



**SPRING MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
MONDAY, APRIL 15, 2019
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
232 KOLLIGIAN LIBRARY**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- I. ANNOUNCEMENTS** – *Divisional Chair Schnier* **5 MIN**
- II. CONSENT CALENDAR**¹ **5 MIN**
- A. Approval of the Agenda
 - B. Approval of the Draft Minutes of the December 4, 2018 Meeting of the Division (Pp.4 -14)
- III. CAMPUS UPDATES** – *Chancellor Leland & EVC/Provost Camfield* **10 MIN**
- IV. GENERAL EDUCATION UPDATE** – *UGC Chair Sharping & General Education Program Chair Leppert* **10 MIN**
- V. DISCUSSION: MEMORIAL TO THE REGENTS (PP. 15-22)** – *Divisional Chair Schnier* **10 MIN**
- The San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate has initiated a petition to the Regents to divest the University’s endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves. Members are invited to discuss the Memorial in anticipation of a vote by the Division to be initiated within several days.
- VI. ANNOUNCEMENT: 2019-20 DIVISION CHAIR, VICE CHAIR & SECRETARY/PARLIAMENTARIAN** – *CRE Chair Viney* **5 MIN**
- VII. ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO DIVISION REGULATIONS (PP. 23-31)** – *CRE Chair Viney* **5 MIN**
- Graduate Council proposes to revise Part IV. Section II: Master’s Degree Requirements of the [Merced Division Regulations](#). The revisions would reduce the minimum of units of approved courses required for a master’s degree by comprehensive exam (Plan II) from 30 to 24 and, commensurately, from 24 to 20 the number of units which must be from graduate-level courses in the 200 series. Language is also proposed to clarify what is meant by the requirement for a general examination, in addition to a thesis, under Plan I. All standing committees and school executive committees of the Division were invited to review the proposal. At its March 4, 2019 meeting, Divisional Council endorsed the proposal presented here for consideration by the Division.
- ACTION REQUESTED:** The Merced Division votes to endorse the proposed revision to Part IV. Section II: Master’s Degree Requirements of the Merced Division Regulations. If approved, the changes are effective May 26, 2019.

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. Christopher Viney, Secretary/Parliamentarian

VIII. STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORTS

10 MIN

[Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#), Chair Jessica Trounstine

(oral)

[Committee on Academic Personnel](#), Chair Ignacio López-Calvo

(oral)

[Committee on Committees](#), TDB

(oral)

[Committee on Diversity and Equity](#), Member, David Jennings

(oral)

[Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom](#), Chair Laura Hamilton

(oral)

[Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications](#), Chair Maria DePrano

(oral)

[Committee on Research](#), Chair Michael Scheibner

(oral)

[Committee on Rules and Elections](#), Chair Christopher Viney

(oral)

[Graduate Council](#), Chair LeRoy Westerling

(oral)

[Undergraduate Council](#), Chair Jay Sharping

(oral)

[Admissions and Financial Aid](#)

IX. [SENATE AWARDS](#)

15 MIN

The Dr. Fred Spiess Distinguished Service to the Academic Senate Award

Senate Faculty Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award

Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Award for Non-Senate Faculty

Senate Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award

Senate Distinguished Early Career Research Award

Senate Distinction in Research Award

Senate Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award

Senate Excellence in Faculty Mentorship Award

Senate Award for Contributions to Diversity

X. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS

5 MIN

None.

XI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5 MIN

XII. NEW BUSINESS

5 MIN

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

CAP - Committee on Academic Personnel

CAPRA - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation

CoC - Committee on Committees

COR - Committee on Research

CRE - Committee on Rules and Elections

D&E - Diversity and Equity

DivCo - Divisional Council

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



**FALL MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2018
3:00 – 4:30 P.M.
232 KOLLIGIAN LIBRARY**

I. Chair's Report and Announcements

Chair Schnier reported that the systemwide administrative leadership is pursuing funding to close the UC faculty salary gap as benchmarked against the system's comparison eight institutions. The recent campus visit of two Regents went well; the Regents were encouraged by UC Merced's progress to R1 status, our commitment to diversity and inclusion, and how we serve our students' needs. They recognized the unique contributions and needs of the campus. The Budget Working Group, which was initiated last academic year, continues to meet and make good progress. It is currently analyzing indirect cost return distributions and intends to make progress on instructional budgets in spring 2019.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: Approved as presented.

III. Campus Update – *Chancellor Leland and Interim Provost/EVC Camfield*

Chancellor Leland announced that we may have some cause for optimism with regard to policies on undocumented students, given that the new Congress that will be sworn into office next year. Governor-Elect Gavin Newsom visited UC Merced and appears to be well-versed about campus activities and Merced's unique needs moving forward. UCOP is developing a five-year plan for strategic budget priorities. Those priorities are not yet set, but faculty salaries will very likely be a component. UC President Napolitano presented a framework for this plan, which will also take into account the funding needs of those campuses that serve the most diverse and economically disadvantaged student populations (Merced and Riverside) and, yet, have the fewest resources. The hope is that a significant fraction of that funding will be allocated to UC Merced.

The Provost/EVC search is reaching its conclusion. The search began in spring 2018, with the search committee reviewing 66 applications. Three candidates were invited for campus interviews. The Chancellor received feedback from approximately 70 people, mostly faculty. She stated that one candidate in particular stood out from the rest in terms of positive ratings. She plans to make the announcement by early next week.

Finally, the Chancellor reported that she and systemwide leadership are troubled by the inequitable access to quality health care experienced by UC Merced faculty and staff. While the Chancellor cannot divulge details at this point, she shared that she has had discussions with UCSF/Fresno and hopes that a solution will be implemented by fall 2019.

Interim Provost/EVC Camfield added to the Chancellor's announcement regarding health care access for UCM faculty and staff, stating that if the proposed plans come to pass, UC Merced will have a connection with UCSF physicians and specialists. With regard to UCOP's five-year budget priority plan, Interim Provost/EVC Camfield explained that the change in strategy was made to reflect the difference in the contributions the UC makes to educating the state's students relative to the California State University (CSU) system and the Community Colleges. Specifically, the UCs do not provide as many seats for students as the CSUs and Community Colleges, so the UC will not "win" if it continues to argue for resources using the criterion of access. The UC does exceed these other two systems in terms of completion rates, and so the planning focus on degree generation rather than enrollment. The Interim Provost/EVC noted that the UC can still improve degree completion rates.

The Interim Provost/EVC also reported that the Budget Work Group is making good progress with the ultimate goal of the campus being able to make more accurate and longer term planning decisions. Interim Provost/EVC Camfield stated that he intends to partner with CAPRA and the joint council of deans and vice chancellors on integrative planning that will feature predictability and transparency. He envisions, for example, a future process for hiring faculty that includes required discussions with Space Planning and Analysis, the Library, and other affected units so all campus constituencies can engage in coordinated planning.

