as local schools’ schedules do not align with UCM’s academic calendar. In fall 2016, FWAF members began working on a set of survey questions to assess the needs of parents or guardians who require or expect to

require child care for at least one child (age 0 to 13) during the workday or after school.

In spring 2017, FWAF's draft survey questions were submitted to various campus stakeholders for input, including IRDS, the campus survey committee, the director of the ECEC, and members of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women. FWAF slightly revised the questions according to feedback received.

In May 2017, the survey was issued via the campus Communications unit to all faculty (including unit 18 lecturers), staff, and graduate students. The results of the survey were compiled into a report and submitted to FWAF members in June 2017. The analysis of the results, as well as plans for distribution of a summary of the results, will occur in the next academic year.

Diversity in Faculty Hiring

In spring 2017, FWAF members discussed the concern that is sometimes raised by faculty when presented with the importance of diversity in hiring and retention. Specifically, some faculty are under the impression that diversity and excellence (or quality) as potentially opposing goals. FWAF rejected this notion and drafted a statement to Division Council that asserted that excellence in the context of a university setting is the byproduct of capable, motivated scholars who are given the tools, resources, and an environment that allows them to effectively apply their talents. In its statement, FWAF argued that this perspective has a number of important implications for the way we think about our personnel process. First, it means that in evaluating job candidates faculty need to move beyond simply counting the number of publications or grants a scholar has to examining candidates holistically, including the context in which their work to date has been accomplished and their fit at a campus such as UC Merced. Second, once faculty are hired, the campus must work steadfastly to ensure that all faculty members have both the necessary resources and a supportive environment in which to pursue their research and teaching.

FWAF's statement on diversity in faculty hiring was submitted to the Senate Chair in April 2017 and discussed in Divisional Council. A revised version of this statement that takes Division Council's comments into account will be drafted in Fall 2017.

Police Advisory Board

Since the campus incident of November 2015, FWAF has been in discussions with the administration (originally, with the former campus Police Chief) on empaneling a police advisory board. A draft board membership was created by Associate Chancellor Luanna

Putney, and reviewed by FWAF in the last academic year. While the committee generally viewed the draft favorably, it took issue with the role of the Chief of Police; the committee maintained that the Chief should neither serve as the board chair nor have the power to appointment or dismiss members of the board.

In spring 2017, Associate Chancellor Putney issued the draft board membership to a variety of campus stakeholders for review and input including the ASUCM, GSA, and the Chancellor. In April 2017, Putney announced that plans to establish a Police Advisory Board are ready to proceed now that a new Police Chief has been appointed; in addition, the administration is recruiting for a Director of Public Safety who will serve as the Chancellor's designee on the future Board.

Faculty Professional Development Series

FWAF continued its partnership with the Academic Personnel office on sponsoring a year-long series of workshops for the benefit of all faculty. Topics this year included mentoring of graduate students and post docs and an overview of the promotion and advancement process.

Consultation

Consultation with Vice Provost for the Faculty

FWAF benefited during the academic year from consultation with ex-officio, non-voting committee member, VPF Camfield. In addition to VPF Camfield's attendance at meetings, the FWAF chair met with him via regular, standing meetings. VPF Camfield brought the following issues before FWAF:

- Emeriti faculty benefits. Other campuses provide various benefits for their emeriti faculty members and this may be something for UC Merced to consider in the future when our population of emeriti faculty increases.
- The importance of faculty members to understand their rights and responsibilities in this highly-charged political climate.
- The VPF hosted an academic freedom forum on April 10, 2017 attended by the Provost/EVC, faculty, deans, and staff. Forum participants shared with faculty a variety of campus resources and assistance.

- Hiring of two faculty liaisons who are tasked with taking a systematic approach to standardizing policies across campus in support of faculty members. These positions were established as a result of discussions from workforce planning. Both positions are housed with the VPF's office.
- Evaluation of teaching. Relying on student ratings for the evaluation of teaching is not an ideal method due to various reasons including the low response rate. The VPF proposed the formation of a task force and asked for a volunteer from FWAF. This will be a carry-over item to the next academic year.
- The VPF intends to conduct shared governance workshops with next year's department/unit chairs and Senate committee chairs.

Consultation with Administration

FWAF benefited throughout the academic year from consultation with various members of the administration who provided valuable updates and information:

- *AVC and CIO of Information Technology*

AVC/CIO Ann Kovalchick kept FWAF informed on systemwide developments related to cybersecurity, specifically, surveillance methods, cyber risk assessment, and updates from the cyber risk governance committee.

- *Director of Campus Climate*

Director De Acker offered FWAF members various resources available to faculty pertaining to academic freedom, including guidance on how to handle classroom disruption, contact information for campus individuals who can provide guidance on interpersonal conflict, the abusive conduct policy, and threat management.

- *Associate Chancellor*

As recounted above, FWAF enjoyed a positive working relationship with Associate Chancellor Putney, specifically, on matters pertaining to the Police Advisory Board.

Goals for AY 17-18

Looking ahead to the next academic year, FWAF intends to continue advocating for quality mental health care for faculty and will voice its support for Counseling & Psychological Services to receive additional resources.

FWAF will also continue to engage stakeholders in issues related to campus safety and the need for a cohesive emergency response plan. FWAF also believes that current campus buildings need to be upgraded to include adequate safety features; new buildings under the 2020 Project should be outfitted with safety features; the campus should install a PA system for announcement and instructions in emergencies; safety procedure workshops should be offered for instructors and staff so they can help students during emergencies and lock downs, and finally, unit 18 lecturers and graduate student instructors should have a private space to consult with students who are in distress.

FWAF looks forward to continue working with Associate Chancellor Putney and the future Director of Public Safety to implement the Police Advisory Board.

Finally, FWAF hopes to continue working on an issue it raised at the end of this academic year in consultation with the chairs of D&E and UGC, regarding Senate and non-Senate lecturer lines within the context of future campus academic planning.

Systemwide Committee Updates

- University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) updates. FWAF member Sean Malloy continued in his role as the UCM representative to the UCFW, and kept FWAF members informed of the major items of discussion this academic year:
 - Updates on UC health plans
 - The systemwide Senate's efforts to bring into balance the policies on same-sex and opposite-sex domestic partnerships and marriages.
 - UCFW's response to the President's travel ban was endorsed by Academic Council. The response did not confine itself to the impact of the ban on faculty, students, and staff, rather, it

- highlighted the general xenophobia that motivated the implementation of the ban.
- UCFW proposed a systemwide police advisory board in addition to each campus version of the same.
 - 3% raise of faculty salaries. As with the previous raise, discussions at systemwide include dividing the extra money into two pools: 1.5% raise across the board and 1.5% to be used at the discretion of each Chancellor to address salary inequities and compression. UCFW members advocated for across the board raises and establishing separate funds for inequity and compression.
 - Discussion around the protection of faculty given the current political climate.
 - UCFW was concerned over the proposed revisions to APM 285, 210, 133, and 740 that would re-designate the L(P)SOE series to “Teaching Professor”, as some on the committee believed it implies that ladder-rank faculty do not serve the UC teaching mission.
- University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) updates. FWAF Chair Jayson Beaster-Jones represented FWAF on UCAF and updated FWAF members on the following major topics of discussion:
 - Cybersecurity updates, specifically, the implementation of FireEye. UCAF advised members to remain cognizant of human subject data and the importance of maintaining a robust cybersecurity regimen for faculty who conduct research using human subjects.
 - Free speech issues following the 2016 presidential election. UCAF members discussed cadres of aggrieved students and their interactions with faculty members.
 - UCAF circulated a draft memo to its members in response to the systemwide statement condemning anti-Semitism.
 - UCAF drafted guidelines on academic freedom given the current political climate.

Systemwide Review Items

- FWAF reviewed and endorsed the revisions to the G-28 travel policy as the modifications made the policy more family-friendly, and, endorsed the revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 which clarified the scope of the University Committee on International Education.

Campus Review Items

- FWAF reviewed and endorsed the newly-drafted guide to Senate committee membership and the purpose and practice of executive session; declined to endorse the Committee on Rules and Elections' (CRE) Recommended Voting Guidelines in Academic Personnel Cases, as FWAF took issue with CRE's recommendation that faculty members can only vote on cases at their rank or below, as it implies that faculty below the rank of Full Professor are somehow intellectually incapable of judging the academic work of those at higher levels and that faculty at lower ranks are unable to be objective while evaluating their colleagues' work; and endorsed the Committee for Diversity and Equity's proposed guidelines for the appointment and reappointment of endowed chairs to be incorporated in the MAPP.

