

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING & RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)**Wednesday, December 17, 2014****9:00 – 10:30 am****KL 362****[UCMCROPS/CAPRA1415/Resources](#)**

- I. **Chair's Report** – Anne Kelley
Updates from December 2 UCPB meeting

- II. **Consent Calendar** **Pg. 1-3**
Action requested: approval of minutes from November 19 meeting

- III. **Revised FTE Allocation Process** **Pg. 4-7**
Background: In the last academic year, CAPRA prepared a process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests in expectation of reviewing FTE proposals in spring 2014. The Provost/EVC approved the document. However, the traditional call for FTE requests did not occur due to the implementation of the new strategic academic focusing process. Pursuant to CAPRA's memo to the Provost/EVC on November 21 requesting the release of disciplinary FTE lines, CAPRA chair has revised the criteria for evaluation of FTE requests.

Action requested: CAPRA members to review and approve the revised process and criteria for evaluating faculty FTE requests.

- IV. **Campus Review Item** **Pg. 8-19**
Background: proposed two-year pilot program for undergraduate program chairs in SNS and SSHA. The CAPRA chair has drafted comments that are appended to this packet.

Action requested: CAPRA to review the proposed pilot program and provide comments to the Senate Chair by Friday, December 19.

- V. **Other Business**

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA)
Minutes of Meeting
November 19, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation met at 9:00 am on November 19, 2014 in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Anne Kelley presiding.

Attendees: Anne Kelley, Joshua Viers, Jan Wallander, Mukesh Singhal, Cristián Ricci, Marilyn Fogel, and Daisy Pelayo Figueroa. Absent: Danielle Bermudez.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Kelley and committee member Wallander updated the CAPRA members on the November 14 Meeting of the Division. At the meeting, Provost/EVC Peterson discussed the strategic academic focusing process and Vice Provost for Faculty's (VPF) Camfield's recent memo to all faculty on facilitated discussions to narrow down the five, broad, thematic research areas. Some faculty members in attendance responded to the Provost/EVC that he has the information he needs and suggested that he should make a decision on the themes now. These faculty members expressed concern with the timeline and that FTE lines will not be released in time for next year's hiring if these facilitated discussions proceed. Another faculty member in attendance voiced support for the facilitated discussions.

II. Consent Calendar

The November 5 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. VPF's Memo on Strategic Academic Focusing

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members reviewed the memo that was sent to all faculty from VPF Camfield. CAPRA members drafted a response memo asking the Provost/EVC to release a subset of FTE lines now for the foundational/disciplinary areas so that next year's hiring is not negatively impacted. Faculty are concerned that the strategic academic focusing process will not conclude in a timely manner for an effective FTE allocation process to occur. The draft memo also included CAPRA's suggestion that the

Provost/EVC make a decision on the five broad, thematic research areas as he should already be in possession of all the information required.

CAPRA drafted a similar memo to members of the strategic academic focusing committee and the VPF to inform them that CAPRA is making the aforementioned suggestions to the Provost/EVC.

CAPRA members debated the language of the memo to the Provost/EVC, as a minority of the committee felt that due to the broad nature of many of the strategic academic focusing proposals and the significant resource implications, the Provost/EVC should proceed with consulting additional groups of faculty. A majority of the committee felt that the Provost/EVC has all the information required and should make a decision on the narrowing of the five broad, thematic research areas.

CAPRA members agreed on the following language to include in the memo to the Provost/EVC: suggest a binary choice to either 1) make the decision now on the five thematic research areas and release FTE lines for both the disciplinary/foundational and strategic areas for search next year; or 2) postpone assigning faculty lines associated with the strategic academic focusing process for one year to allow faculty to generate the information requested in the VPF's memo, and release FTE lines only for the disciplinary/foundational areas. CAPRA will revise the criteria it developed last year for FTE requests for the disciplinary hires.

IV. Space Principles

Prior to this meeting, CAPRA members reviewed all Senate committee and school executive committee comments and revised the space principles accordingly.

ACTION: Send space principles to the Provost/EVC, school deans, school executive committee chairs, Division Council, Tom Lollini, campus architect; Steve Rabedaux, Director of Academic Facilities Planning; Jeffrey Gilger, faculty representative on the Campus Physical Planning Committee; Phillip

Woods, Director of Physical & Environmental Planning; Abigail Rider, AVC of Real Estate; Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research; Marjorie Zatz, Vice Provost & Dean of Graduate Education, and Graeme Mitchell, AVC of Strategic Facilities Planning.

