COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)
Wednesday, December 17, 2014
3:00 – 4:30 pm
KL 324
UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources

I.   **Chair's Report**
Updates from UCORP meeting of December 8

II.   **Consent Calendar**   **Pg. 1-4**
Action requested: Approval of December 3 meeting minutes.

III.   **Reviewing CRU Bylaws**
Background: COR received a request to review the bylaws of a CRU.   There is currently no expectation that COR will review CRU governance other than during initial approval and periodic review per the research unit procedures approved in the last academic year.

Discussion: COR members to discuss whether COR or another campus unit should review research unit bylaws.

IV.   **Campus Review Item**   **Pg. 5-14**
Background: proposed two-year pilot program for undergraduate program chairs in SNS and SSHA.

Action requested: COR to review the proposed pilot program for impacts on the campus research mission and provide comments to the Senate Chair by Friday, December 19.

V.   **Senate Faculty Grants Program**
Background: Pursuant to the action item from the December 3 meeting, previous award winners were emailed and asked to describe in one paragraph how the award positively impacted their research (e.g., publications, presentations, related competitive grant awards, students supported, new collaborations formed).

Discussion: COR members to discuss the results received from survey of previous award winners and hold further discussion on the data to be included in the memo to the Provost/EVC.

Relevant background documents, including the previous awardees, proposals, and calls, as well as information from the other UC campuses, are posted at: ***UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Faculty research grants***

VI.   **Research Development Services Review Items**   **Pg. 15-19**
Background: At the November 5 meeting, Research Development Services (RDS) and Sponsored Projects Office (SPO) staff attended a COR meeting to provide an overview of their services. They requested the committee's feedback on 1) the document detailing RDS' services and timeline of grant submissions and assistance and 2) SPO's internal deadlines for proposal submissions.

The NCURA final report of recommendations following the review of the Office of Research is posted on ***UCMCROPS/COR1415/Research Development Services***.

Action requested: COR to review both documents and provide input to RDS Director Susan Carter and SPO Director Thea Vicari.

VII.   **Other Business**

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
December 3, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on December 3, 2014 in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

I.   AVC for Research and Economic Development
        AVC Peter Schuerman provided an overview of his services to COR members.   By way of introduction, Chair Noelle first summarized the situation at the systemwide level where President Napolitano is interested in innovation and the commercialization of research. She has formed a committee to this effect and has delayed appointing a new Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies.   UCORP has discussed these concerns at previous meetings and asked members to provide an overview of tech transfer from each of their campuses.

        AVC Shuerman announced he closed the UCM tech transfer office and the office is now known as the Office of Business Development. AVC Shuerman related that the tech transfer business model at many institutions is problematic and no longer sustainable. The National Council of University Research Administrators formed a subcommittee to administer intellectual property at universities after consensus was reached that the tech transfer business model needed to be addressed.

        AVC Shuerman has staff working on projects related to start-up companies. He emphasized that the university is a research institution, not a research and development entity. However, his office is attempting to introduce the development element by seeking partnerships, shared opportunities, and return on investment.   While it is important to continue communicating with government agencies, the university also has to work with industry and encourage co-investment.   The university has many resources from which companies can benefit so companies are encouraged to work with our campus by hiring our students. In return, our faculty members offer their research to be developed.   Put another way, faculty researchers deserve an

"agent" to help them with business opportunities and partnerships.   Industry is looking for investments, not simply research projects to fund.

VCR Traina mentioned that AVC Shuerman successfully negotiated a contract with HP (previously, faculty could not engage in research agreements with HP).

AVC Shuerman mentioned that the campus has acquired space downtown to begin building teams in support of business partnerships. He asked COR's assistance in imparting to the faculty that the tech transfer model is not sustainable and that business partnerships is the more effective path.

A COR member expressed concern that the business model contains a development component that could be emphasized over the university research enterprise.   AVC Shuerman and VCR Traina reiterated the importance of partnerships and pointed out that the business model provides for support for faculty members with their research and inventions.