Respectfully submitted:

FWAF members:

Jayson Beaster-Jones (SSHA), Chair, UCAF representative

Virginia Adán-Lifante (SSHA), Vice Chair

Laura Hamilton (SSHA)

Carolin Frank (SNS)

Changqing Li (SOE)

UCFW representative:

Sean Malloy (SSHA)

Ex officio, non-voting member:

Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

Staff:

Simrin Takhar

**GRADUATE COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017**

During the academic year 2016-2017, the Graduate Council (GC) met 11 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw [II.IV.3.B](#). The issues that GC considered and acted on this year follow.

Administrative Structure

The GC operated with three standing subcommittees that met via email throughout the year:

- The CRF Subcommittee reviewed all requests for new graduate courses, and modifications of existing courses, and provided recommendations to the council as a whole.
 - Membership: Ramesh Balasubramaniam (SSHA), Andy LiWang (SNS), Ming-Hsuan Yang (SOE)

- The Awards Subcommittee reviewed guidelines and applications, and provided recommendations on awardees to the Graduate Division. To keep the review responsibilities of GC reasonable, GC released reviewing responsibilities for more specialized, smaller fellowships to the Graduate Division, and retained review of the following fellowships: Faculty Mentor Program Fellowship, Fletcher Jones, Graduate Student Opportunity Program Fellowship, Miguel Velez Scholarship, President's Dissertation Year Fellowship, Outstanding Teaching Award, Will Shadish Fellowship, Chancellor's Graduate Fellowship, Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship, and the Graduate Dean's Recruitment Fellowship.
 - Membership: Nancy Burke (SSHA, Chair). To manage the workload, Graduate Council expanded the review panel to include graduate group representatives external to GC. Graduate Council reviewed the final rankings and made the final recommendation to the Graduate Division.

- The Policy Subcommittee provided the initial review of all graduate-related policies, making recommendations to the council as a whole.
 - Membership: Teamrat Ghezzehei (SNS) and Hrant Hrachian (SNS)

- GC added informal consultants to meetings as necessary, including staff representatives from Graduate Division and the Registrar.

CCGA Proposals and the IIGP

GC reviewed two CCGA proposals for new graduate groups and associated degree programs. The proposal for a Master of Management (MM) program in Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology (MIST) was approved by Graduate Council on November 14, 2016, by CCGA in June 2017, and the President in July 2017. GC requested revisions and resubmittal for the second proposal, a program emerging from the BEST emphasis of the IIGP. Masters and doctoral degrees in Economics and Public Health, that were approved by GC in AY 2016-17, were approved for implementation by the system.

GC submitted to CCGA a request to extend the IIGP through AY 2017-18. This request was approved by CCGA on June 16, 2017. In its approval letter, CCGA emphasized its desire that the programs emerging from the remaining two emphases, EECS and BEST, advance toward CCGA approved status during AY 2017-18.

Proposals for Concentrations

GC approved a proposal for a concentration in Molecular and Cellular Biology in the Quantitative and Systems Biology Ph.D. program, effective fall 2017. This is the first concentration approved under the policy for establishing concentrations and designated emphases approved by GC in AY 2015-16.

Program Review

Following the recommendation from the Periodic Oversight Review Committee (PROC), GC closed the program review of the Environmental Systems program. GC thanked ES for piloting the graduate program review process at UC Merced, and echoed PROC's recognition of the excellent precedent established by this review. GC noted that ES's next program review has been scheduled to begin in Spring 2022.

On May 2, 2017, GC approved a revised program review schedule proposed by PROC. The revisions align the program review cycle to revisions to the program review policies enacted in May 2014.

Graduate Course Requests

GC approved 34 requests for new courses or revisions to existing courses. This included the first six Extension courses approved under GC's new procedures for reviewing and approving X300 and X400 courses (see policies below).

GC considered a renewed request from Graduate Division to offer, under a Graduate Division prefix, a professional development course open to graduate students from all programs. Following discussion, and in consultation with the Registrar, GC and Graduate Division agreed to pilot the course as a cross-listed, 290 course for up to three offerings. With sufficient student and program interest, the course could eventually be shifted to a unique and permanent course subject/number.

Continuing work initiated in AY 2015-16, the Curriculum Proposal and Management Information System (CPMIS) Committee selected Curriculog as the campus' new curriculum management system, and initiated the process for implementing the software in AY 2017-18. Once implemented all graduate course requests will be handled through the new system.

Graduate Student Appointments as Instructor of Record for Upper Division Courses

Graduate Council considered, and approved jointly with UGC, more than 14 requests to appoint graduate students as instructors for upper division courses for AY 2017-18. This stimulated the development of related policy (see Graduate Policies below).

Graduate Policies

Graduate Policy Development

- GC approved a process for the review and approval of X300 and X400 Extension courses. This process was added to the *Graduate Course Approval and CRF Process* policy.
- GC revised the *Non-Academic Senate Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses* policy to permit graduate students to be employed as teaching assistants for graduate courses if three conditions are met: the TA has advanced to candidacy for the Ph.D. degree and/or has suitable expertise in the course topic, the TA will not be involved in handling final course grades, and the instructor of record ensures TAs are appropriately supervised to avoid any conflicts or perceived conflicts.

- GC approved two sets of revisions to the *Graduate Advisor's Handbook*. With the second set of revisions, the handbook was renamed the *Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook*. The second revision was approved on August 7, 2017 for implementation in fall 2017.
- GC tabled for consideration in AY 2017-18 a request from Extension to develop policy and procedures for the review and approval of Extension certificate programs.
- GC initiated, in consultation with UGC, a policy to guide the process by which graduate students are appointed as instructors for record for upper division courses. The policy will be completed in fall 2017.
- In consultation with UGC, GC revised the *Policy on the Posthumous Awarding of Degrees and Certificates of Attendance*, establishing more generous standards for awarding a posthumous doctoral degree.
- Graduate Council considered and ultimately declined a request from the School of Engineering to lower the TOEFL threshold for international students, and allow each program to have its own GRE admissions threshold. In declining this request, GC noted its desire to maintain uniformity of general admissions standards across schools and programs.

Graduate Group Policies and Procedures

- GC reviewed and approved revised Policies and Procedures for the following programs: Applied Math, Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Interdisciplinary Humanities, Mechanical Engineering, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology. GC requested and revisions are pending for Public Health, Cognitive and Information Sciences, Environmental Systems, and Physics.

Graduate Group Bylaws

- GC did not receive for review any requests for revisions to Graduate Group Bylaws.

Senate Awards

GC revised the call for the Senate Award for Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship, adding to it a nomination form and a list of past recipients. Following the process outlined in the call for the award, Graduate Council ultimately recommended Jan Wallander for the award.

Consultations with Administrative Leadership

Graduate Council consulted with the Provost/EVC Peterson and the Registrar over the course of the year.

Campus Review Items & Other Senate Chair Requests for Comment

GC commented on the following items:

- Noted to the Senate Chair that it would like school executive committees consulting with the schools deans regarding graduate student funding, Teaching Assistant policies, USAP allocations and graduate scholarships awarded by the Schools. (11/29/2016)
- Made recommendations to the Senate Chair regarding a proposed incentive plan for revenue generating Master's Degree programs. (12/19/2016)
- Made recommendations to the Senate Chair regarding proposals for five new academic units in the School of Engineering. GC ultimately endorsed the proposals following the consideration of the school's response the proposals. (5/23/2017)
- Made recommendations to the Senate Chair regarding the proposal that the campus endorse the Open Access 2020 Expression of Interest. (5/15/2017)

- Endorsed the proposal for a new undergraduate major in Philosophy (5/15/2017)
- Made recommendations to the Senate Chair regarding the draft campus *Draft Policy on Assurance of Laboratory Safety Compliance*. (5/15/2017)
- Endorsed the Committee on Research's May 15, 2017 memo requesting the UC Merced Academic Senate work with the Office of Research and Economic Development, as well as the Graduate Division, to pursue options for ameliorating the negative impact on research of recent increases to postdoctoral scholar salaries. (5/15/2017)

GC declined to comment on the following items:

- Proposal to Discontinue the Services Science Minor (9/12/2016)
- Proposal for a Heritage Studies Minor (9/21/2016)
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaws for the Committee on Diversity and Equity (10/5/2016)
- Request for review of the Writing Center Report (10/7/2016)
- Proposed revisions to the MAPP regarding the process for appointing endowed chairs (11/29/2017)
- Draft campus Student Success Definition (12/13/2017)
- Proposed revisions to UGC's CRF policy (12/14/2016)
- Revised Report from the Task Force on University Honors (1/17/2017)
- Draft UC Merced Policy for Access to Student Data (1/17/2017)
- Proposal for a Major in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies (4/6/2017)
- Proposal for an English Honor's Program (4/6/2017)
- Proposal for a GE Program (4/6/2017)
- Guide to Senate Committee Membership and Purpose and Practice of Executive Session (4/10/2017)
- Proposal for a Minor in Management Analytics and Decision Making (4/10/2017)

System Review Items

GC declined to comment on the following review items:

- Proposed technical revisions to APM – 190, Appendix G (10/3/2016)
- Proposed Presidential Policy on International Activities (10/24/2016)
- Proposed revisions to APM 015, APM 016, and Senate Bylaw 336 (10/24/2016)
- Recommendations for Future Faculty Salary Equity Analyses (11/29/2016)
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 –UCIE (12/8/2016)
- Proposed revisions to the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) Policy (12/8/2017)
- Proposed revisions to the Presidential Nondiscrimination Policy and APM 015 (12/8/2017)
- Proposed revisions to the G-28 Travel Regulations (1/17/2017)
- Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 630.D (2/24/2017)
- Draft Presidential Policy on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) (3/24/2017)
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Export Controls (4/25/2017)

Respectfully submitted,

Ramesh Balasubramaniam, Chair and CCGA Representative (SSHA)

Teamrat Ghezzehei, Vice Chair (SNS)

Nancy Burke (SSHA)

Hrant Hratchian (SNS)

Andy LiWang (SNS)

Fabian Filipp (SNS)

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DIVISION**

ACADEMIC SENATE –MERCED

Fred Wolf (SNS)
Ming-Hsuan Yang (SOE)

Ex-Officio

Susan Amussen, Divisional Council Chair (SSHA)
Kurt Schnier, Divisional Council Vice Chair (SSHA)
Marjorie Zatz, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education

Student Representative

Nicholas Dove (SNS)

Senate Staff

Gregory Fellin, Senate Senior Analyst
Laura Martin, Executive Director, Academic Senate

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
ANNUAL REPORT
2016-2017**

To The Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its standing subcommittees held a total of 14 regularly scheduled in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's [Senate Bylaw II.IV.2](#). Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate subcommittee(s), followed by full Council review and action. The structure of UGC and the issues that the Council considered this year are described briefly below.

Undergraduate Council Organization

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

- General Education (GESC), chaired by Professor Jack Vevea
- Admissions and Financial Aid, chaired by UGC Member and BOARS Representative Christopher Viney
- Undergraduate Academic Programs/Policies/Courses, chaired by UGC Chair and UCEP Representative Anne Zanzucchi

In addition, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed for the reviews of nominations for the Undergraduate Distinguished Teaching Awards for Faculty and for Non-Senate Faculty, and for the review of the Catalog.

UGC received regular updates on systemwide committees' activities from UC Merced representatives on the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), the University Committee on International Education (UCIE), and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). All these systemwide committees are represented by UGC members. GESC representative David Jennings, GESC Chair Jack Vevea, and UGC Vice Chair and PROC representative Mario Sifuentez provided regular updates on General Education and on the Periodic Review and Oversight Committee (PROC) activities. Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Charles Nies, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Whitt, and Director of Admissions Ruiz were also invited to update UGC regularly on enrollment, admissions, and activities related to undergraduate education.

Campus Review Items

1) Discontinuation of Services Science Minor

The proposal to discontinue this minor was approved by UGC in September 2016.

2) Master of Management (MM) program in Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology (MIST).

In October 2016, UGC recommended that the University launch this program on a "pilot" or "proof of concept" basis to gauge potential demand, before investing more faculty lines.

3) General Education Program Learning Outcomes

On November 16, 2016 the Undergraduate Council considered the General Education Subcommittee's request for endorsement of the General Education Program Learning Outcomes. UGC voted to endorse the PLOs. As a future item in Spring 2017 and a long-term policy element, UGC asked for collaboration with the GESC on a CRF process for reviewing and approving GE courses.

4) Role of School Executive Committees

UGC has maintained strong relationships with Executive Committees by including guests and consultants across Schools. As an open invitation, UGC encouraged Executive Committee chairs to feel welcome to meet with the UGC Chair and Vice Chair or the UGC at any point for synergies and planning. UGC's goal is to improve processes related to academic planning.

5) DivCo Summer sessions memo

UGC requested clarification regarding the formula related to unit 18 lecturers summer salary (\$10,000 cap as 1/9 salary or a one course salary). Chair Zanzucchi reported on this item at the November 17 DivCo meeting.

6) Access to Student Data Policy

In January 2017, UGC discussed the Access to Student Data policy, noting that the dual consultation with the Registrar's Office and Institutional Research & Decision Support formalized current practice in useful ways. UGC supported these procedures for how student data will be accessed and distributed.

7) Master's Program Incentive Plan

In January 2017, UGC offered the following comments on this proposal.

- UGC encouraged continued planning to explore and define how the professional, non-academic, non-research STEM field careers proposed in this plan are differentiated from University Extension, which similarly is engaged in self-paying professional graduate coursework.
- The proposal noted that self-paying graduate students "do not require the same concentrated, individualized faculty time as students in thesis tracks." UGC wondered what the impact of less faculty time might be.
- While instructional benefits are noted, in terms of profit and minimized investment in the graduate student needs, UGC requested a description of potential consequences or challenges.

8) Revised Undergraduate Course Review Policy

UGC proposed revisions to the CRFs policy and solicited feedback from key campus stakeholders in spring and summer 2016, and on December 2, 2016. Comments were provided by the school assessment coordinators, the ALO, the Graduate Council, the Registrar, and the SNS Executive Committee. The UGC revisions addressed comments received and included the following elements:

- A refinement of the general review and approval process of CRFs
- Addition of General Education outcomes (approved by UGC in November 2016)
- Integration of existing policies related to credit hours and course outlines
- Defined parameters related to online courses

At its January 23 meeting, the Undergraduate Council unanimously approved revisions to the Procedures and Policies for Approval of New Undergraduate Courses and Undergraduate Course Changes, effective March 2, 2017.

9) Revised Calls for Senate Awards for Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching (Senate and Non-Senate Faculty)

The revisions consisted of the following and were approved by UGC on January 23.

- 1) Addition of a statement on contributions to diversity
- 2) Clarification of the selection process
- 3) Addition of an undergraduate student representative to the membership of the call for Non-Senate Faculty
- 4) Addition of lists of past nominees
- 5) Addition of nomination forms

The revisions were approved by DivCo in February 2017.

10) CAPRA's faculty hiring model analysis and Provost Peterson's faculty hiring plan

In February, UGC encouraged CAPRA to continue developing criteria that address FTE hiring that emphasize high-quality teaching in a research university context as part of valuing the campus's educational mission. The current criteria could be enhanced to speak more fully to projected enrollment, impacted course offerings, and teaching specialization as part of hiring considerations. UGC hopes that CAPRA and the Provost will continue to advise on a robust and responsive approach to faculty hiring to support our comprehensive mission.

11) World Heritage Minor in SSHA

This proposal was previously submitted to the Senate for review as the Heritage Studies Minor. In light of comments provided by the Senate, the program co-chairs provided some clarification on the proposed minor and changed the program's name to World Heritage. On February 27, The Undergraduate Council unanimously voted in favor of approving the minor, effective Fall 2017.

12) University Honors Proposal

In December 2014 the Provost asked VPDUE Whitt and former Special Assistant to the Chancellor Lawrence to co-chair a task force charged with developing an institution-wide Honors program. The task force membership included Senate faculty representatives Jack Vevea, Mario Sifuentez, Hrant Hratchian, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and undergraduate students. The task force came to the conclusion that it should recommend a University Honors program. In 2015, the Academic Senate reviewed the task force report and recommended review during the following academic year, with potential intersections with General Education program revision.

A revised proposal was considered by the Senate in 2016 and 2017. On February 13, UGC issued the following recommendations on the proposal:

- UGC accepted the task force report, as it responded to the Provost's call for exploratory review.
- UGC endorsed the development of an academic program plan. The proposal is a university-wide academic program, and while the student cohort is specialized, the scope is institutional. Eventually, the University Honors program will engage in academic program review, akin to major / minor programs and General Education. This academic program proposal would be based on the fundamentals of the task force report and could address the topics raised in previous and current Senate reviews.