IV. Informational Item: Gallo School Planning – Paul Maglio

Professor Paul Maglio, who is the Director of the Division of Information and Management in the School of Engineering, provided an overview of the process by which the proposal for the Gallo School is being developed. Director Maglio explained that the future school will include the following three existing departments: Cognitive and Information Sciences, the Department of Economics and Business Management, and the Department of Management of Complex Systems, and possibly others. The first two departments will move from SSHA, and the third from the School of Engineering. A core team taskforce for the future Gallo School has been established, and has drafted a preliminary vision statement that was issued to the campus by Interim Provost/EVC Camfield on November 14. Faculty are encouraged to submit feedback. The task force will review all feedback over the next six months and draft a pre-proposal for the establishment of the school. The proposal will undergo campus wide review, following submission to the Senate in summer of 2019.

V. Informational Item: Academic Planning – Senate Chair Schnier and CAPRA Chair Jessica Trounstine

Chairs Schnier and Trounstine updated Division members on the proposed spring 2019 activities of the Academic Planning Work Group (APWG):

The APWG was empaneled last year and conducted an extensive amount of work, but as a result of critical feedback from faculty on that work, a new charge is being developed. The co-chairs of the revised APWG are Interim Provost/EVC Camfield and CAPRA Chair

Trounstine, and they hope to reconvene in spring semester 2019. The co-chairs agreed that the campus needs multi-year planning, and that departments should be empowered to make strategic planning decisions.

The APWG would like to hold faculty town halls in spring 2019 to discuss topics including Carnegie criteria for achieving R1 status. The intention is to conduct academic planning through this lens. Faculty who wish to advocate for resources for their department/group will therefore be fully aware of the criteria and the role of the criteria in academic planning.

A Division member pointed out that while she understands the rationale for focusing on achieving R1 status, she inquires how general education and undergraduate education will be prioritized given the campus's goal of enrolling 10,000 students by 2020. Senate Chair Schnier responded that undergraduate education is a component of academic planning and will be taken into account. However, achieving R1 status will continue to be the lens through which academic planning is conducted.

Another Division member asked about the Gallo school proposal in the context of budget planning as well as the budget planning for the affected schools (SSHA and SoE). CAPRA Chair Trounstine answered that that has not yet been discussed, however, a solid integrative academic planning structure (which the campus hopes to develop and implement) should take into account all future schools.

VI. **Discussion Item: Space Planning – Senate Chair Schnier and Maggie Saunders**

Chair Schnier and Executive Director of Space Planning and Analysis, Maggie Saunders provided an overview of the final space allocation plan and its implementation.

Director Saunders thanked the faculty in attendance for the many meetings and consultations she and her team have held with them over the past year. She announced that the final space allocation plan should be published by December 6.

Director Saunders presented an update on the 19 backfill space projects and then moved to a summary of the implementation process: the Schools will receive their space allocations; deans and vice chancellors will meet with department chairs and space coordinators to make specific space assignments; and the space assignments will reflect the standards listed in the space allocation and assignment guidelines. In the future, departments will have more governance over their space.

VII. **Standing Committee Chair Reports**

CAP:

- The CAP Vice Chair reported that this is the first year in the Senate's history that CAP has had the same number of internal members as external members. (External members are from the campuses of San Diego, Davis, Irvine, and Riverside.) In January, CAP will be joined by an additional internal member (Ashlie Martini from Engineering).
- CAP continues to conduct its normal business of reviewing appointments, advancements, promotions, and mid-career appraisals.

- On October 18, CAP members participated in the annual APO/all faculty meeting. CAP members, in addition to the VPF and the interim Provost/EVC answered questions from untenured and tenured faculty on all aspects of the advancement and promotion process, including questions about collaborative projects, grant funding, graduate student and post doc mentorship, evaluation of teaching, criteria for accelerations, and the nature of the feedback given for mid-career appraisals.

CAPRA:

- The CAPRA Chair reported that CAPRA has consulted with Interim Provost/EVC Camfield during almost every meeting this semester.
- The committee is working closely with the Interim Provost/EVC on identifying ways to integrate and prioritize the various campus planning activities. In doing so, CAPRA is also determining where in the integrative planning process it wishes to engage. Part of this process will involve data gathering in order to ascertain what it will take to reach R1 status. To that end, CAPRA will be consulting with IRDS staff at its December meeting.
- One of the major items of discussion in CAPRA this semester is the committee's formulation of a recommendation to the interim Provost/EVC on holding a percentage of faculty FTE lines in reserve for hiring outside of the normal process: spousal/partner hires, targets of opportunity hires (diversity), and targets of excellence hires.
- Another of CAPRA's main tasks this semester is the revision of its annual Call for FTE requests which outlines CAPRA's criteria for the evaluation of these requests. CAPRA plans to issue the Call to the Interim Provost/EVC by December 7 for his distribution to the school deans. Both CAPRA and the interim Provost/EVC agreed that requests should be due by February 15.
- CAPRA has standing consultations with the Director of Space Planning and Analysis, Maggie Saunders, on 2020 space and backfill space projects. CAPRA collaborated with LASC on a memo to Director Saunders (in response to her call for comments on the 2020 space allocation plan) regarding concerns over the lack of sufficient space for Library functions.
- CAPRA has consulted several times with Romi Kaur in the Budget Office to hear updates on the campus budget, funding sources, and the academic budget planning process. These consultations will continue in spring semester.
- CAPRA is currently reviewing two campus review items: Campus Space Principles and the proposed Policy for the Establishment of New Schools and Colleges. In response to Interim Provost/EVC Camfield's campus announcement, CAPRA is also reviewing the preliminary vision statement drafted by the proposed Gallo School of Management Task Force Core Team.

- The CAPRA Chair represents UC Merced at meetings of the University Committee on Planning & Budget. Major topics of discussion include moving to a multi-year budgeting process and developing a set of policies for evaluating self-supporting graduate programs.

CoC:

- The CoC Chair reported that the committee has been busy this fall identifying a few additional members to Division committees and addressing requests for faculty representation on campus and systemwide search committees, work groups, and task forces.
- Regarding the latter, at the campus level, CoC has nominated faculty representatives to the
 - Search committee for the Associate Chancellor for Diversity and Equity
 - Search committee for the Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
 - AY 18-19 Budget Work Group from four Senate committees: CAPRA, UGC, GC and CoR
 - Export Control Working Group from two Senate committees: CoR and GC
 - Faculty and Staff Well-being Council
- At the system level, CoC has nominated representatives to the
 - UCDC Governing Council
 - Academic Advisory Board for the UC Center for Free Speech and Civic Engagement
 - UC Advisory Board on Unmanned Aircraft Systems
 - New UC Task Force on Agriculture and Natural Resources
- Appointments to system-level committees are very competitive, and CoC is working to put forward strong applications with the goal of increasing UC Merced's profile and contributions where there is a strong fit between UC Merced faculty interest and expertise and committee needs.
- CoC issued this morning its annual Senate Service Preference Survey in anticipation of initiating its efforts to populate committees for AY 19-20, and encouraged faculty to complete it. The CoC Chair highlighted that this is an exciting time to be a member of Senate committees as the Senate has been working closely with the administration on initiatives, policies, and other matters that are central to the ongoing development of the campus.