V. FTE Tracking

Near the end of the last academic year, CAPRA requested from the Provost/EVC a list of all new faculty lines originally allocated for search at the start of the current academic year, and a corresponding list of all other new faculty lines that were approved through special mechanisms after the original allocation was made. CAPRA requested this information for purposes of improved strategic planning and to assist the Provost/EVC in making the most efficient use of limited resources to meet increasing demands.

The Provost/EVC responded earlier this fall semester with the requested information. CAPRA members reviewed and discussed the information provided.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:00 am.

Attest:

Anne Kelley, Chair

Minutes prepared by:

Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

UC Merced CAPRA (Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation) Process and Criteria for Evaluating Faculty FTE Requests for AY 2015-2016

Requests for new faculty lines (FTEs) may be initiated by the Bylaw 55 units, graduate groups, or recognized campus or multicampus research institutes. However, as appointments are made to Bylaw 55 units, a position is unlikely to be highly recommended unless it is a priority of one or more such units. Each requested position should be accompanied by a brief (1 paragraph) description of the position and a brief (1 page) justification for the position, referencing the CAPRA criteria listed below. The faculty group(s) requesting each position should be clearly identified.

The requested positions should be ranked in priority both by the School Dean and by the faculty of each hiring unit within the School. It is expected that in SSHA and SNS, the faculty of each Bylaw 55 unit will rank those positions that might reasonably be assigned to that unit, but a single position may be ranked by more than one unit. In SOE, which is a single Bylaw 55 unit, the faculty may choose to provide separate rankings by program. Both the dean's and the faculty's rankings should be provided to CAPRA, along with a statement describing how the faculty's rankings were determined (e.g. by a vote of all faculty in the unit or by another method agreed upon by the faculty).

It is expected that each new faculty position will be assigned primarily to a single School. If a particular position may contribute significantly to more than one School, whether through a split appointment or otherwise, the justification for that position should include supporting letter(s) from the Dean and/or the program faculty of the other School. Cluster hires (multiple positions in different disciplinary units and/or Schools that support research in a common area) are encouraged. Each position that is considered part of a cluster hire should be identified as such in the position description.

In addition to the ranked FTE requests, CAPRA requests that each School submit (1) a table listing, for each requested FTE, the level of the position, the principal graduate and undergraduate programs in which this person is expected to participate, expected space, startup, and other infrastructure requirements, and the Dean's and Faculty's priority rankings; (2) a table listing all faculty currently holding appointments in the School, with their unit and graduate group affiliations and the principal undergraduate programs in which they teach; (3) a table listing all currently approved but unfilled positions. Please see Appendices 1-3 for examples.

The final position descriptions, prioritizations, and supporting tables are due **February 15, 2015** to the Senate office (senateoffice@ucmerced.edu) and the Provost's office (provostevc@ucmerced.edu).

CAPRA criteria

1. Potential to strengthen research programs in existing or nascent graduate programs/groups, including cross-school or interdisciplinary programs.
2. Support of graduate education through student mentorship and graduate teaching.
3. Ability to build connections with ORUs, CRUs, or other existing or proposed organized research units or academic units on campus or systemwide.
4. Support of undergraduate majors and undergraduate teaching needs.

This FTE request should include any needed LPSOE positions. It should not include carryover positions (those approved in a prior year but not yet filled) or replacements for vacated positions.

DRAFT

Appendix 1: Sample Table of Requested FTEs

Name of position	Level (Lecturer/ Assistant/ Associate/ Full)	Primary Grad Group	Secondary Grad Group(s) (optional)	Primary Major	Secondary Major(s) (optional)	Est. startup costs	Est. space and other infrastructure needs	Priority (Dean)	Priority (Faculty)

Appendix 2: Sample Table of Current School Faculty

Name	Level (Lecturer/ Assistant/ Associate/ Full)	Bylaw 55 Unit	Primary Grad Group	Secondary Grad Group(s)	Primary Undergrad Major	Secondary Undergrad Major(s)

Appendix 3: Sample Table of Unfilled Positions

Name of position	Replacement (for whom?) or new position?	Level (Lecturer/ Assistant/ Associate/ Full)	Primary Graduate Group	Secondary Graduate Group(s) (optional)	Primary Major	Secondary Major(s) (optional)	Estimated startup costs	Estimated space and other infrastructure needs

Proposal for Pilot Program – Undergraduate Chairs in Undergraduate Majors in the School of Natural Sciences and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts*
December 8, 2014

Purpose:

The position, Undergraduate Program Chair, will facilitate attention to undergraduate success within the context of the major and in support of program and institutional goals. In carrying out this role, undergraduate chairs will represent the major program to the Undergraduate Student Success Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Committee. In addition, the Undergraduate Chairs will work closely with AP/By-Law Unit Chairs and Grad Group Chairs in attending to curriculum and other matters (see Appendix 1 for specific responsibilities). The Undergraduate Chairs also will work closely with the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education on matters related to institutional priorities for undergraduate student success.