13) Proposal for a Critical Race and Ethnic Studies Major

The proposal for a CRES major was distributed to the Chairs of Senate Committees, School Curriculum Committees, and School Executive Committees. All committee comments and the program's response were sent to UGC for consideration before final recommendation. At its May 8, 2107 meeting, UGC found the program's response to questions raised by the Senate to be detailed and comprehensive. UGC approved the Proposal for a Major in Critical Race and Ethnic Studies, effective fall 2017.

14) General Education Program

UGC received regular updates on GE activities and discussed the GE program proposal over the course of several meetings throughout the academic year. The GE Proposal was sent to the campus faculty in Spring 2017 with comments requested by April 5, 2017. On May 22, 2017, the Undergraduate Council voted in favor of the GE proposal. In its May 24 memo to the Senate Chair, UGC noted that this endorsement reflected the committee's analysis that the program is comprehensive and thoughtfully designed. UGC recognized that the timing of the GE re-design, beginning in Fall 2018, is significant, with externally driven mandates (e.g. re-affirmation of accreditation) and campus academic planning (e.g. 2020 growth and academic planning). Much of UGC's dialogue on the GE proposal focused on institutional context, particularly campus resource planning. UGC offered the following priorities vis-à-vis the GE proposal:

- The shift from what essentially has been three school-based GE programs to a campus-wide program will be significant on a practical and conceptual level. In particular, developing an effective Senate-administrative governance structure for the program will be crucial.
- The GE proposal follows the program review recommendations by establishing structured GE experiences within majors as well as two common GE courses (Spark seminars for freshmen and Crossroads courses for juniors). In developing this design, the emphasis was on serving both the needs of majors/programs while providing GE to non-majors. Nevertheless, concerns were noted about how this re-design will impact the delivery of majors and research priorities. To ensure successful implementation, UGC strongly recommended School-based and bylaw-based consultation to plan participation and evaluate localized impacts (benefits and costs). By broadening the number of programs and, thus, Senate faculty involved in GE delivery, the program restructures resources within majors and requires strategic investment in the common first and third year student experiences.
- Unless addressed, the potential mismatch between instructional demand and resources will only increase with enrollment growth. Historically, faculty hiring has focused on meeting the demand for core and elective courses for undergraduate majors and, more recently, for graduate education; General Education has been in the background as available seats to non-major students in major courses. Implementation of this proposal will require General Education be explicitly integrated into faculty instructional workload planning. Further, as noted previously, this may disproportionately impact some programs that have not previously contributed extensively to GE. Thus, it will be important to pursue comprehensive academic planning. UGC urged the campus to engage in strategic academic planning, in light of major programs and in support of a transition to a campus-wide GE program.
- The rate at which the program is rolled-out should be projected and continuously adjusted in the context of committed and available resources. The campus needs this planning to be feasible and functional. Program implementation, then, would benefit from clear language that outlines a timetable for documentable consultation through which the roll-out scale and schedule can be revised in the context of actual resources provided.

15) Guide to Senate Committee Membership and the Purpose and Practice of Executive Session

Per DivCo's request, UGC offered comments on the proposed guide for committee membership.

16) English Honors Proposal

The English Honors proposal was inspired by and based on the existing History Honors program. To ensure consistency between academic policies and UCM Regulations, UGC encouraged 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 approved the English Honors proposal on March 13, 2017.

17) SOE Bylaw Units

In, April, UGC offered comments on the proposal to establish five bylaw units in the School of Engineering. The proposals were revised to address senate committee comments. At its May 8 meeting, UGC discussed SOE's response to the Senate comments. Members found the responses to questions raised by Divisional Council and, in turn, Undergraduate Council, to be direct in some ways and indirect in other instances. UGC endorsed the bylaw proposals. This endorsement, though, came with a suggested clarification and continued encouragement to address a prior UGC recommendation.

18) Policy on the Posthumous Awarding of Degrees and Certificates of Attendance.

In response to Graduate Council's request, UGC reviewed and endorsed the proposed revisions to the Policy on the Posthumous Awarding of Degrees and Certificates of Attendance as it seemed to provide a greater range for the possibilities of bestowing posthumous degrees.

19) FWAF Statement on Senate and Non-Senate Lecturer Lines

At its May 8, 2017 meeting, UGC endorsed the statement, with a comment from membership emphasizing that UGC co-signing the statement is recommendable as this topic and planning questions are very important to sustaining high-quality undergraduate education, from individual classrooms all the way to campus-level academic planning.

20) Proposed Revisions to the Administrative Policy Governing the Establishment or Revision of Academic Degree Programs.

At its May 8, 2107 meeting, UGC endorsed the proposed revisions to this policy. In discussing the policy, members recommended that, to support shared awareness and planning, the policy specify that UGC, and the Senate more generally, receive copies of pre-proposals submitted to PROC together with copies of PROC's response. Looking forward, in AY 2017-18 UGC will continue to facilitate the Senate's working group focused on updating undergraduate and graduate policies for the approval of new academic programs, with the goal of finalizing policies for inclusion in a single Senate-Administration policy governing the review and approval of new academic programs.

21) In consultation with the Graduate Council, UGC reviewed and endorsed requests for exceptions exception to allow a senior Ph.D. student to teach an upper level course.

22) Requests from the Periodic Review Oversight Committee

UGC made recommendations on the following program reviews items:

- Psychology major
- Management and Business Economics major
- Computer Science and Engineering major
- Approval of Revised Academic Program Review Schedule

23) Request from the WSCUC Steering Committee

In response to a request from the Provost, Professor Christopher Viney volunteered to serve as the UGC representative on the WSCUC Steering Committee.

24) Petitions of Academic Policy

UGC considered and made recommendations on five student petitions.

25) Curriculog

The campus is implementing a Curriculum Management System, which will streamline the submission and approvals of all undergraduate and graduate courses as a basis for the campus catalog. A team of leads from Graduate Council, Information Technology, Registrar's Office and Undergraduate Council, along with representatives from the Schools and the Academic Senate Office, have partnered and selected Digarc Curriculog as a system that reflects faculty and staff priorities. The implementation phase of this project has started, and all faculty will be using the new system in the spring of 2018.

26) CRFs

UGC reviewed and made recommendations on 257 CRFs.

Systemwide Review Items

UGC commented on the following systemwide items:

- UGC discussed a UCEP report on components of the Budget Framework Initiative's (BFI), with particular focus on Credit by Examination. UCEP explored recommendations for a common policy for P/NP or grade using credit by Examination.
- UCEP's Report on Advanced Placement Exams
- Draft Presidential Policy on International Activities
- Salary Equity (UGC discussed this item and viewed it as informational. UGC did not issue a memo).
- Proposed Revisions to Bylaw 182 - University Committee on International Education.
- Proposed Revised APM Sections 278 and 210-6 PDF
- Senate Bylaw 336
- APM 285-210-133-740 pertaining to the re-designation of the L(P)SOE series to "Teaching Professor".

The following items were discussed during AY 16-17 with recommendations to follow in AY 17-18

- 1) UGC Bylaws
- 2) Proposal for Philosophy Major
- 3) Minor in Management Analytics and Decision-making (MAD)
- 4) UGC Handbook
- 5) ASUCM RRR Week Proposal
- 6) American Studies Minor

UGC Guests:

November 14, 2016: Andy Boyd, Executive Director, Business and Financial Strategic Initiatives Center, and Sara Anastos, Project Coordinator, Real Estate Services
 December 12, 2016: Provost Peterson

Respectfully Submitted,

Anne Zanzucchi, Chair and UCEP Representative

Mario Sifuentez, Vice Chair and PROC Representative

Christopher Viney, Chair of the Admissions & Financial Subcommittee and BOARS Representative

Laura Beaster-Jones, Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee (SNS)

Paul Gibbons (SSHA)

Nigel Hatton, Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee (SSHA)

Robert Innes (SSHA)

David Jennings, GESC and UCOPE Representative (SSHA)

Yanbao Ma, UCIE Representative (SOE)

Linda-Anne Rebhun, Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee (SSHA)

Yanbao Ma, School of Engineering, UCIE Representative

Ex-Officio (non-voting):

Andre Frise, Undergraduate Student Representative

Charles Nies, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Susan Amussen, Senate Chair (SSHA)

Kurt Schnier, Senate Vice Chair (SSHA)

Elizabeth Whitt, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education

Non-Senate Faculty Representatives (non-voting):

Ross Avila (SSHA)

David Samper (MWP)

Staff

Fatima Paul (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 RULES AND ELECTIONS
LIN TIAN, CHAIR
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

NOVEMBER 16, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

RE: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW

The Committee on Rules and Elections reviewed the proposed revisions to the CAP section of Division Bylaw (Part II, Title III.3) establishing Point A ("Membership") to include language articulating the membership of the Reserve CAP and details of the RCAP membership. CRE members unanimously approved the proposed Bylaw modifications as presented.