CoR:

- The CoR Chair reported that CoR benefits from regular consultation with ex-officio committee member Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development, Sam Traina. VC Traina has kept CoR informed of developments from the federal government and funding agencies. The main item of discussion in this area has been the impending regulations concerning research collaborations in China. If implemented, these regulations will have a major impact on the future of student visas, visiting scholars, and faculty collaborations. The UC is attempting to mitigate the impact.

- One of CoR's main functions is the administration of the Senate faculty grants program. The committee modified last year's Call for Proposals slightly, and issued it to the campus in mid-November. Submission deadline is January 22. This year, CoR elected to move the grants process to an earlier timeline mainly to accommodate PIs who need to appoint graduate students in a timely manner to work on summer projects.
- CoR is currently revising the policy on the establishment and review of Organized Research Units. The committee will submit a revised policy to Divisional Council this academic year.
- CoR is working with VC Traina on revising the campus's current procedures for limited submissions. A revision is necessary given the campus's formation of formal departments and responsibilities of department chairs.
- CoR has representation on the campus Budget Work Group and the committee is especially interested in monitoring developments related to indirect cost return.
- CoR maintains an interest in various issues surrounding pre and post-award management and hears regular updates from VC Traina on the restructuring efforts.
- CoR has consulted with members of the administration on a variety of topics, including the Director of Space Planning and Analysis, Maggie Saunders, on new 2020 space and backfill space, and the CIO, Ann Kovalchick, on the newly-implemented two-factor authentication policy.
- CoR has recently opined on the draft report from the UC Agriculture and Natural Resources Advisory Committee that contained recommendations on UC ANR's structure, governance, and funding. CoR supported the recommendations but suggested that ANR's headquarters be moved to a centrally located area in California (Fresno) and that awareness should be increased among the UC campuses about ANR's mission. Specifically, they should highlight ANR's capability to support or enhance faculty outreach and research activities; for example, this could lead to contributions to the development of grant proposals and potential, additional revenue for UC ANR.
- CoR is currently reviewing two campus review items: Campus Space Planning Principles and the proposed Policy for the Establishment of New Schools and Colleges.
- The CoR Chair serves as UC Merced's representative on the University Committee on Research Policy. Major items of business include:
 - The upcoming RFP in the Lab Fee Research Program, which is scheduled to be released in spring and for which input on topics has been solicited recently.
 - An increased interest in enhancing the interaction between the campuses and the National Labs.

- Renewal of the contract to manage Los Alamos, now in a partnership called Triad National Security LLC, which includes Texas A&M and the non-profit Battelle Memorial Institute. The contract is for 10 years for \$25B.

CRE:

- The CRE Chair reported that, this semester, the Committee on Rules and Elections convened three times.
- Members identified the following committee goals for AY 2018-19:
 - Respond to all incoming requests efficiently and in a timely manner
 - Finalize CRE's revised Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases document
 - Service all requests relating to the planned new Gallo School
- Main items considered by CRE this semester include:
 - CRE Conflict of Interest Policy
 - Proposal for a new Non-Degree Certificate in Child Development and Care
 - Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw II.IV.4.A addressing the membership of the Committee for Scholarly and Library Communication. With respect to this proposal, CRE recommended broadening the proposed number of at-large members to account for additional members when another school comes online.
 - Principles to Guide the Conduct of Executive Sessions
 - CRE's Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases. Following input from Divisional Council, CRE is finalizing this document in consultation with the Committee of Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Committee for Diversity and Equity.
- At the systemwide level, CRE opined on:
 - Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 related to the Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information.
 - Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment

D&E

- The D&E Chair reported that, as the committee that established Faculty Equity Advisors, D&E keeps abreast of updates from the current three FEAs. D&E issued a memo to the FEAs with the reminder that per the Regents Policy 4400, diversity includes sexuality and gender expression, and that FEAs should take into account all types of diversity when proffering advice to deans and faculty search committees.
- D&E was made aware of CAPRA's recommendation to the interim Provost/EVC regarding the percentage of lines to hold in reserve for faculty hiring outside the normal process: spousal/partner hires and targets of opportunity hires. D&E is collaborating with FWF on drafting a response to CAPRA that advocates for a reserve of 20%, and encouraging the interim Provost/EVC to utilize this reserve to increase diversity in faculty hiring.

- D&E has proposed the formation of a new Senate award for contributions to diversity. The committee recently transmitted draft language to the interim Provost/EVC with a request that he approve an additional \$1,000 to fund this award.
- D&E has consulted with the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty, Zulema Valdez, and looks forward to collaborating with AVPF Valdez in her efforts to increase diversity among the faculty, and to enhance faculty recruitment activities including strategies surrounding President's Postdoctoral Fellows.
- D&E is addressing faculty retention, specifically, re-examining the former Provost's proposed guidelines for faculty retention. D&E wishes to draft retention guidelines in such a way that highlights the various non-monetary reasons why faculty separate from the university, including campus climate.
- D&E opined on CRE's revised, Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases and continues to express concern over the "at or above rank of application" rule. The committee welcomes the opportunity to assist in a revised set of procedures.
- D&E opined on the systemwide revised Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. While the committee viewed the overall policy favorably, members suggested it be revised to state that once a formal investigation finds a party responsible, the university consider this transgression to be academic misconduct.

FWAF:

- The FWAF Chair reported that one of FWAF's main goals for this academic year is to work with the administration on solutions to challenges around the lack of after school, holiday, and summer child care for UCM faculty. In spring semester, FWAF will consult with AVC Alan Coker on this issue. To inform this conversation, FWAF will again analyze the survey data previously collected by the committee from UCM faculty, staff, and graduate students.
- FWAF is also closely monitoring developments on the campus implementation of the plan to close the faculty salary gap. FWAF member Jayson Beaster-Jones represents FWAF on the University Committee on Faculty Welfare, and keeps FWAF updated on systemwide discussions in this area. At the November 14 FWAF meeting, the committee consulted with interim Provost/EVC Camfield on the campus plans for implementing the salary increase.
- FWAF is committed to exploring ways to improve the equity of faculty in the Teaching Professor series (LPSOEs/LSOEs). To that end, the committee consulted with a representative group of Teaching Professors at its November 14 meeting, where the main topic of discussion was the need for an equitable and clear teaching workload policy for faculty in this series. FWAF is concerned that Teaching Professors with greater teaching loads may be disadvantaged in the advancement/promotion process, given the requirement that Teaching Professors

must also conduct professional research and engage in professional activities. FWAF submitted a memo to Divisional Council outlining these concerns, and requested that Divisional Council take them under consideration.

- FWAF was made aware of CAPRA's recommendation to the interim Provost/EVC that he hold in reserve a certain percentage of faculty FTE lines for the purpose of spousal/partner hires and targets of opportunity hires. FWAF and D&E are collaborating on a response to CAPRA that advocates for a reserve of 20%, and encouraging the interim Provost/EVC to utilize this reserve to increase diversity in faculty hiring.
- FWAF benefits from updates provided by Professor Nancy Burke who serves on the University Committee on Faculty Welfare Health Care Task Force.
- With regard to campus review items, FWAF opined again on CRE's Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases, and maintains its concern regarding the use of the "at or above rank of application" method of voting.
- Finally, FWAF submitted a memo to Divisional Council regarding impending parking changes, including the exorbitant parking rate increases and concerns over data management around the license plate recognition software. Divisional Council invited members of TAPS to a Council meeting for a consultation on these issues.