II.   Chair's Report
Chair Noelle updated COR members on the discussion items from the Division Council meeting held earlier today.

--Provost/EVC expects that the strategic academic focusing thematic areas will be ready to implement in January or February 2015.
--the Governor is advocating for three-year undergraduate degree programs.
--the systemwide Senate has discussed the total remuneration study which found that UC faculty are receiving about 12% less pay than the "Comparison 8" institutions.   Each campus Provost/EVC has been asked to work with his or her Senate division to provide recommendations on closing this salary gap.
--Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Dan Feitelberg delivered a Project 2020 presentation that focused on transferring risk to private entities. One of the proposals for new buildings is a "mortgage" model whereby the campus pays a fee for the financing, building, and maintenance of new buildings and

if after a certain number of years the buildings are well maintained, then ownership of the buildings is transferred to the campus.

--The systemwide emeriti society is a resource that campuses can use to fill slots on Senate committees.

--the medical education task force has been formed.

--the search committee for the new dean of SSHA is nearly filled.

--Division Council discussed COR's memo requesting the empaneling of a standing Senate committee on library and scholarly communication. The Council has requested that COR formulate a charge and membership.

COR members discussed the possible membership and agreed that the new library committee should include members from COR, CAPRA, UGC, and GC.

ACTION: COR Chair will review the COR bylaws and last year's Library Working Group's report in which the Group listed the charges and membership of library committees on other UC campuses. COR Chair will draft a proposed charge and membership and circulate to COR members for review.   COR to send Division Council the proposed charge prior to the first Council meeting in January 2015.

III.   Consent Calendar
ACTION: The minutes from the November 19 meeting were approved as presented.

IV.   Senate Faculty Grants Program

Pursuant to the action item from the November 19 meeting, the committee analyst collected the award winners and budgets from AY 2008-2009 through AY 2013-2014 as well as total number of campus faculty during that timeframe.   A COR member has begun crafting a graph to illustrate the low funding trend. COR members agreed that an email should be sent to all previous award winners, explaining that COR is attempting to make a compelling case to the Provost/EVC on the need for increased funding for the Senate faculty grants program. COR will ask the awardees to list their project

titles, amount funded, co-PIs, and write one paragraph that explains how their Senate award positively impacted their research output. Examples can include publications, other competitive grants, travel awards, student support, new collaborations, presentations at professional meetings, etc. Deadline for response should be December 19.

ACTION: Committee analyst will send the draft language to the Chair who will circulate to the committee for review and input. The next steps include refining the graph based on funding comparisons with other UC campuses and reviewing the responses from the previous award winners. Then, COR will send the memo to the Provost/EVC. Lastly, in January, COR will focus on drafting the spring 2015 call for proposals.

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

Attest: David C. Noelle, COR Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

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. <u>Duration</u>: The proposed pilot project will begin January 1, 2015 and end on January 1, 2017.
2. <u>Evaluation of Pilot</u>: 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. <u>Scope of Responsibilities and Compensation</u>:
    - 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. <u>Funding</u>: 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 2013-2014[1]. The other half will be funded, as are the Graduate Chairs, by an allocation from the Provost's Office.

5. <u>Coordination</u>: 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 <u>all</u> 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

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

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
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 annually[1].
- 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
• 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	• 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. Collaborative responsibilities • 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.

Shared Responsibilities

• Resources
• Review and recommend temporary lecturer appointments.
• Teaching assignments

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

DRAFT ONLY
RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT SERVICES (RDS) Services and Timelines

RDS accepts requests for assistance on a first-come, first-serve basis. Demand for the services that RDS provides often exceeds its capacity to respond. Whether RDS can assist with any given request is contingent upon several factors including timeliness of your request, the status of your proposal at the time of your request, the quantity of requests already in progress, and staff availability.