Rationale:

Creating the administrative role of Undergraduate Program Chair, will:

1. Organize responsibilities for, and attention to, undergraduate student success. These responsibilities include program learning outcomes assessment, curriculum and resource planning, student petitions, General Education, and other duties as specified in the Undergraduate Chair position description.
2. Provide reliable access to, and interactions with, a group of faculty members for the VPDUE, thereby allowing for effective institution-level attention to matters related to undergraduate student success.
 - a. In this way, the undergraduate chairs will function with the VPDUE much as the Graduate Group chairs do with the Graduate Dean, linking program-level practices and priorities to those at the institutional level.
 - b. Institutional priorities include addressing external demands for institution-level attention to undergraduate success (e.g., WASC, UCOP), as well as internal concerns (e.g., revising General Education and GE program assessment, improving student retention and persistence, identifying and addressing obstacles to student success).
3. Address inequities in rewards, compensation, and incentives across schools and programs for a variety of tasks related to undergraduate student success, including the role of Faculty Assessment Organizer.

Pilot Project Specifications

1. **Duration:** The proposed pilot project will begin January 1, 2015 and end on January 1, 2017.
2. **Evaluation of Pilot:** Criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of the pilot will include (1) assessment, including timely completion of annual assessment reports and use of assessment data for program improvement; (2) curriculum, including annual and three-year teaching and course scheduling plans consistent with student needs for normal progress to degree; (3) engagement of faculty in institution-level student success initiatives, including identifying and addressing obstacles (e.g., academic policies, practices) to student success, examining potential programs for honors students, using data to assess program effectiveness; (4) advancing goals for General Education; and (5) considerations internal to programs, including communication and coordination.
 - If, at the end of the pilot period, evaluation data demonstrate that the program is unnecessary, it will not continue.
 - If, at the end of the pilot period, evaluation data demonstrate that the program is effective and should be continued, a proposal for a permanent program will be introduced to Undergraduate Council for Senate consultation.
 - Because the nature of future academic organizational structures at UC Merced is undetermined at this point in time, the pilot program for undergraduate chairs does not presume any particular future structure. Decisions about those structures (e.g., whether traditional academic departments are desirable) could affect the need for, or roles of, undergraduate chairs.
3. **Scope of Responsibilities and Compensation:**
 - One Undergraduate Chair will be named for each of 21 undergraduate majors.

- Two options for undergraduate chair responsibilities are available and compensation differs based on the scope of responsibilities (see Appendix 1 for descriptions; these were based on appointment letters for Grad Group chairs and for the School of Engineering Undergraduate Chairs). AP/By-Law Unit chairs, in collaboration with program faculty, will decide which option meets the needs of the program most effectively.
- 1) *Option 1*: The Undergraduate Chair will perform the role of Faculty Assessment Organizer (FAO), as well as the role of undergraduate chair. In this case, the Undergraduate Chair will receive compensation in the amount of \$5000 to a research account (for use as a stipend or research funds) for each year she or he serves as Undergraduate Chair.
 - 2) *Option 2*: The roles of Undergraduate Chair and FAO will be performed by two different program faculty members. In this option, the Undergraduate Chair will work with the FAO to ensure integrated, regular, and ongoing attention to undergraduate learning and success in the program. In Option 2, the Undergraduate Chair and the FAO will receive compensation in the amount of \$2500 each to a research account (for use as a stipend or research funds) for each year each serves in these roles.
4. Funding: Half of the amount (\$2500 per Chair) will be paid from the FAO stipend budget of the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment; those funds were first allocated in AY 2013-2014¹. The other half will be funded, as are the Graduate Chairs, by an allocation from the Provost's Office.
 5. Coordination: The Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education (Office of Undergraduate Education) and the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment will provide oversight and coordination of the pilot program. They will seek input from undergraduate chairs, AP/By-Law Unit chairs, and FAOs to evaluate the pilot.

*The School of Engineering faculty approved Undergraduate Chairs in Spring 2014

¹ The FAO stipend budget also includes funds for the FAOs of standalone minors. As such, these FAOs will receive a stipend as well.