GC

- The Graduate Council Vice Chair reported that Graduate Council has met eight times this fall.
- Over the course of the semester, GC has
 - Commented on and/or endorsed, four campus review items
 - Commented on, and/or endorsed, three systemwide review items
 - Approved three petitions for graduate students to teach upper division courses as the instructor of record
 - Approved one petition for a non-Senate faculty member to teach a graduate course
 - Proposed for consideration by the Division revisions to Merced Division Regulations that would reduce the number of units required for a master's degree by comprehensive exam from 30 to 24.
 - Revised the policy on Non-Ladder Rank Faculty Eligibility to Teach Graduate Courses policy; the new policy will be distributed to graduate group chairs before the holidays.
 - Approved a request to substitute the GMAT for the GRE for admission to the MIST Graduate Group's Management of Complex Systems MS/PhD degree programs.
 - Recommended to PROC additions to the charges to the external review teams for the Psychological Sciences and Quantitative and Systems Biology program reviews.
 - Discussed with Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education, Marjorie Zatz, possible graduate student funding models; these conversations have led GC to draft a larger memo on graduate student and research support needs if

the campus is to research R1. The memo will be considered by Divisional Council for endorsement at its December 11 meeting.

- Consulted with the Vice Chancellor for Research on the organization of research administration support.
- GC has also approved 23 CRFs, and currently has only two CRFs from Extension in its queue.
- The Coordinating Committee for Graduate Affairs and President Napolitano have approved for implementation the following three graduate programs. These are the final degrees to emerge from the interim Individual Graduate Program. Once these programs are fully implemented the IGP will be closed.
 - Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
 - Materials and Biomaterials Science and Engineering
 - Bioengineering
- A fourth new graduate program: Management of Complex Systems has been approved by CCGA and awaiting Presidential approval.
- Graduate Council has initiated an effort to review, and as possible strengthen, the efficacy of the system. This effort will be undertaken in partnership with UGC, the Registrar's Office, IT, and school staff and will involve consultation with faculty.
- This spring GC anticipates revising GC's policies and procedures for proposing new graduate groups and degree programs, its CRF policy, and the policy and procedures for establishing concentrations and designated emphases

UGC

- The UGC Chair reported that, this semester, the Undergraduate Council convened five times to conduct business.
- UGC's main goals for this academic year are:
 - To continue to consult with General Education (GE) Program Chair and VPDUE regarding implementation of the GE program
 - Address strategic enrollment management
 - Complete the Review Week Proposal
 - Monitor the Living and Learning Communities initiative
 - Improve the program review process and fill the existing gaps between program review recommendations and implementation of action plans.
 - Promote campus support for students' mental well-being and health resources.
 - Promote campus support for students' and campus community safety.
- UGC receives regular reports from Professor Catherine Keske, Chair of the Admissions and Financial Aid Subcommittee and BOARS representative. Items that are being discussed both locally and at UCOP address transfer students. Specifically,

- The 2:1 freshmen-to-transfer ratio and how some campuses may be struggling to meet this target while responding to growing freshmen demand.
- Strategic enrollment management and transfer student success
- UGC members also receive updates on systemwide activities and initiatives from members of UGC who serve on systemwide committees.
- At the beginning of this academic year, it was not clear how carry-over GE-related business would be addressed during the transition to the GE Executive Committee (GEEC) with the absence of a fully-constituted Executive Committee. It was agreed, in consultation with the VPDUE and most recently with the GE Program Chair, that CRFs with GE components would be handled by the UGC; however, UGC emphasizes that it will not usurp the authority of the GEEC to implement the approved GE program or proactively redesign the GE program.
- UGC approved 76 courses and made recommendations on 5 co-curricular experiences.
- This fall UGC endorsed:
 - GE program transfer guidelines
 - PROC's recommendation to close the review of the Earth Systems Science program
 - PROC's request to adapt the program review policy for the reviews of Economics and Management and Business Economics.
 - CRE's Recommended Voting Policies in Academic Personnel Cases
 - LASC's proposal to revise the bylaws with the additions of 3 at-large members
 - Principles to Guide the Conduct of Executive Sessions
 - Two petitions for graduate students to teach upper division undergraduate courses
- UGC opined on the following systemwide items:
 - Policy for Awarding the Baccalaureate Degrees Posthumously
 - Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 -Use of Vehicles and Driver Selection policy
 - Presidential Policy BFB-RMP-7 Protection of Administrative Records Containing Personally Identifiable Information

VIII. **Petitions of Students**
No petitions were presented

IX. **New Business**
No new business was raised

Attest: Kurt Schnier

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
KURT SCHNIER, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

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

March 12, 2019

RE: Memorial to the Regents – Fossil Fuel Divestment

Dear Colleagues:

With this letter, I invite you to review, in preparation for a vote, the enclosed Memorial to the Regents on Fossil Fuel Divestment. The Memorial, which was initiated by the San Francisco Division of the Academic Senate, would petition the Regents to divest the University's endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves.

As per [Senate Bylaw 90](#), which outlines the process by which Memorials are approved, the Memorial will advance to a vote of the membership of the Academic Senate if at least three Divisions, representing at least thirty-five percent of the membership of the Academic Senate, have notified the Chair of the Assembly that the Memorial has been approved by their Divisions.

To facilitate the Merced Division's consideration of this proposal, the Memorial will be discussed at the April 15, 2019 Meeting of the Division, which will take place from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m. in KL 232. An electronic vote will be initiated after the Division Meeting. The results of the Merced Division's vote will be reported to the Chair of the Assembly, and the Chairs of all other Divisions, within seven calendar days of the vote.

As per Senate Bylaw 90, all Divisions of the University of California Academic Senate must vote to approve, disapprove, or to decline to act, within in 90 days of receipt of the proposed Memorial. Divisions may not amend the proposal as submitted.

In the enclosed, you will find a brief account of the Memorial's history, an explanation of its provisions, and a succinct statement of the arguments for and against it.

We look forward to your participation in this significant decision.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Kurt Schnier".

Kurt Schnier, Chair
Merced Division of the Academic Senate

From: U.C. Academic Senate
To: President of the University of California, for transmission to the Regents
Re: Memorial to the Regents

The U.C. Academic Senate petitions the Regents to divest the University's endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves.

History of the Memorial to the Regents

On January 17, 2019 the UCSF Academic Senate Ad-hoc Committee on Sustainability held a vote to approve the Memorial to the Regents. The Memorial was approved.

On January 24, 2019 the UCSF Academic Senate Executive Council held a vote to approve the Memorial. The vote passed.

On February 15, 2019 the UCSF Academic Senate voted to approve the Memorial. 238 voted to approve, 58 voted to reject, and 6 abstained. The Memorial was approved.

Explanation of the Provisions of the Memorial to the Regents

The Memorial states: “The U.C. Academic Senate petitions the Regents to divest the University’s endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves.”