We thank you 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; fax (209) 228-7955

DATE: NOVEMBER 8, 2017

TO: LIN TIAN, CHAIR, CRE

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

RE: DRAFT REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW

At its November 6, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed the appended revisions to the CAP section of Division bylaw (Part II. Title III.3). 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 November 28, 2017 Meeting of the Division.

The revisions endorsed by Divisional Council address recommendations made by the Committee on Research in response to campus review of this item (appended). Specifically, CoR proposed that point A ("Membership") be revised to specify the presence of both a CAP and a Reserve CAP, thereby providing a better transition to Point D ("Reserve CAP"). In keeping with this recommendation, point A. Membership has been revised to include a sentence articulating the membership of the Reserve CAP and, commensurately, details of the RCAP membership (i.e. "of six members") struck from point D. The term length was also removed from point D. since it repeats point B.

Divisional Council also discussed the specification in point D. that "the committee will consist of full professors." While CoC appoints only full professors to CAP, DivCo recommended enshrining that practice in bylaw. Thus, a final sentence was added to point A, and the corresponding text deleted from point D.

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 August 28, 2017, the draft bylaw revision was circulated to the standing committees of the Division and the school executive committees. CAPRA, D&E, FWF, and UGC endorsed the proposed revisions (appended). CoC, GC, the SNS Executive Committee, and the SSHA Executive Committee appreciated the opportunity to opine, but declined to comment.

Divisional Council thanks CRE for its consideration of this matter.

CC: Divisional Council
Senate Office

[Merced Division Bylaws](#)

Part II. Title 3.2.

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate. The reserve CAP consists of six members who are members of the Division. Members will be full professors.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) ~~of six members~~ will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. ~~The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty.~~ The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. ~~Members will ordinarily serve a three year term, which may be renewed.~~ If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

[Merced Division Bylaws](#)

Part II. Title 3.2.

- B. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate. The reserve CAP consists of six members who are members of the Division. Members will be full professors.

- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.

- C. Duties
 - 2. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 4. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 5. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.

- E. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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

October 26, 2017

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: COR Comments on Proposed UCM Bylaw Revisions to Establish a Reserve CAP

At its October 18, 2017 meeting, COR discussed the proposed revision to the UCM Academic Senate Bylaws that would empanel a Reserve CAP (RCAP). The committee identified one way in which the proposed revision could be improved. As the revision is currently written, points A ("Membership"), B ("Term"), and C ("Duties") under Part II. Title 3.2. all refer to the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The newly-written Point D then introduces the Reserve CAP. COR suggests that these bylaws could be clarified by modifying point A ("Membership") to specify the presence of both a CAP and a Reserve CAP, thereby providing a better transition to Point D.

COR appreciates this 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

SEPTEMBER 8, 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: BYLAW REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW ESTABLISHING A RESERVE CAP

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Part II. Title III. 2.](#) of the Division Bylaws. The proposed revisions would establish a six-member reserve CAP (RCAP) as a standing committee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The proposed revisions have been put forth by the Committee on Rules and Elections, following a request for advice from Divisional Council on how best to empanel a reserve CAP (see attached). CRE's recommendation is modeled on the approach taken by the [Riverside Division](#).

At its February 16, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a reserve CAP (appended). This decision followed consultation with the Vice Provost of the Faculty, and deliberations addressing the need for and role of a reserve CAP. As noted in the cover memo for the proposal, the reserve CAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members¹. Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures ([MAPP](#)), these types of actions are addressed by an ad-hoc committee established for each review by the Vice Provost of the Faculty. A standing reserve CAP will simplify and speed up the review process for these types of cases. It will also place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since CoC, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. The VPF supports this initiative.

The approved proposal recommends a committee with balanced representation across all three schools, with ideally at least two representatives from each school (i.e. a minimum of six members). This composition is intended to promote an appropriately broad range of disciplines on the committee, and thus mitigate against the need for additional ad-hoc representation. The RCAP would expect to handle only a few cases a year, at most.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed bylaw revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu by close of business, **Friday, October 27**, in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on Monday, November 6.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (2)

¹ The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

AUGUST 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Lin Tian", is written over the "FROM" line.

RE: EMPANELING THE RESERVE CAP

At its March 21 and April 25, 2017 meetings, CRE discussed DivCo's question regarding the process by which the newly approved reserve CAP (RCAP) would be empaneled. Following research on how RCAPs are empaneled on other campuses, CRE recommends establishing the RCAP as a standing subcommittee of CAP in CAP bylaw. Suggested language is appended. This approach is modeled on the [Riverside Division](#).

CRE also discussed whether the establishment of the RCAP as a standing committee would necessitate its representation on Divisional Council. CRE concluded that it would not be necessary given that CAP is already represented on DivCo.

Finally, CRE members noted that the proposed composition of six members seemed fairly large relative to the population of full professors on campus, and questions were raised about CoC's ability to populate an additional committee.

CRE is happy to address any additional questions the Divisional Council may have.

CC: CRE
Senate Office

Encl (2)

Merced Division Bylaws

Part II. Title 3.2.

2. Academic Personnel

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
 - 1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Members will ordinarily serve a three-year term, which may be renewed. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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 PERSONNEL (CAP)
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
ilopez-calvo@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

January 13, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ignacio López-Calvo".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg Camfield".

Re: Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

For Divisional Council's consideration, please find attached a draft proposal to empanel a standing reserve CAP (RCAP) at UC Merced.

Empaneling a standing RCAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address 1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each review.

The attached proposal outlines the charge to the proposed RCAP, proposed membership, term of appointment, appointment process, and procedures for the review of cases.

We look forward to DivCo's input.

cc: Senate Office

Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

Charge: A Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) will be established for the purposes of reviewing 1) case files of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year) and 2) appeals by faculty members. RCAP's recommendations, as with the regular CAP, are made to the Provost/EVC as the Chancellor's designee.

Appointment: The Committee on Committees will appoint the RCAP members from the pool of eligible UCM Full Professors. This pool will include former UCM (internal) CAP members, former AP chairs, former Bylaw 55 unit chairs with experience in AP functions, or other Full Professors with significant academic personnel experience beyond participation on a review committee or a faculty search committee. Each RCAP member will be appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed. RCAP as a whole should reflect a balanced representation across the schools to ensure a wide range of disciplines on the committee. Ideally, this committee would include at least two representatives per school. Since RCAP does not meet regularly, service on the committee is not compensated.

The RCAP will select its own chair who will thenceforth convene the committee as necessary. The chair may convene a subset of as few as five RCAP members for reviewing any case. When handling appeals, if RCAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise and without conflicts of interest, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. Consistent with the procedures for other Senate committees, the list of RCAP members will be posted on the Senate website.

Procedures: In consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), the CAP analyst will notify the RCAP chair when case files need to be reviewed and will provide the RCAP members with access to the files. The CAP analyst will arrange for all meeting logistics. As with regular CAP procedures, once the RCAP has finalized a report on a given case file, the CAP analyst will transmit the report to the Provost/EVC, VPF, and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

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

October 19, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

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

Re: Proposed Revisions to Division Bylaws – Reserve CAP

Per your request, CAPRA reviewed the proposed revisions to Part II. Title III. 2. of the Division Bylaws that would establish a six-member Reserve CAP. CAPRA endorses the proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine.

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

SEPTEMBER 8, 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: BYLAW REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW ESTABLISHING A RESERVE CAP

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Part II. Title III. 2.](#) of the Division Bylaws. The proposed revisions would establish a six-member reserve CAP (RCAP) as a standing committee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The proposed revisions have been put forth by the Committee on Rules and Elections, following a request for advice from Divisional Council on how best to empanel a reserve CAP (see attached). CRE's recommendation is modeled on the approach taken by the [Riverside Division](#).