Appendix 1: Meetings with Senate Faculty, Fall 2014

Background

In August 2014, the school deans and the Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor approved a proposal for a pilot program for Undergraduate Chairs. The School of Engineering faculty had approved undergraduate chairs for Engineering's five undergraduate majors in Spring 2014 and the pilot program was a means to create similar opportunities in the School of Natural Sciences and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts.

Timeline

Beginning in September 2014, the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education and the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment met with Senate faculty members to obtain feedback about the proposed pilot program. All FAOs for majors in SNS and SSHA received an invitation to meet. This included FAOs who also fill the administrative role of AP/Bylaw chairs. At the request of some FAOs, faculty leads for their majors were invited as well. The VPDUE also had initial meetings regarding the pilot program and the process for moving forward with the pilot with Jack Vevea, Chair of Undergraduate Council, and Gregg Camfield, Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Those meetings were followed by the following faculty conversations:

School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts FAOs – September 23, 2014

Participants: Virginia Adan-Lifante (Spanish), Kathleen Hull (Anthropology), Sholeh Quinn (History), Susanna Ramirez (Public Health), Michael Spivey (Cognitive Sciences), Jack Vevea (Psychology), Alex Whalley (Economics), Laura Martin (Coordinator for Institutional Assessment), and Elizabeth Whitt (Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education).

School of Natural Sciences FAOs and Undergraduate "Leads" – October 1, 2104

Participants: Francois Blanchette (Applied Math), Yue Lei (Applied Math), Carrie Menke (Physics), Jay Sharping (Physics), Jess Vickery (Chemistry), and Elizabeth Whitt

School of Natural Sciences AP Chairs who also serve as FAOs - October 3, 2104

Participants: Rob Innes (Management), Nathan Monroe (Political Science), Nella Van Dyke (Sociology), Laura Martin, and Elizabeth Whitt.

Feedback provided at these meetings (see notes that follow) highlighted the fact that majors differ in their current models for focusing on undergraduate education, and thus "One size does not fit all." Following this feedback, the pilot was revised to offer two options/models: (1) Option 1, whereby the Undergraduate Chair also is FAO, and (2) Option 2, whereby the FAO and UG chair duties – and the \$5000 stipend – are split between 2 faculty members. In Option 2, however, the Undergraduate Chair would be the point of contact and coordinator, in collaboration with the AP/By-Law Unit chair, for all relevant aspects of the undergraduate program in the major.

Following those revisions, the proposal for the pilot program was shared, and discussed, with AP and By-Law Unit chairs in SNS and SSHA:

AP and By-Law Unit Chair Meetings

November 18, 2014

Participants: Marilyn Fogel (SNS), Arnold Kim (SNS), Ignacio Lopez-Calvo (SSHA), Jennifer Manilay (SNS), Nella Van Dyke (SSHA), Jan Wallander (SSHA), Laura Martin, and Elizabeth Whitt.

November 24, 2014

Participants: Michael Colvin (SNS), Laura Martin, and Elizabeth Whitt

November 26, 2014

Participants: David Noelle (SSHA), Laura Martin, and Elizabeth Whitt

Notes from Meetings with Senate Faculty

The meetings with faculty (FAOs, undergraduate leads, and AP/Bylaw Chairs, including AP Chairs who are also FAOs) generated a lot of very useful information regarding the proposed role of undergraduate chairs. What follows is a brief summary of that information, organized by perceived strengths of the role and the concerns and questions that were raised. Faculty of both schools identified similar strengths and raised similar concerns.

Perceived Strengths:

The general consensus across the faculty meetings was that undergraduate chairs are a positive step, providing recognition and reward for tasks many faculty members are doing without such reward or recognition. Examples of specific comments regarding perceived strengths include:

One faculty member commented, “This position makes perfect sense to me. It’s a structure that allows for planning and coordination.” Another noted, “Linking broader responsibility for student success with the FAO role creates logical connections.” Similarly, “this provides opportunities for focused conversations about undergraduate students, similar to those we’re having about graduate education.” Also, “this position will raise the priority of undergraduate education” within the majors.

A common response across the discussions was “This formalizes, rewards, and recognizes what we’re already doing.” At the same time, “we’d have one point person who can coordinate with other faculty in [the school] and across campus.” “This puts undergraduate priorities administratively on peoples’ radar; we can set goals and work toward something meaningful, rather than functioning ‘willy nilly’.” “It fills something that’s been missing.”