The Carbon Underground 200 list identifies the largest owners of carbon reserves.

Fossil Free Indexes identifies the top 100 coal and the top 100 oil and gas publicly-traded reserve holders worldwide.

The Memorial petitions the Regents to divest UC’s endowment portfolio of all investments in companies on the Carbon Underground 200 list.

UC currently owns shares in companies on the Carbon Underground 200 list. UC’s holdings of securities in oil and gas drilling and refining firms is approximately three percent of UC’s public equity holdings. In contrast, oil and gas drilling and refining firms represent six to seven percent of the global economy. The Memorial would have the Regents divest entirely from all companies currently on that list.

Arguments in Favor of the Memorial to the Regents

Ensuring that our planet does not undergo catastrophic climate change requires that fossil fuels be phased out in the near future. Thus, being co-owners of corporations devoted to producing fossil fuels is both morally and financially unwise.

Global warming will have catastrophic consequences.ⁱ

If current trends continue, major cities will be destroyed, and trillions of dollars in assets will be lost due to sea level rise and extreme weather events. Droughts, floods, and climate changes will cause crops to fail resulting in mass starvation. Ecosystems will be devastated, which combined with other anthropogenic disruptions, will drive millions of species extinct.

Prudence requires that we secure 'planet insurance.'ⁱⁱ

A rapid evolution to a largely carbon-free energy system is essential within the next 15 to 30 years. This is technically possible and affordable.

The greatest impact of climate change will be on those least responsible for it, and with the least power to affect it.

The effects of climate change will be greatest on the youth, and future generations for hundreds of years; on poorer countries who contributed the least atmospheric pollution; and on other species. We who benefited most from the last 300 years of cheap energy, and who control the most resources, must act for them as well as ourselves.

Fossil fuel companies are a primary cause for insufficient action countering global warming.

Fossil fuel companies continue to spend billions of dollars to extract fossil fuels that should never be burned based on a business model assuming continued high fossil fuel use. They have hidden their research predicting global warming due to atmospheric carbon dioxide for decades. They have donated millions of dollars to think tanks which spread misinformation. Their direct and indirect support has helped elect climate denying senators, representatives, governors and presidents.

Fossil fuel stocks will experience volatility if international agreements such as the Paris Agreement are followed.ⁱⁱⁱ

In the Paris Agreement, 197 countries committed to taking the action necessary to limit global temperature rise this century to <2°C, and aim for a rise of <1.5°C. This requires that <20% of existing fossil fuel reserves can be burned. However, the value of fossil fuel companies is heavily dependent on the value of these proven reserves. If these reserves cannot be burned then those companies may undergo significant devaluation. Increased volatility of fossil fuel investments means we cannot assume that the historic returns from fossil fuel stocks will continue into the future.

ⁱ Current scientific consensus regarding global warming from the US gov., IPCC and World Bank

<https://science2017.globalchange.gov/>

<http://www.nature.com/nclimate/journal/v7/n1/full/nclimate3179.html>
<https://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v427/n6970/full/nature02121.html>
<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/344/6187/1246752>
<http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v471/n7336/full/nature09678.html>

ii Sustainable energy is economically and technically viable

https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-38919-6_12
https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-38919-6_11

iii The Paris Agreement:

http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php

Arguments in Opposition to the Memorial to the Regents

The University of California is taking meaningful steps to minimize the risk and reduce the impact of climate change. While the UC Office of Chief Investment Officer has adopted a Framework for Sustainable Investing, it must also fulfill its fiduciary duty to current and former employees. The Memorial would impose an extreme and one-sided solution to a complex problem while simultaneously threatening the financial health of UC's investments portfolio.

Solutions to global warming will require a variety of strategies and tactics if they are not to drastically disrupt global economic systems.

While climate change threatens widespread catastrophe to cities and ecosystems, the solutions to address climate change must not threaten to upend economic systems upon which communities depend. Fossil fuels are still a viable source of energy on which economies rely. Thus, solutions to global warming must utilize a variety of strategies and tactics including but not limited to investment in carbon reducing technologies and carbon alternatives. However, until those technologies and alternatives are fully developed and sufficient substitutes to fossil fuel, we cannot completely abandon the use of fossil fuel.

University of California has already taken action against climate change.

UC has made a commitment to be carbon neutral by 2025 on its ten campuses, five medical centers, and three national labs. UC joined Mission Innovation, a global initiative, to increase investment in energy research and development. UC entered into an agreement to purchase 80 megawatts of solar power.

The UC Office of Chief Investment Officer has a fiduciary duty to over 500,000 current and former employees.

The UC Office of Chief Investment Officer has a fiduciary duty to protect and increase UC's investment assets. Maintaining the financial health of UC's endowment is a moral and legal responsibility of UC.

UC currently considers the impact of climate change when making investment decisions.

Based on feedback from the UC Board of Regents, UC students, faculty, staff, and stakeholders, UC established a Framework for Sustainable Investing. The Framework for Sustainable Investing sets out a process for evaluating environmental sustainability, social responsibility, and governance into investment decisions.

Divestment from fossil fuel companies would result in a forfeiture of UC's influence over those companies as an institutional investor.

UC currently can exercise its rights as a shareholder of fossil fuel companies to advocate for solutions to global climate change including investments in alternatives to fossil fuel. Divestment would mean forfeiting UC's right to influence corporate governance of those fossil fuel companies.

Office of the Academic Senate

500 Parnassus Ave, MUE 230
San Francisco, CA 94143-0764
Campus Box 0764

tel: 415/514-2696

academic.senate@ucsf.edu

<https://senate.ucsf.edu>

David Teitel, MD, Chair
Sharmila Majumdar, PhD, Vice Chair
Vineeta Singh, MD, Secretary
Jae Woo Lee, MD, Parliamentarian

February 27, 2019

DIVISIONAL ACADEMIC SENATE CHAIRS

Re: Memorial to the Regents – Fossil Fuel Divestment

Dear Divisional Academic Senate Chairs:

On February 15, 2019, the San Francisco Division of the UC Academic Senate initiated and voted to approve a Memorial to the Regents pursuant to Senate Bylaw 90 and [Regents Bylaw 40.1](#).

The Memorial petitions the Regents to divest the University's endowment portfolio of all investments in the 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies with the largest carbon reserves.

Count of votes

Approved	238 (78.81%)
Rejected	58 (19.21%)
Abstained	6 (1.99%)
Total	302 (100%)

Enclosed, please find the Memorial to the Regents, a brief account of its history, an explanation of its provisions, and a succinct statement of the arguments for and against it.

We are including Bylaw 90 with the Memorial packet. Most relevant to you at this time is [Bylaw 90.D.](#), which provides:

- Each Division shall have ninety calendar days from receipt of the Memorial to vote upon it.
- [A] Division may vote to approve, to disapprove, or to decline to act, but may not amend the proposal as submitted.
- The Chair of the division shall within seven calendar days forward to the Chair of the Assembly and to the Chairs of all other Division the results of the Divisional vote on the proposed Memorial
- If at least three Divisions representing at least thirty-five percent of the membership of the Academic Senate have notified the Chair of the Assembly that the Memorial has been approved by their Divisions, the proposed Memorial shall be voted upon in accordance with the procedure set forth in Article E of this [Bylaw](#).