At its February 16, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a reserve CAP (appended). This decision followed consultation with the Vice Provost of the Faculty, and deliberations addressing the need for and role of a reserve CAP. As noted in the cover memo for the proposal, the reserve CAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members¹. Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures ([MAPP](#)), these types of actions are addressed by an ad-hoc committee established for each review by the Vice Provost of the Faculty. A standing reserve CAP will simplify and speed up the review process for these types of cases. It will also place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since CoC, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. The VPF supports this initiative.

The approved proposal recommends a committee with balanced representation across all three schools, with ideally at least two representatives from each school (i.e. a minimum of six members). This composition is intended to promote an appropriately broad range of disciplines on the committee, and thus mitigate against the need for additional ad-hoc representation. The RCAP would expect to handle only a few cases a year, at most.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed bylaw revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu by close of business, **Friday, October 27**, in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on Monday, November 6.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (2)

¹ The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

AUGUST 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Lin Tian", is written over the "FROM" line.

RE: EMPANELING THE RESERVE CAP

At its March 21 and April 25, 2017 meetings, CRE discussed DivCo's question regarding the process by which the newly approved reserve CAP (RCAP) would be empaneled. Following research on how RCAPs are empaneled on other campuses, CRE recommends establishing the RCAP as a standing subcommittee of CAP in CAP bylaw. Suggested language is appended. This approach is modeled on the [Riverside Division](#).

CRE also discussed whether the establishment of the RCAP as a standing committee would necessitate its representation on Divisional Council. CRE concluded that it would not be necessary given that CAP is already represented on DivCo.

Finally, CRE members noted that the proposed composition of six members seemed fairly large relative to the population of full professors on campus, and questions were raised about CoC's ability to populate an additional committee.

CRE is happy to address any additional questions the Divisional Council may have.

CC: CRE
Senate Office

Encl (2)

Merced Division Bylaws

Part II. Title 3.2.

2. Academic Personnel

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
 - 1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Members will ordinarily serve a three-year term, which may be renewed. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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 PERSONNEL (CAP)
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
ilopez-calvo@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

January 13, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ignacio López-Calvo".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg Camfield".

Re: Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

For Divisional Council's consideration, please find attached a draft proposal to empanel a standing reserve CAP (RCAP) at UC Merced.

Empaneling a standing RCAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address 1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each review.

The attached proposal outlines the charge to the proposed RCAP, proposed membership, term of appointment, appointment process, and procedures for the review of cases.

We look forward to DivCo's input.

cc: Senate Office

Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

Charge: A Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) will be established for the purposes of reviewing 1) case files of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year) and 2) appeals by faculty members. RCAP's recommendations, as with the regular CAP, are made to the Provost/EVC as the Chancellor's designee.

Appointment: The Committee on Committees will appoint the RCAP members from the pool of eligible UCM Full Professors. This pool will include former UCM (internal) CAP members, former AP chairs, former Bylaw 55 unit chairs with experience in AP functions, or other Full Professors with significant academic personnel experience beyond participation on a review committee or a faculty search committee. Each RCAP member will be appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed. RCAP as a whole should reflect a balanced representation across the schools to ensure a wide range of disciplines on the committee. Ideally, this committee would include at least two representatives per school. Since RCAP does not meet regularly, service on the committee is not compensated.

The RCAP will select its own chair who will thenceforth convene the committee as necessary. The chair may convene a subset of as few as five RCAP members for reviewing any case. When handling appeals, if RCAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise and without conflicts of interest, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. Consistent with the procedures for other Senate committees, the list of RCAP members will be posted on the Senate website.

Procedures: In consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), the CAP analyst will notify the RCAP chair when case files need to be reviewed and will provide the RCAP members with access to the files. The CAP analyst will arrange for all meeting logistics. As with regular CAP procedures, once the RCAP has finalized a report on a given case file, the CAP analyst will transmit the report to the Provost/EVC, VPF, and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
COMMITTEE FOR DIVERSITY AND EQUITY
WEI-CHUN CHIN, CHAIR
wchin2@ucmerced.edu

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

October 6, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Wei-Chun Chin, Chair, Committee for Diversity and Equity

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W.C.", is placed to the right of the "From:" line.

Re: Proposed Revisions to UCM Bylaws – Reserve CAP

At its September 21 meeting, the Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E) discussed the proposed revisions to the UCM Bylaws that would empanel a Reserve CAP (RCAP). The RCAP is proposed as a six-member committee who would review the case files of current CAP members, CAP members who have recently termed off the committee, and appeals.

D&E endorses the proposed bylaw revisions, with a request that the future membership of RCAP reflects diversity considerations. To assure this is clear, D&E suggests including “the selection of committee members should consider diversity factors” in the RCAP bylaws.

We appreciate the opportunity to opine.

cc: Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty
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

SEPTEMBER 8, 2017

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

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Amussen", is written over the "FROM:" line.

RE: BYLAW REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW ESTABLISHING A RESERVE CAP

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Part II. Title III. 2.](#) of the Division Bylaws. The proposed revisions would establish a six-member reserve CAP (RCAP) as a standing committee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The proposed revisions have been put forth by the Committee on Rules and Elections, following a request for advice from Divisional Council on how best to empanel a reserve CAP (see attached). CRE's recommendation is modeled on the approach taken by the [Riverside Division](#).

At its February 16, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a reserve CAP (appended). This decision followed consultation with the Vice Provost of the Faculty, and deliberations addressing the need for and role of a reserve CAP. As noted in the cover memo for the proposal, the reserve CAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members¹. Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures ([MAPP](#)), these types of actions are addressed by an ad-hoc committee established for each review by the Vice Provost of the Faculty. A standing reserve CAP will simplify and speed up the review process for these types of cases. It will also place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since CoC, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. The VPF supports this initiative.

The approved proposal recommends a committee with balanced representation across all three schools, with ideally at least two representatives from each school (i.e. a minimum of six members). This composition is intended to promote an appropriately broad range of disciplines on the committee, and thus mitigate against the need for additional ad-hoc representation. The RCAP would expect to handle only a few cases a year, at most.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed bylaw revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu by close of business, **Friday, October 27**, in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on Monday, November 6.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (2)

¹ The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

AUGUST 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Lin Tian", is written over the "FROM" line.

RE: EMPANELING THE RESERVE CAP

At its March 21 and April 25, 2017 meetings, CRE discussed DivCo's question regarding the process by which the newly approved reserve CAP (RCAP) would be empaneled. Following research on how RCAPs are empaneled on other campuses, CRE recommends establishing the RCAP as a standing subcommittee of CAP in CAP bylaw. Suggested language is appended. This approach is modeled on the [Riverside Division](#).

CRE also discussed whether the establishment of the RCAP as a standing committee would necessitate its representation on Divisional Council. CRE concluded that it would not be necessary given that CAP is already represented on DivCo.

Finally, CRE members noted that the proposed composition of six members seemed fairly large relative to the population of full professors on campus, and questions were raised about CoC's ability to populate an additional committee.

CRE is happy to address any additional questions the Divisional Council may have.

CC: CRE
Senate Office

Encl (2)

Merced Division Bylaws

Part II. Title 3.2.

2. Academic Personnel

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
 - 1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Members will ordinarily serve a three-year term, which may be renewed. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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 PERSONNEL (CAP)
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
ilopez-calvo@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

January 13, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ignacio López-Calvo".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg Camfield".

Re: Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

For Divisional Council's consideration, please find attached a draft proposal to empanel a standing reserve CAP (RCAP) at UC Merced.

Empaneling a standing RCAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address 1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each review.

The attached proposal outlines the charge to the proposed RCAP, proposed membership, term of appointment, appointment process, and procedures for the review of cases.

We look forward to DivCo's input.

cc: Senate Office

Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

Charge: A Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) will be established for the purposes of reviewing 1) case files of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year) and 2) appeals by faculty members. RCAP's recommendations, as with the regular CAP, are made to the Provost/EVC as the Chancellor's designee.

Appointment: The Committee on Committees will appoint the RCAP members from the pool of eligible UCM Full Professors. This pool will include former UCM (internal) CAP members, former AP chairs, former Bylaw 55 unit chairs with experience in AP functions, or other Full Professors with significant academic personnel experience beyond participation on a review committee or a faculty search committee. Each RCAP member will be appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed. RCAP as a whole should reflect a balanced representation across the schools to ensure a wide range of disciplines on the committee. Ideally, this committee would include at least two representatives per school. Since RCAP does not meet regularly, service on the committee is not compensated.