Concerns and Questions:

Along with the positive comments, faculty members raised some key concerns and questions about the roles of undergraduate chairs. The most common concern can be summarized as: “The ‘devil is in the details.’ One faculty member noted, “It’s a good idea, but what about the practicalities?” The practicalities raised most frequently as concerns were (1) possible disruption to “what’s working now,” (2) challenges of organizational communication, and (3) faculty workload issues. The latter included concerns about one individual assuming responsibilities that are currently distributed. Ways in which these concerns have been addressed so far are summarized below; it should be noted, however, that all of these matters – and others – will be the focus of ongoing evaluation of the pilot program.

One theme in the meetings with faculty was, in the words of one person, “One size does not fit all. We have a good arrangement, where I take care of the major and [my colleague] is FAO.” As noted earlier, the response to this concern was to create two options for organizing the work of the undergraduate chair and the FAO, with the UG Chair acting as point of contact to support communication and coordination.

Another common concern was expressed by one faculty member as “the potential for splitting our attention.” That is, might there be potential for undergraduate education initiatives to become disconnected from other program priorities or other program leaders (e.g., AP/By-Law Unit chairs, Grad Group chairs)? The descriptions of the undergraduate chair position include a strong emphasis on collaboration and communication within the program unit, as well as between the program unit – via the undergraduate chair and the AP/By-Law Unit chair -- and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. This is not to say there aren’t challenges inherent in this arrangement, but effective communication among colleagues is key to anticipating those challenges.

A related concern was whether the roles identified for the undergraduate chairs overlapped with the responsibilities of the AP/By-Law Unit chairs. This turns out not to be true in most cases, though the AP/By-Law Unit chair responsibilities vary somewhat across programs. A chart detailing areas of difference and overlap (based AP/By-Law Unit chairs responsibilities as outlined in the SNS and SSHA appointment letter) is attached.

Finally, as one faculty member noted, “this is a lot of work for one person.” Concerns were raised about the extent to which the responsibilities of the undergraduate chairs would be too much – particularly without a course release (which is not an option in the pilot program) – for untenured faculty members or, in some cases, associate

professors. This is a significant concern, of course, and one that will be taken into account in the evaluation of the pilot. However, many Senate faculty currently perform these roles and do so without the recognition that would come with a specified administrative position and without a stipend for the work.

Appendix 2: Appointment Letters

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95344
PHONE: (209) 228-4411
FAX: (209) 228-4047

DATE

Professor XXX

Undergraduate Program Chair, School of [Name]

With this letter I am pleased to offer you an appointment to the position of Undergraduate Program Chair for [Program Name] in the School of [Name]. This is a two-year appointment, beginning xx and ending xx.

As Undergraduate Program Chair, your primary duties and responsibilities are as follows:

- Facilitate program attention to undergraduate success (enrollment management, persistence, timely degree progress and graduation, diversity) in the context of the major and in support of institutional goals. Includes service as the program representative to the Undergraduate Student Success Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Council.
- Serve as program Faculty Assessment Organizer (FAO), with responsibility for annual and periodic program assessment. Administer the curriculum and resources associated with a degree program or programs, in consultation with by-law/unit chair, program faculty and staff; may delegate tasks to program faculty or committees.
- Represent program faculty in all matters related to the undergraduate degree program(s) to the dean(s) and School Executive Committee(s).
- Review and correct catalog copy and other publicity for the undergraduate program.
- Review and act on student petitions for exceptions to policy, such as requirement or prerequisite waivers, course substitutions from other programs or institutions, leaves of absence, and so on.
- In collaboration with by-law/unit chair, graduate chair, and program faculty, assist with teaching assignments consistent with the program's 3-year teaching plan to ensure that degrees are attainable in 4 years, faculty teaching capacity is being used efficiently (e.g., required courses offered at least once per year, attention to under-enrolled courses), and General Education commitments are met.
- Serve as program representative to the School Curriculum Committee(s).
- Participate with the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education and the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment in ongoing formative and summative evaluation of the Program Chair pilot program.

This position is intended to ensure regular and ongoing attention to undergraduate learning and success in your program in keeping with school and campus priorities. Consistent with this purpose, you will receive compensation in the amount of \$5000 (in the form of a stipend or research funds) each year you serve in this role.

Thank you for assuming this appointment on behalf of your colleagues and the University. Please signify your acceptance of these responsibilities by signing below.

Sincerely,

[Name], Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
 5200 N. LAKE ROAD
 MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95344
 PHONE: (209) 228-4411
 FAX: (209) 228-4047

DATE

Professor XXX

Undergraduate Program Chair, School of [Name]

With this letter I am pleased to offer you an appointment to the position of Undergraduate Program Chair for [Program Name] in the School of [Name]. This is a two-year appointment, beginning xx and ending xx.