Thank you for your consideration of this Memorial to the Regents.

Sincerely,



David Teitel, MD, 2017-19 Chair
UCSF Academic Senate

Encl.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
KURT SCHNIER, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

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

JANUARY 3, 2019

**CHAIRS OF STANDING COMMITTEES
CHAIRS OF SCHOOL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES
MARJORIE ZATZ, VICE PROVOST AND DEAN FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION
ERIN WEBB, REGISTRAR**

**RE: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO PART IV. SECTION II: MASTER'S DEGREE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
MERCED DIVISION REGULATIONS**

Dear Colleagues:

At its December 11, meeting, Divisional Council unanimously endorsed for campus review the enclosed revisions to Part IV. Section II: Master's Degree Requirements of the [Merced Division Regulations](#) proposed by Graduate Council.

The enclosed memo from Graduate Council provides an overview of the proposed revisions, explains the rationale for the changes, and summarizes the process by which the proposal was developed.

Divisional Council thanks you for considering this proposal and looks forward to your comments.

Sincerely,

Kurt Schnier
Chair, Divisional Council

CC: 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
LEROY WESTERLING, CHAIR, GRADUATE COUNCIL
lwesterling@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-6312

NOVEMBER 20, 2018

TO: KURT SCHNIER, CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO PART IV. SECTION II: MASTER'S DEGREE REQUIREMENTS OF THE [MERCED DIVISION REGULATIONS](#)

Dear Kurt:

On behalf of Graduate Council, I transmit to you for consideration proposed revisions to Part IV. Section II: Master's Degree Requirements of the [Merced Division Regulations](#).

As per the enclosed, the proposal is to reduce the minimum of units of approved courses required for a master's degree by comprehensive exam (Plan II) from 30 to 24 and, commensurately, to reduce from 24 to 20 the number of units which must be from graduate-level courses in the 200 series. No changes are proposed to the unit requirements for a master's degree by thesis (Plan I), which requires 24 units, 20 of which must be from courses in the 200 series. Language is, however, proposed to clarify what is meant by the requirement for a general examination, in addition to a thesis, under Plan I.

In proposing these revisions, Graduate Council reviewed the unit requirements at other UC campuses, and determined that the reduction would make our requirements much more similar to those of other campuses, including Berkeley¹, the only other campus on the semester system (data enclosed). GC also solicited comment from the graduate group chairs (enclosed). In discussing this topic by email, the graduate group chairs recommended that the required number of units be divisible by 12, the number of units required of a full time graduate student. They also suggested that 24 units, while meeting the divisible by 12 criterion, would also enable students to complete their coursework in a single academic year. It was noted that to meet the current 30 unit requirement, students would need to take overload of 15 units per semester to finish in a year or, if taking 12 per semester, enroll as a part-time student for a third semester.

Graduate Council thanks the Senate for considering this proposal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "LeRoy Westering".

LeRoy Westering
Chair, Graduate Council

CC: Graduate Council
Senate Office

¹ Berkeley requires 20 units for Plan I and 24 for Plan II.

(TRACKED Changes Version)

Draft revisions to Merced Division Regulations [Part IV. Section II: Master's Degree Requirements](#)

SECTION 2. MASTER'S DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The master's degree is attained by: Plan I, the Thesis option, or Plan II, the Comprehensive Examination option. A program may offer the option of one or both plans with the approval of the Graduate Council. Each of these plans has minimal coursework requirements, but programs may impose additional requirements.

Plan I (Thesis)

In addition to the thesis, a minimum of 24 semester units in approved courses is also required, at least 20 of which must be earned in 200 series graduate-level courses exclusive of credit given for thesis research and preparation. A general examination is also required ([e.g. a thesis defense](#)).

Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)

In addition to the comprehensive examination, a minimum of ~~30-24~~ semester units in approved courses, at least ~~24-20~~ of which must be from graduate-level courses in the 200 series.

(CLEAN Version)

Draft revisions to Merced Division Regulations [Part IV. Section II: Master's Degree Requirements](#)

SECTION 2. MASTER'S DEGREE REQUIREMENTS

The master's degree is attained by: Plan I, the Thesis option, or Plan II, the Comprehensive Examination option. A program may offer the option of one or both plans with the approval of the Graduate Council. Each of these plans has minimal coursework requirements, but programs may impose additional requirements.

Plan I (Thesis)

In addition to the thesis, a minimum of 24 semester units in approved courses is also required, at least 20 of which must be earned in 200 series graduate-level courses exclusive of credit given for thesis research and preparation. A general examination is also required (e.g. a thesis defense).

Plan II (Comprehensive Examination)

In addition to the comprehensive examination, a minimum of 24 semester units in approved courses, at least 20 of which must be from graduate-level courses in the 200 series.