The RCAP will select its own chair who will thenceforth convene the committee as necessary. The chair may convene a subset of as few as five RCAP members for reviewing any case. When handling appeals, if RCAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise and without conflicts of interest, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. Consistent with the procedures for other Senate committees, the list of RCAP members will be posted on the Senate website.

Procedures: In consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), the CAP analyst will notify the RCAP chair when case files need to be reviewed and will provide the RCAP members with access to the files. The CAP analyst will arrange for all meeting logistics. As with regular CAP procedures, once the RCAP has finalized a report on a given case file, the CAP analyst will transmit the report to the Provost/EVC, VPF, and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

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 FACULTY WELFARE AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM
SEAN MALLOY, CHAIR
smalloy@ucmerced.edu

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

October 27, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Sean Malloy, Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom (FWAF)

Re: Proposed Revisions to Division Bylaws – Reserve CAP

Per your request, FWAF reviewed the proposed revisions to Part II. Title III. 2. of the Division Bylaws that would establish a six-member Reserve CAP. FWAF endorses the proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine.

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

SEPTEMBER 8, 2017

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

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Amussen", is written over the "FROM:" line of the memo.

RE: BYLAW REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW ESTABLISHING A RESERVE CAP

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Part II. Title III. 2.](#) of the Division Bylaws. The proposed revisions would establish a six-member reserve CAP (RCAP) as a standing committee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The proposed revisions have been put forth by the Committee on Rules and Elections, following a request for advice from Divisional Council on how best to empanel a reserve CAP (see attached). CRE's recommendation is modeled on the approach taken by the [Riverside Division](#).

At its February 16, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a reserve CAP (appended). This decision followed consultation with the Vice Provost of the Faculty, and deliberations addressing the need for and role of a reserve CAP. As noted in the cover memo for the proposal, the reserve CAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members¹. Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures ([MAPP](#)), these types of actions are addressed by an ad-hoc committee established for each review by the Vice Provost of the Faculty. A standing reserve CAP will simplify and speed up the review process for these types of cases. It will also place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since CoC, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. The VPF supports this initiative.

The approved proposal recommends a committee with balanced representation across all three schools, with ideally at least two representatives from each school (i.e. a minimum of six members). This composition is intended to promote an appropriately broad range of disciplines on the committee, and thus mitigate against the need for additional ad-hoc representation. The RCAP would expect to handle only a few cases a year, at most.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed bylaw revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu by close of business, **Friday, October 27**, in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on Monday, November 6.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (2)

¹ The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

AUGUST 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Lin Tian", is written over the "FROM" line.

RE: EMPANELING THE RESERVE CAP

At its March 21 and April 25, 2017 meetings, CRE discussed DivCo's question regarding the process by which the newly approved reserve CAP (RCAP) would be empaneled. Following research on how RCAPs are empaneled on other campuses, CRE recommends establishing the RCAP as a standing subcommittee of CAP in CAP bylaw. Suggested language is appended. This approach is modeled on the [Riverside Division](#).

CRE also discussed whether the establishment of the RCAP as a standing committee would necessitate its representation on Divisional Council. CRE concluded that it would not be necessary given that CAP is already represented on DivCo.

Finally, CRE members noted that the proposed composition of six members seemed fairly large relative to the population of full professors on campus, and questions were raised about CoC's ability to populate an additional committee.

CRE is happy to address any additional questions the Divisional Council may have.

CC: CRE
Senate Office

Encl (2)

Merced Division Bylaws

Part II. Title 3.2.

2. Academic Personnel

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
 - 1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Members will ordinarily serve a three-year term, which may be renewed. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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 PERSONNEL (CAP)
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
ilopez-calvo@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

January 13, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ignacio López-Calvo".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg Camfield".

Re: Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

For Divisional Council's consideration, please find attached a draft proposal to empanel a standing reserve CAP (RCAP) at UC Merced.

Empaneling a standing RCAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address 1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each review.

The attached proposal outlines the charge to the proposed RCAP, proposed membership, term of appointment, appointment process, and procedures for the review of cases.

We look forward to DivCo's input.

cc: Senate Office

Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

Charge: A Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) will be established for the purposes of reviewing 1) case files of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year) and 2) appeals by faculty members. RCAP's recommendations, as with the regular CAP, are made to the Provost/EVC as the Chancellor's designee.

Appointment: The Committee on Committees will appoint the RCAP members from the pool of eligible UCM Full Professors. This pool will include former UCM (internal) CAP members, former AP chairs, former Bylaw 55 unit chairs with experience in AP functions, or other Full Professors with significant academic personnel experience beyond participation on a review committee or a faculty search committee. Each RCAP member will be appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed. RCAP as a whole should reflect a balanced representation across the schools to ensure a wide range of disciplines on the committee. Ideally, this committee would include at least two representatives per school. Since RCAP does not meet regularly, service on the committee is not compensated.

The RCAP will select its own chair who will thenceforth convene the committee as necessary. The chair may convene a subset of as few as five RCAP members for reviewing any case. When handling appeals, if RCAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise and without conflicts of interest, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. Consistent with the procedures for other Senate committees, the list of RCAP members will be posted on the Senate website.

Procedures: In consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), the CAP analyst will notify the RCAP chair when case files need to be reviewed and will provide the RCAP members with access to the files. The CAP analyst will arrange for all meeting logistics. As with regular CAP procedures, once the RCAP has finalized a report on a given case file, the CAP analyst will transmit the report to the Provost/EVC, VPF, and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

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

October 31, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Divisional Council

Re: Proposed Revisions to UCM Bylaws – Reserve CAP

UGC discussed the proposed revisions to Bylaw II. III. 2 that would establish a reserve CAP as a standing committee of CAP. Members endorse the proposal.

We thank you for the opportunity to opine.

Sincerely,

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

Anne Zanzucchi
Chair, Undergraduate Council

Cc: UGC
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

SEPTEMBER 8, 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: BYLAW REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW ESTABLISHING A RESERVE CAP

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Part II. Title III. 2.](#) of the Division Bylaws. The proposed revisions would establish a six-member reserve CAP (RCAP) as a standing committee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The proposed revisions have been put forth by the Committee on Rules and Elections, following a request for advice from Divisional Council on how best to empanel a reserve CAP (see attached). CRE's recommendation is modeled on the approach taken by the [Riverside Division](#).

At its February 16, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a reserve CAP (appended). This decision followed consultation with the Vice Provost of the Faculty, and deliberations addressing the need for and role of a reserve CAP. As noted in the cover memo for the proposal, the reserve CAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members¹. Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures ([MAPP](#)), these types of actions are addressed by an ad-hoc committee established for each review by the Vice Provost of the Faculty. A standing reserve CAP will simplify and speed up the review process for these types of cases. It will also place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since CoC, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. The VPF supports this initiative.

The approved proposal recommends a committee with balanced representation across all three schools, with ideally at least two representatives from each school (i.e. a minimum of six members). This composition is intended to promote an appropriately broad range of disciplines on the committee, and thus mitigate against the need for additional ad-hoc representation. The RCAP would expect to handle only a few cases a year, at most.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed bylaw revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu by close of business, **Friday, October 27**, in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on Monday, November 6.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (2)

¹ The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

AUGUST 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Lin Tian", is written over the "FROM" line.

RE: EMPANELING THE RESERVE CAP

At its March 21 and April 25, 2017 meetings, CRE discussed DivCo's question regarding the process by which the newly approved reserve CAP (RCAP) would be empaneled. Following research on how RCAPs are empaneled on other campuses, CRE recommends establishing the RCAP as a standing subcommittee of CAP in CAP bylaw. Suggested language is appended. This approach is modeled on the [Riverside Division](#).

CRE also discussed whether the establishment of the RCAP as a standing committee would necessitate its representation on Divisional Council. CRE concluded that it would not be necessary given that CAP is already represented on DivCo.

Finally, CRE members noted that the proposed composition of six members seemed fairly large relative to the population of full professors on campus, and questions were raised about CoC's ability to populate an additional committee.

CRE is happy to address any additional questions the Divisional Council may have.

CC: CRE
Senate Office

Encl (2)

Merced Division Bylaws

Part II. Title 3.2.

2. Academic Personnel

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
 - 1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Members will ordinarily serve a three-year term, which may be renewed. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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 PERSONNEL (CAP)
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
ilopez-calvo@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

January 13, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ignacio López-Calvo".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg Camfield".