Contact RDS with your request well in advance of deadlines to allow staff to fully support your needs. *The amount of advance notice RDS requires depends upon the complexity and size of the proposal and the level of service you request. > See Section B. for required lead times.*

A. General Assistance:
RDS encourages all faculty to contact us for **general assistance** in locating and competing for extramural research funding for your research. If you are working with a specific Research Development Officer (RDO), you may contact them directly; otherwise please send your request to rds@ucmerced.edu and we will refer you to the appropriate RDO. Please contact us as soon as you have an idea for a research project you'd like to get funded! With ***at least several months notice***, we can:

- Help you find funding opportunities that are a good 'fit' with your idea;
- Assist in identifying both internal and external collaborators;
- Help you refine your ideas to fit the needs and agenda of specific agencies;
- Help you communicate with and establish relationships with potential funders;
- Help you strategize a timeline for development of large or complex research proposals.

B. Assistance with Specific Proposal Development:
Once you have identified a specific funding opportunity that you wish to apply for, RDS will assist you with proposal development. The types and amount of service that RDS can provide is contingent on the amount of lead-time you give. Contact RDS well in advance of the proposal submission deadline to receive greater levels of support for your request. Please keep in mind that the Office of Sponsored Projects (SPO) and the Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development (VCRED) have implemented a three business day deadline for submission of proposals to SPO for review and submission to funding agencies; faculty who work with RDS within the service timelines outlined below will receive assistance from RDS to assure that the SPO review and submission deadlines are met. Working with RDS will help assure that your proposal meets a funder's administrative deadlines and will be submitted in a timely fashion.

Lead Time for Requests
To determine the necessary lead time for your request, consider the size and complexity of your proposal based on the following categories:
• **Category 1 proposals:** Small, uncomplicated proposals.
Any proposal with an entire multi-year budget (including any indirect costs) less than $500,000 and with *no more than one* sub-award to another institution.
• **Category 2 proposals:** Large and/or complex proposals.
Any proposal with an entire multi-year budget of $500,000 or greater AND any proposal with more than one sub-award to other institutions.

1

Send ALL requests for assistance with development of a specific proposal to rds@ucmerced.edu. Include the following minimum intake information:

1. Sponsor name and solicitation information (URL or other access)
2. Basic proposal details: Project title; estimated start and end date; estimated total budget including indirect costs.
3. Whether proposal includes a sub-award or sub-awards, and if so, names of collaborating institutions.

CATEGORY 1: Small and Individual Investigator Proposals

***a.* With 30 calendar days notice** prior to the internal SPO deadlines for proposal review before submission (See xxx for more information on the SPO required internal deadlines), RDS can provide full proposal development assistance including:

- Full proposal development and editing; assistance with preparation of supplementary materials including internal forms, budget, budget justification and non-scientific portions of proposal; and quality assurance by providing feedback and revisions to address the funding agency review criteria.
- Create Cayuse/SP electronic record, or assist faculty with creating Cayuse/SP electronic record; and begin the routing process to obtain approvals and facilitate SPO review and agency submission.
- Coordination of supporting documents for sub-award and for institutional support.

_b._ With 7 business days notice prior to the internal SPO deadlines for proposal review before submission, RDS **must** receive the following to additional information in order to provide *any* proposal development assistance:

- Draft budget and budget justification.
- One page summary of scope of work.
- Preliminary draft narrative.
- Any required Internal forms—Completed and signed by all parties required.
- Collaborator/sub-award contact information; names and contact information for any letters of support.
- Names of co-PIs for coordination of supporting documents
- **If the above information is provided, RDS can provide a quality assurance check including:**
  - Provide feedback and assistance on proposal revisions as time permits.
  - Assist the PI in completing Cayuse/SP forms.
  - Assist the PI in facilitating the final Sponsored Projects Office proposal review and submission.

c. With less than 7 business days notice: No assistance can be guaranteed for Category 1 proposals. RDS assistance will be limited to assisting with data entry into Cayuse/SP, time permitting, and routing a proposal for approvals if and once Cayuse/SP data entry is completed. If less than 7 business days notice is given to RDS, RDS may decline to provide any assistance, which would require the PI to complete the Cayuse/data entry themselves and could put the proposal at risk for not meeting SPO deadlines for review and submission.