Minimum number of units required at the different UC campuses					
	Plan I: Thesis Option	Plan II: Comprehensive Exam option	Notes	Hyperlinks	
UCM	24	30	<p>Plan I: In addition to the thesis, a minimum of 24 semester units in approved courses is also required, at least 20 of which must be earned in 200 series graduate-level courses exclusive of credit given for thesis research and preparation. A general examination is also required.</p> <p>Plan II: In addition to the comprehensive examination, a minimum of 30 semester units in approved courses, at least 24 of which must be from graduate-level courses in the 200 series.</p> <p>Under either plan, requirements for the M.A. and M.S. degrees shall be determined by the departments, subject to approval by the Graduate Council. The minimum course requirements shall be the same for both the thesis and capstone plans. These requirements must include a minimum of 9 upper division and graduate level courses (the equivalent of 4 quarter units each), of which at least 5 must be graduate level (200 series or, with the approval of the Graduate Council, individual study or research courses in the 500 series). Individual departments shall specify the number of 500 series courses that may, with the approval of the Graduate Council, apply toward the divisional or the departmental minimum course requirements for Master's degrees. Departments shall specify also the number of times an individual student may enroll in any one of these courses. [Am 4 Jun 15]</p>	https://senate.ucmerced.edu/node/991#p4s2	
UCLA			<p>Plan I: There are required 30 units of graduate and upper division courses (the 100 and 200 series only) and, in addition, a thesis or a project in lieu of a thesis. At least 12 of the 30 units must be graduate work in the major field. The student is subject to guidance by the major program regarding the distribution of his or her work.</p> <p>Plan II: There are required 36 units of graduate and upper division courses, of which at least 18 units must be graduate courses in the major field. Not more than 9 units of research (299 or equivalent) may be used to satisfy the 18-unit requirement. A comprehensive final examination in the major subject, of such nature and conducted in such manner as may be determined by the program concerned, is required of each candidate.</p>	https://senate.ucla.edu/regulations/chapter31#bootstrap-fieldgroup-accordion-item--section-2-requirements-for-masters-degrees-1	
UCD	30	36	<p>Plan I: There are required 30 units of graduate and upper division courses (the 100 and 200 series only) and, in addition, a thesis or a project in lieu of a thesis. At least 12 of the 30 units must be graduate work in the major field. The student is subject to guidance by the major program regarding the distribution of his or her work.</p> <p>Plan II: There are required 36 units of graduate and upper division courses, of which at least 18 units must be graduate courses in the major field. Not more than 9 units of research (299 or equivalent) may be used to satisfy the 18-unit requirement. A comprehensive final examination in the major subject, of such nature and conducted in such manner as may be determined by the program concerned, is required of each candidate.</p>	https://academicenate.ucdavis.edu/bylaws_and_regulations/regulations.cfm#500-	
UCSD	36	36	<p>Plan I: Thesis Plan - Credit must be obtained for 36 quarter units distributed as follows: at least 12 units must be in graduate courses in the major field, no more than 12 units may be in upper-division courses, and there must be at least 6 research units which lead to a Master's thesis to be approved by a committee of three faculty members appointed by the Dean of Graduate Studies.</p> <p>Plan II: Comprehensive Examination Plan - Credit must be obtained for 36 quarter units of which at least 14 must be in graduate courses in the major field, 10 additional units in graduate courses, and 12 units in graduate or upper-division courses. A comprehensive final examination, designated as a Master's examination, must be passed.</p>	http://senate.ucsd.edu/Operating-Procedures/Senate-Manual/Regulations/700	
UCSB	30	36	<p>Plan I: Thesis. At least 30 units of upper-division and graduate courses must be completed, including no fewer than 20 units in graduate courses in the major subject or in graduate courses related to that subject as approved by the departmental graduate advisor. A thesis is required, which must be approved by each member of the master's committee. The major department may require any examination deemed necessary to test the student's command of the field. (Am 7 Nov 96)</p> <p>Plan II: Comprehensive Examination or Project. At least 36 units of upper-division and graduate courses are required, including no fewer than 24 units in graduate courses in the major subject or in graduate courses related to that subject as approved by the departmental graduate advisor. The student must satisfactorily complete one of the following options: A comprehensive final examination set by the major department and administered by the master's committee. (Am 7 Nov 96) A project under the supervision of at least one ladder faculty member. Completion requires approval by the project committee. (Am 2 May 02; Am 7 Jun 18)</p>	https://senate.ucsb.edu/manual/regulations/Full/	
UCR	36	36	<p>Plan I: Thesis Plan. A minimum of 36 quarter units of graduate and upper division undergraduate courses in or related to the major subject area are required. At least 24 of the 36 units must be in graduate courses taken at this University; of these a maximum of 12 may be in the graduate research for the thesis. The preparation and presentation of an acceptable thesis is required for every candidate for the degree. Provided that these general requirements are met, the student is subject to his/her major department's or group's guidance in the distribution of his/her work among the departments. In addition, the major department or group may require any examination which it deems necessary to test the candidate's knowledge of his/her field.</p> <p>Plan II: Comprehensive Examination Plan. A minimum of 36 quarter units of graduate and upper division undergraduate courses in or related to the major subject area are required. At least 18 units must be in graduate courses taken at this University, of which none may be in graduate research for the thesis or dissertation. Provided that these general requirements are met, the student is subject to his/her major department's or group's guidance in the distribution of his/her work among the departments. A comprehensive final examination, to be of such nature and to be conducted in such manner as determined by the department or group concerned, is required of every candidate for the degree.</p>	http://senate.ucr.edu/bylaws/?action=read_bylaws&code=gr&section=02	
UCI	28	36	<p>Plan I (Thesis) A minimum of 28 quarter units in approved courses, at least 20 of which must be earned in 200 series graduate courses exclusive of courses primarily intended to give credit for thesis work.</p> <p>Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) A minimum of 36 quarter units in approved courses, at least 24 of which must be from graduate courses in the 200 series.</p>	http://senate.uci.edu/uci-academic-senate-manual/part-ii-regulations/#regulation805	
UCB	20	24	<p>PLAN 1 There are required 20 units and a thesis. The courses must be graduate courses or upper division undergraduate courses. At least 8 of the 20 units must be strictly graduate work in the major subject. No unit credit is allowed for the thesis. It is expected that the work of the graduate course or courses, together with the thesis, will ordinarily amount to not less than half of the entire work presented for the Degree. Provided that the foregoing general requirements and the special departmental requirements be met, the work may be distributed among any courses in the 100 or 200 series. The student is subject to guidance by the major department respecting the distribution of the student's work among the departments. With the special approval of the Graduate Council, the candidate may satisfy the 20-unit requirement for the Degree by a comprehensive supervised plan of research to an acceptable thesis, the schedule for each candidate to be as follows: Research (designation and number of courses) 8-12 units per term, or 2-4 units per Summer Session.</p> <p>PLAN 2 There are required 24 units of upper division and graduate courses, of which at least 12 units must be in strictly graduate courses in the major subject. The student is subject to guidance by the major department respecting the distribution of the student's work among the departments. A comprehensive final examination in the major subject, to be of such nature and to be conducted in such manner as may be determined by the department concerned, is required of every candidate. (Am. 3.83)</p>	https://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/regulations/1501-requirements-masters-degree	
UCSF	30	36	<p>Plan I (Thesis) Thirty academic units and a thesis are required. A minimum of 12 units must be taken in 200 series courses in the major subject. Of these 12, only eight units of course work numbered 250 may be used toward the master's degree. The following courses are graded only S/U: 220,221,250,298,299, and 300. (215 Lab Rotation may be approved as an exception.) In other 200 series courses, S/U grading may be offered as an option for graduate students. A maximum of six units of course work for which S/U grading is elected may be used toward the unit requirements for a graduate degree. The thesis constitutes the results of an original investigation of a problem. It should be carried out in the same systematic and scholarly way as investigations of greater magnitude, such as a doctoral dissertation. Students must either be registered or on filing fee for the quarter in which they submit their thesis.</p> <p>Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) Thirty-six academic units and a comprehensive examination are required. A minimum of 18 units must be taken in 200 series courses in the major subject. Of these 18, no more than 12 units numbered 250 may be applied toward the degree. The following courses are graded only S/U: 220,221,250,298,299, and 300. (215 Lab Rotation may be approved as an exception.) In other 200 series courses, S/U grading may be offered as an option for graduate students. A maximum of six units of course work for which S/U grading is elected may be used toward the unit requirements for a graduate degree. The comprehensive examination should demonstrate the student's mastery of the major field and ability to think critically. The nature and matter of the examination are determined by the faculty of the degree program. Students must either be registered or on filing fee for the quarter in which they submit their comprehensive examination. A student who fails the comprehensive examination is allowed to take a second examination after a suitable period of additional preparation. Students may not submit more than one exam per quarter. A student who fails the comprehensive exam a second time is no longer eligible to receive the master's degree.</p>	https://graduate.ucsf.edu/masters-degree	DID NOT FIND IN REGULATIONS
UCSC	35	35	<p>Students pursuing academic Master's Degrees will pursue either a thesis capstone (Plan I) or comprehensive capstone (Plan II) curriculum. Individual programs may adopt one or both plans. Candidates for either plan are subject to guidance by the program's Faculty respecting the distribution of the student's workload among departments. Subject to the approval of the Academic Senate, programs are to develop Master's degree requirements appropriate to the field of study. These requirements must meet the following minimum standards. Minimum Number of Units Required</p> <p>Plan I: Must require a minimum of 35 quarter units of graduate and upper division courses, of which no more than 15 units may be upper division undergraduate courses. Of the required graduate-level courses, a minimum of 20 units must be courses other than supervised research, except by special exception of the Graduate Council. This exception shall be provided to the program as a whole, rather than case-by-case to individual candidates.</p> <p>Plan II: Must require a minimum of 35 quarter units of graduate and upper division courses, of which no more than 15 units may be upper division undergraduate courses. Supervised research classes may not count towards the satisfaction of minimum unit requirements for Plan II candidates.</p>	https://graddiv.ucsc.edu/current-students/academic-regulations/graduate-student-handbook/section-eleven.html#3	

The following is a series of emails, best read from the bottom up.