As Undergraduate Program Chair, your primary duties and responsibilities are as follows:

- Facilitate program attention to undergraduate success (enrollment management, persistence, timely degree progress and graduation, diversity) in the context of the major and in support of institutional goals. Includes service as the program representative to the Undergraduate Student Success Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Council.
- Administer the curriculum and resources associated with a degree program or programs, in consultation with the Faculty Assessment Organizer (FAO), the by-law/unit chair, program faculty and staff; you may delegate tasks to program faculty or committees.
- In collaboration with by-law/unit chair, graduate chair, and program faculty, assist with teaching assignments consistent with the program's 3-year teaching plan to ensure that (1) degrees are attainable in 4 years, (2) faculty teaching capacity is being used efficiently (e.g., required courses offered at least once per year, attention to under-enrolled courses), and (3) General Education commitments are met.
- Represent program faculty in all matters related to the undergraduate degree program(s) to the dean(s) and School Executive Committee(s).
- Review and correct catalog copy and other publicity for the undergraduate program.
- Review and act on student petitions for exceptions to policy, such as requirement or prerequisite waivers, course substitutions from other programs or institutions, leaves of absence, and so on.
- Serve as program representative to the School Curriculum Committee(s).
- Serve as general point of contact for all matters related to the undergraduate academic program. This includes working with the FAO to coordinate student learning outcomes assessment and use of assessment data for program improvement.
- Participate with the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education and the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment in ongoing formative and summative evaluation of the Program Chair pilot program.

As part of your program's administrative leadership team, you will work with your program's Faculty Assessment Organizer to ensure (1) integration of your program's assessment work with broader program stewardship activities, and (2) regular and ongoing attention to undergraduate learning and success in your program in keeping with school and campus priorities. As the Undergraduate Program Chair you will be the point of contact for the responsibilities outlined above and program assessment.

Consistent with this purpose, you will receive compensation in the amount of \$2500 (in the form of a stipend or research funds) each year you serve in this role.

Thank you for assuming this appointment on behalf of your colleagues and the University. Please signify your acceptance of these responsibilities by signing below.

Sincerely,

[Name], Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
 5200 N. LAKE ROAD
 MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95344
 PHONE: (209) 228-4411
 FAX: (209) 228-4047

DATE

Professor XXX

Faculty Assessment Organizer, Program [Name]

With this letter I am pleased to offer you an appointment to the position of Faculty Assessment Organizer for [Program Name] in the School of [Name]. This is a [x-year] appointment, beginning xx and ending xx.

In collaboration with the Undergraduate Chair, program colleagues and with the support of the [Manager of Student and Program Assessment X], FAOs facilitate the [annual assessment activities](#) of their programs. This includes

- assessing at least one Program Learning Outcome annually¹.
- discussing findings with program faculty, including the identification of any actions suggested by the findings.
- implementing resulting actions, including any that address the assessment strategy itself.
- developing a [summary report](#) that is shared with the school dean and the Periodic Review Oversight Committee ([PROC](#)). The annual report submission date for your program is [insert date].
- reviewing, disseminating (to colleagues), and implementing PROC feedback as appropriate.

FAOs also facilitate [academic program review](#), a comprehensive, peer-review based review that each program undertakes once every seven years. Your program's next review is currently scheduled for [x – and hyperlink].

As part of your program's administrative leadership team, you will work with the Undergraduate Chair to ensure (1) integration of your program's assessment work with broader program stewardship activities, and (2) regular and ongoing attention to undergraduate learning and success in your program in keeping with school and campus priorities. The Undergraduate Program Chair will be the point of contact for program assessment, consistent with his/her larger chair responsibilities.

Consistent with this purpose, you will receive compensation in the amount of \$2500 (in the form of a stipend or research funds) each year you serve in this role.

Additional information and resources in support of your work as FAO are available via the [FAO FAQ page](#) at assessment.ucmerced.edu.

Your program's previous Program Learning Outcomes Reports as well as PROC feedback on these activities are available [point to where this is archived]. In this same folder, you will also find your program's assessment plan for addressing the [WASC Core Competencies](#) as part of your program's ongoing assessment efforts.

Following the [advice of experienced FAOs](#)², I encourage you to contact [Manager's name] as soon as possible to review your program's timeline for completing the annual assessment cycle, and to initiate your program's efforts.

Thank you for assuming this appointment on behalf of your colleagues and the University. Please signify your acceptance of these responsibilities by signing below.

Sincerely,

[Name], Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education

Signed _____

¹ Typically this involves coordinating with program faculty to identify, gather and assess evidence of student learning (e.g. student work and student perceptions of their learning) and the student experience. This may involve developing and/or revising program rubrics.