Re: Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

For Divisional Council's consideration, please find attached a draft proposal to empanel a standing reserve CAP (RCAP) at UC Merced.

Empaneling a standing RCAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address 1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each review.

The attached proposal outlines the charge to the proposed RCAP, proposed membership, term of appointment, appointment process, and procedures for the review of cases.

We look forward to DivCo's input.

cc: Senate Office

Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

Charge: A Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) will be established for the purposes of reviewing 1) case files of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year) and 2) appeals by faculty members. RCAP's recommendations, as with the regular CAP, are made to the Provost/EVC as the Chancellor's designee.

Appointment: The Committee on Committees will appoint the RCAP members from the pool of eligible UCM Full Professors. This pool will include former UCM (internal) CAP members, former AP chairs, former Bylaw 55 unit chairs with experience in AP functions, or other Full Professors with significant academic personnel experience beyond participation on a review committee or a faculty search committee. Each RCAP member will be appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed. RCAP as a whole should reflect a balanced representation across the schools to ensure a wide range of disciplines on the committee. Ideally, this committee would include at least two representatives per school. Since RCAP does not meet regularly, service on the committee is not compensated.

The RCAP will select its own chair who will thenceforth convene the committee as necessary. The chair may convene a subset of as few as five RCAP members for reviewing any case. When handling appeals, if RCAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise and without conflicts of interest, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. Consistent with the procedures for other Senate committees, the list of RCAP members will be posted on the Senate website.

Procedures: In consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), the CAP analyst will notify the RCAP chair when case files need to be reviewed and will provide the RCAP members with access to the files. The CAP analyst will arrange for all meeting logistics. As with regular CAP procedures, once the RCAP has finalized a report on a given case file, the CAP analyst will transmit the report to the Provost/EVC, VPF, and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.

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

SEPTEMBER 8, 2017

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

FROM: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Susan Amussen", is written over the "FROM:" line.

RE: BYLAW REVISIONS TO CAP BYLAW ESTABLISHING A RESERVE CAP

On behalf of Divisional Council, please find appended for review and comment proposed revisions to [Part II. Title III. 2.](#) of the Division Bylaws. The proposed revisions would establish a six-member reserve CAP (RCAP) as a standing committee of the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP). The proposed revisions have been put forth by the Committee on Rules and Elections, following a request for advice from Divisional Council on how best to empanel a reserve CAP (see attached). CRE's recommendation is modeled on the approach taken by the [Riverside Division](#).

At its February 16, 2017 meeting, Divisional Council unanimously approved the proposal to establish a reserve CAP (appended). This decision followed consultation with the Vice Provost of the Faculty, and deliberations addressing the need for and role of a reserve CAP. As noted in the cover memo for the proposal, the reserve CAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address (1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year), and (2) appeals by faculty members¹. Currently, as per the Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures ([MAPP](#)), these types of actions are addressed by an ad-hoc committee established for each review by the Vice Provost of the Faculty. A standing reserve CAP will simplify and speed up the review process for these types of cases. It will also place the composition of the review committee directly under the control of the faculty since CoC, not the VPF, will appoint RCAP members. The VPF supports this initiative.

The approved proposal recommends a committee with balanced representation across all three schools, with ideally at least two representatives from each school (i.e. a minimum of six members). This composition is intended to promote an appropriately broad range of disciplines on the committee, and thus mitigate against the need for additional ad-hoc representation. The RCAP would expect to handle only a few cases a year, at most.

If your committee elects to opine on the proposed bylaw revisions, please send comments to Senatechair@ucmerced.edu by close of business, **Friday, October 27**, in preparation for the Divisional Council meeting on Monday, November 6.

CC: Senate Office
Enc (2)

¹ The appeal process is outlined in section 2014 of the [Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures](#).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
LIN TIAN, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ltian@ucmerced.edu

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

AUGUST 10, 2017

TO: SUSAN AMUSSEN, CHAIR, DIVISIONAL COUNCIL

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Lin Tian", written over a horizontal line.

RE: EMPANELING THE RESERVE CAP

At its March 21 and April 25, 2017 meetings, CRE discussed DivCo's question regarding the process by which the newly approved reserve CAP (RCAP) would be empaneled. Following research on how RCAPs are empaneled on other campuses, CRE recommends establishing the RCAP as a standing subcommittee of CAP in CAP bylaw. Suggested language is appended. This approach is modeled on the [Riverside Division](#).

CRE also discussed whether the establishment of the RCAP as a standing committee would necessitate its representation on Divisional Council. CRE concluded that it would not be necessary given that CAP is already represented on DivCo.

Finally, CRE members noted that the proposed composition of six members seemed fairly large relative to the population of full professors on campus, and questions were raised about CoC's ability to populate an additional committee.

CRE is happy to address any additional questions the Divisional Council may have.

CC: CRE
Senate Office

Encl (2)

Merced Division Bylaws

Part II. Title 3.2.

2. Academic Personnel

- A. Membership: This Committee has seven or more members who may be members of other Divisions of the Senate.
- B. Term: Subject to reappointment, members will ordinarily serve a three-year term beginning the first day of the Fall semester.
- C. Duties
 - 1. Represents the Division in all matters and policies relating to appointments, promotions, and academic personnel matters.
 - 2. Makes recommendations to the Chancellor on appointments, promotions, salaries, and other matters related to faculty quality.
 - 3. Makes an annual report to the Division stating the extent to which its recommendations have been accepted by the University administration. This report shall be sufficiently detailed to inform the Division of the effectiveness of the committee as a liaison between the Division and the administration.
- D. Reserve CAP: A standing committee (Reserve CAP) of six members will exist to review personnel files of current CAP members, or those who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and appeals by faculty members. The committee will consist of full professors from the Division faculty. The membership will be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Members will ordinarily serve a three-year term, which may be renewed. If Reserve CAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise, and without conflicts of interest, to address a particular case, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. The committee will make an annual report to the Division.

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 PERSONNEL (CAP)
IGNACIO LÓPEZ-CALVO, CHAIR
ilopez-calvo@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-4369; fax (209) 228-7955

January 13, 2017

To: Susan Amussen, Chair, Division Council

From: Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for the Faculty

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ignacio López-Calvo".

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg Camfield".

Re: Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

For Divisional Council's consideration, please find attached a draft proposal to empanel a standing reserve CAP (RCAP) at UC Merced.

Empaneling a standing RCAP is intended to simplify the process of developing review committees to address 1) cases of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year, and 2) appeals by faculty members. Currently, an ad-hoc committee must be established for each review.

The attached proposal outlines the charge to the proposed RCAP, proposed membership, term of appointment, appointment process, and procedures for the review of cases.

We look forward to DivCo's input.

cc: Senate Office

Draft Proposal to Empanel a Standing Reserve CAP at UCM

Charge: A Reserve Committee on Academic Personnel (RCAP) will be established for the purposes of reviewing 1) case files of current or former CAP members (i.e. members who termed off the committee in the preceding academic year) and 2) appeals by faculty members. RCAP's recommendations, as with the regular CAP, are made to the Provost/EVC as the Chancellor's designee.

Appointment: The Committee on Committees will appoint the RCAP members from the pool of eligible UCM Full Professors. This pool will include former UCM (internal) CAP members, former AP chairs, former Bylaw 55 unit chairs with experience in AP functions, or other Full Professors with significant academic personnel experience beyond participation on a review committee or a faculty search committee. Each RCAP member will be appointed for a three-year term, which may be renewed. RCAP as a whole should reflect a balanced representation across the schools to ensure a wide range of disciplines on the committee. Ideally, this committee would include at least two representatives per school. Since RCAP does not meet regularly, service on the committee is not compensated.

The RCAP will select its own chair who will thenceforth convene the committee as necessary. The chair may convene a subset of as few as five RCAP members for reviewing any case. When handling appeals, if RCAP cannot field enough members with sufficient expertise and without conflicts of interest, it may add members from other campuses or may convene an ad hoc. Consistent with the procedures for other Senate committees, the list of RCAP members will be posted on the Senate website.

Procedures: In consultation with the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF), the CAP analyst will notify the RCAP chair when case files need to be reviewed and will provide the RCAP members with access to the files. The CAP analyst will arrange for all meeting logistics. As with regular CAP procedures, once the RCAP has finalized a report on a given case file, the CAP analyst will transmit the report to the Provost/EVC, VPF, and Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.