Marcelo Kallmann <mkallmann@ucmerced.edu>

Reducing the minimum should not impact any program because we can always require more than the minimum. In EECS it makes sense to have more course work for the non-thesis option because this option often involves a final project that is simpler/smaller than a MS thesis.

From: Leroy Westerling <leroy.westerling@icloud.com>

Date: Thursday, September 20, 2018 at 11:37 AM

I would like to second what Marjorie said: programs can have different requirements at or above the minimum. If we reduce the minimum, no programs have to change if they don't want to. However, if we keep existing policy, those programs that are currently not compliant will have to revise their requirements.

LeRoy Westerling

On Sep 20, 2018, at 11:33 AM, Marjorie Zatz <mzatz@ucmerced.edu> wrote:

For me, the question is really what is expected in the non-thesis path—if it is just coursework and a capstone project then sometimes programs (at various universities I've seen) want to have additional coursework; if there is a truly comprehensive it seems like it would be similar in scope to a thesis. And remember programs can always require more than the minimum.

On 9/20/2018 11:20 AM, Erik Menke wrote:

Since the minimum is unlikely to impact CCB I don't have real strong feelings on any of this. However, I am curious what the rationale is behind having different minimums for the two paths, either here or at the other campuses that have differences. Is there something that we're missing by just proposing that both paths should be 24 units, minimum?

On Sep 20, 2018, at 10:19 AM, Kevin Dawson <kdawson4@ucmerced.edu> wrote:

I'm fine with Ramesh's proposal. I'll need to run it by the IH Ed Policy Committee, though.

Kevin

Kevin Dawson

From: Boaz Ilan

Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 10:15 AM

I agree with Ramesh's proposal for a 24 units minimum.

- Boaz

On Sep 20, 2018, at 9:55 AM, Jan Wallander <jwallander@ucmerced.edu> wrote:

I also agree with Ramesh's proposal as the minimum./Jan

From: Irene Beattie

Sent: Thursday, September 20, 2018 9:54 AM

This proposal by Ramesh sounds reasonable to me. Our program will never be impacted by this minimum, however, since we require more coursework than average, even for a terminal masters.

Best,

Irene R. Beattie

Associate Professor

Department of Sociology

From: Ramesh Balasubramaniam

Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 9:43 PM

My suggestion is to bring the minimum down to 24 credits so 1) coursework can be finished in one-year and 2) it is divisible by 12.

Sincerely,

Ramesh.

Ramesh Balasubramaniam, PhD
Professor, Cognitive & Information Sciences

Applied Math requires 36 units for both Plan I and Plan II. Clearly, 36 is divisible by 12.

I too was not aware of the official minimum. It makes sense for the campus-wide minimum and the

actual number of units that are required by the programs to be divisible by 12, but there's nothing wrong with fractions in my book.

Cheers,

- Boaz

On Sep 19, 2018, at 7:09 PM, Marjorie Zatz <mzatz@ucmerced.edu> wrote:

That's a good point, Erik

From: Erik Menke <emenke@ucmerced.edu>

Date: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 at 5:02 PM

Hmm, that's very interesting. I would say that, whatever the minimum credit policy is, it would make sense for the number of credits to be divisible by 12, since that is considered full-time status for a student. For that reason alone I don't like the 30 credit minimum, which would imply that a student needs to be enrolled in 15 units per semester, or is expected to be part-time for a third semester.

On Sep 19, 2018, at 4:56 PM, Leroy Westerling <leroy.westerling@icloud.com> wrote:

PS... my proposal for MCS was approved by the campus last year despite also being in violation of this policy. So we have not been tracking these details very well. After learning that our campus had a minimum requirement that no one could explain the origins of, and that it differs from practice across much of the UC system, I thought we should start a dialogue so that, going forward, we are assured we have a policy that everyone is aware of and can support.

On Sep 19, 2018, at 04:49 PM, Leroy Westerling <leroy.westerling@icloud.com> wrote:

As far as I know, the current requirements have been in place since the dawn of UCM time ...

On Sep 19, 2018, at 04:35 PM, Erik Menke <emenke@ucmerced.edu> wrote:

When did the 30 units minimum for the exam option go into effect? I ask because in the CCB policies both the thesis option and exam option have the same minimum of 24 units.

Erik Menke

Associate Professor of Chemistry

On Sep 19, 2018, at 4:12 PM, Marjorie Zatz <mzatz@ucmerced.edu> wrote:

Dear colleagues,

Graduate Council Chair Leroy Westerling is requesting your thoughts about the following. I know he would like to have a real conversation about this, so please respond to all. Thanks!

Marjorie

Currently, the UC Merced campus sets minimum unit requirements for Masters degrees at 30 units for a Masters with the comprehensive Exam option (Plan II), and 24 units for a Masters with the thesis option (Plan I). Individual programs may set their requirements higher than these minimums to better accord with the requirements of their disciplines.

Other UC campuses set a wide variety of minimum unit requirements (generally lower than UC Merced when accounting for quarter vs semester system), with or without a disparity in units between the two plans that we have at UC Merced. UC Berkeley is the only semester system comparator, and sets minimums of 24 and 20 units for the exam and thesis option Masters, respectively. We are attaching a summary of practice on other campuses.

I would like to ask for feedback from the Grad Group chairs about our existing policy. In particular, are we happy with (1) the level of our minimum requirements, and (2) with the disparity (6 units) between the minimums for thesis versus exam option masters on our campus?

Does maintaining academic quality require more units across all programs on our campus than in our sister campuses? If a program intends to have exam and thesis option students take courses in the same cohort, working one and a half additional courses for exam option students into the curriculum may pose challenges. Another consideration is that, if the exam is comprehensive across a field or subfield and requires substantial preparation, it may not be feasible for exam-option students to complete a masters in one year. As programs roll out BA/BS + 1 year masters programs, this may become more of an issue. Do the graded course unit requirements leave enough time for students to also undertake research or prepare for a comprehensive exam? What are the contributors to quality (exam/thesis, number of courses, ...?) and what is the correct balance between them and their resource requirements?

Marjorie S. Zatz, Ph.D.

Vice Provost and Graduate Dean

Professor of Sociology