² Data from FAO interviews conducted during 2013-14.

Appendix 3: Comparison of AP Chair and Proposed UG Chair Responsibilities 8.12.2014

AP Chair Responsibilities		Proposed UG Chair Responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be responsible for all academic personnel actions within a unit; may delegate actions to unit faculty or committees • Represent the unit faculty in all personnel matters to the School Dean and School Executive Committee • Ensure that all faculty and LSOE personnel actions (promotions, merit reviews, faculty-requested actions) are carried out in a timely fashion (e.g., assemble committees, solicit external letters, write and present cases, and write transmittal letters), either by the chair or by delegation to an appropriate faculty member • Oversee committees, hiring plans, and recruitment for new faculty searches, and be accountable that appropriate attention is given to issues of faculty diversity • Propose unit resource needs, in consultation with group faculty, to the School Dean • In collaboration with graduate group and undergraduate program chairs, recommend teaching assignments for faculty in the unit • Recommend sabbatical leaves and other leaves of absence for unit members in consultation with graduate group and undergraduate program chairs • Review and recommend temporary lecturer appointments in collaboration with undergraduate program chair • Oversee assignment of mentors to lecturers as appropriate • Nominate faculty for awards; write letters of support for faculty applying for grants when the Unit Chair is the appropriate person to provide such a letter • Meet annually with each faculty member to discuss performance in research, teaching, and service • Develop and maintain a unit diversity program for faculty • Maintain a climate that is hospitable to creativity, diversity, and innovation • Serve as the main point of contact for the unit 	<div data-bbox="800 228 1167 488" style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #e0e0e0; padding: 5px;"> <p style="text-align: center;">Shared Responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources • Review and recommend temporary lecturer appointments. • Teaching assignments </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As FAO, administer the curriculum and resources associated with a degree program or programs, in consultation with program faculty and staff; may delegate tasks to program faculty or committees. This includes annual and periodic program assessment. • Represent program faculty in all matters related to the undergraduate degree program(s) to the dean(s) & School Executive Committee(s). • Review and correct catalog copy and other publicity for undergraduate program. • Review and act on student petitions for exceptions to policy, such as requirement or prerequisite waivers, course substitutions from other programs or institutions, leaves of absence, and so on. • In collaboration with AP and graduate group chairs, make teaching assignments consistent with, and maintain, the program's 3-year teaching plan to ensure that degrees are attainable in 4 years, faculty teaching capacity is being used efficiently (e.g., required courses offered at least once per year, attention to under-enrolled courses), and General Education commitments are met. • Serve as program representative to the School Curriculum Committee(s). • Facilitate program attention to undergraduate success (enrollment management, persistence, timely degree progress and graduation, diversity) in the context of the major and in support of institutional goals. • Serve as the program representative to Undergraduate Student Success Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Council. <p>Collaborative responsibilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage in academic and strategic planning, budget requests, and requests for faculty and staff FTE. • Coordinate undergraduate awards. • Participate in and recruit other volunteers for School/UCM UG program activities (e.g., Preview Day, Bobcat Day) • Review and recommend temporary lecturer appointments in collaboration with AP Chair • Determine course needs/qualifications for teaching assistants, oversee TA training, and communicate the needs and any special circumstances to the graduate group chairs and the designees of the school deans.

Appendix 4: Graduate Group Chair Appointment Letter

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE GRADUATE DEAN

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
Mailing Address:
5200 North Lake Rd.
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95343

DATE

Dear,

With this letter I am happy to appoint you to the position of Graduate Group Chair for the (NAME) Graduate Group. This is a calendar-year appointment effective (DATE). This one-year appointment is renewable on an annual basis, subject to administrative review by Dean Aldenderfer and the graduate dean, in consultation with (GROUP NAME) faculty members. As liaison between your graduate group and the Graduate Division, your responsibilities include the following:

- Oversee the progress of graduate students through the program, including satisfaction of degree requirements and advancement to candidacy, in coordination with group advisors, faculty and staff
- Represent the group faculty in all matters related to the degree program(s) to the lead dean, the graduate dean, Graduate and Research Council, and School Executive Committee(s)
- Determine resource needs and administer program budget, in consultation with group faculty, lead dean, and graduate dean
- Oversee graduate student recruitment, graduate program website, admissions, and financial aid, in consultation with group faculty, lead dean, and graduate dean
- Determine graduate course offerings each semester, including curriculum changes, in consultation with group faculty, and school staff and faculty involved in course scheduling and teaching assignments
- Determine graduate course resource needs for equipment, staff support, and other resources, in consultation with faculty and lead deans
- Serve as graduate group Faculty Accreditation Organizer by overseeing annual program assessments and periodic program review, to monitor and maintain academic excellence
- Consult with deans in selecting and reviewing graduate support staff
- Coordinate participation of the graduate group in School and University program activities, including graduate student fellowship and award programs
- Develop and maintain a plan for promoting diversity among matriculated graduate students
- Manage and respond to program feedback and inquiries from faculty, students, staff, and reviewers

If you agree to accept these responsibilities, you will receive compensation in the form of (\$5000) per year, which can be used either for research expenses or summer stipend. I thank you for considering this appointment on behalf of your colleagues and the Graduate Division. Please signify your acceptance of these responsibilities by signing below, and returning a signed copy to the Graduate Division.

(Professor Name)

Sincerely,
Professor Chris Kello
Acting Dean of the Graduate Division

CAPRA comments on undergraduate chairs pilot program

It is proposed to create the position of Undergraduate Program Chair in SNS and SSHA. SoE already established such a position in Spring 2014. The UPC is a faculty member who will have primary responsibility for his or her undergraduate major, somewhat in parallel to the Graduate Group chairs. Apparently the UPC will be appointed by and report to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The UPC will receive an annual stipend of \$5,000 if he/she also takes on the Faculty Assessment Organizer tasks; if the two positions are split, each will receive \$2,500. This is viewed as a pilot program to run for two years starting in January 2015.

I think it is essential that each major have a specific faculty member who takes responsibility for consulting with his or her colleagues to design, deliver, and assess that major's curriculum, and who serves as the principal contact person with the administration. However, I think that for most of our majors the proposed approach is not the best way to accomplish this. Most of our majors are already associated with a specific Bylaw 55 unit whose membership is clearly defined and that already has an appointed chair. Separating out the Undergraduate Program Chair and having that person report directly to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, rather than to the unit chair or even the Dean of the School, will only serve to undermine efforts to develop a functional departmental structure in those disciplines where that makes sense. Under this plan, each proto-department would have three different chairs: a Bylaw chair reporting to the School Dean, a grad group chair reporting to the Graduate Dean, and an undergraduate chair reporting to the Undergraduate Dean. This structure will simply make it more difficult for the faculty to carry out activities that impact more than one of these realms (e.g. teaching assignments). It would make much more sense for the "grad chair" and "undergrad chair" to be chairs of corresponding committees of the unit. The committee chairs may have considerable autonomy but ultimately report to the unit chair, who coordinates all activities of the unit and communicates with the administration.

I realize that the above structure will not work for those majors that are significantly spread among two or more bylaw units. For these majors, designating an undergraduate program chair makes sense.

A few other thoughts/questions:

1. How will the undergraduate program chairs be chosen? I assume that the formal appointment will come from the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, but with what faculty input? If there is to be faculty input, how will that group of faculty be chosen? Many of our faculty teach courses with several different disciplinary prefixes and most of our faculty teach students from many different majors. Graduate group chairs are appointed by the graduate dean following a recommendation from the grad group faculty. This works because the graduate groups exist as administrative entities with a defined membership. No such thing exists for undergraduate majors, and the "program faculty" will be the most difficult to define in precisely those majors for which this position is most needed.

2. If the School Deans are now not responsible for either graduate or undergraduate programs, what is their role? It seems that they will now be responsible for providing resources for everything without having any input into academic programs.

3. To whom do the current Engineering program chairs report? If it is not the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, will this be changed once the pilot program starts? If not, what is the rationale for treating SoE differently? Perhaps SoE should simply be divided into Bylaw 55 units like the other two Schools and each unit be held responsible for its own majors, as is currently the case in most of SNS and SSHA.

4. The proposed stipend for undergraduate program chairs who are also FAOs is \$5,000, the same as the stipend for graduate group chairs (unless it has changed recently). In SNS, unit chairs receive \$10,000 per year (unless it has changed recently). The total administrative stipend of \$20,000 per year is perhaps still low compared with other UCs, where department chairs get teaching relief and a lot more staff support in addition to a stipend, although it may reasonably be argued that our faculty administrators do not handle major issues like budgets and space and should therefore receive less compensation (and less staff support). In any case, it seems that faculty in all three Schools should be treated equally in this regard, although it may be appropriate to impose some scaling factors to account for different numbers of students and faculty in different programs.

5. It seems odd that the listed duties of the undergrad program chair include nothing about curriculum planning, e.g. requirements for the major, new courses, changes in existing courses.