Comment [SC1]: There would be a link here to the SPO webpage with their internal deadlines.

2

CATEGORY 2: Complex, large or multidisciplinary Proposals

a. With 60 calendar days or more notice prior to the internal SPO deadlines, RDS can assist with:
- Coordination of the grant development team and assistance in identifying potential collaborators, evaluators and other external partners.
- Full proposal development and editing; assistance with preparation of supplementary materials including internal forms, budget, budget justification and non-scientific portions of proposal; and quality assurance by providing feedback and revisions to address the funding agency review criteria.
- Create Cayuse/SP record, or assist faculty with creating Cayuse/SP record and begin the routing process to obtain approvals and facilitate SPO review and agency submission.
- Coordination of supporting documents for sub-awards and for letters of institutional support.

b. With 30 calendar days notice prior to the internal SPO deadlines, RDS must receive the following in order to provide proposal development assistance:
- Draft budget and budget justification.
- One page summary of scope of work.
- Preliminary draft narrative.
- Internal forms—Completed and signed by all parties required.
- Collaborator/sub-award contact information; names and contact information for any letters of support.
- Names of co-PIs for coordination of supporting documents
- **If the above information is provided, RDS can provide a quality assurance check including:**
  - Provide feedback and assistance on proposal revisions as time permits.
  - Assist the PI in completing Cayuse/SP forms.
  - Assist the PI in facilitating the final Sponsored Projects Office proposal review and submission.

c. With less than 30 calendar days notice: No assistance can be guaranteed for Category 2 proposals with less than 30 calendar days notice. RDS assistance will be limited to assisting with data entry into Cayuse/SP, time permitting, and routing a proposal for approvals if and once Cayuse/SP data entry is completed. If less than 7 business days notice is given to RDS, RDS may decline to provide any assistance, which would require the PI to complete the Cayuse/data entry themselves and could put the proposal at risk for not meeting SPO deadlines for review and submission.

3

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 N. Lake Road
MERCED, CALIFORNIA 95343
(209) 724-4400

Memorandum (DRAFT)

To: UC Merced Faculty and Principal Investigators

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

Subject: Proposal Submission Deadline

Date: To be determined
_____

The Sponsored Projects Office (SPO) at UC Merced oversees the effective and timely
handling of proposals for grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements submitted by
our faculty. SPO is responsible for reviewing grant, contract, and cooperative
agreement proposals and is charged with ensuring that proposals are consistent with
University policy and can be accepted if an award is made. In consultation with the
Committee on Research and the Deans, SPO has established policies and procedures
that will facilitate the submission of grant and contract proposals in an expeditious
manner while also assuring that the University meets all federal mandates and
assurances.

We request that the following items be submitted to SPO **five (5)** working days in
advance of the sponsor's due date
1) PASS form signed by the appropriate Dean or Institute Director
2) financial disclosure form
3) copy or URL of sponsor's program solicitation or request for proposal
4) original application pages requiring institutional endorsement
5) budget and budget justification
6) draft statement of work
7) additional attachments, when applicable, such as
   - cost sharing commitment letter
   - consultant commitment letter
   - authorized subaward commitment form, scope of work and budget. (Forms are
     available under the Sponsored Projects Office link at http://spo.ucmerced.edu)

When submitting a proposal in draft form for review and endorsement, SPO requires a
final copy of the proposal be forwarded to SPO prior to submission. This is also a

requirement when the proposal submission is electronic either through the internet or via e-mail.

Having this information in advance of the deadline will give SPO an opportunity to review all compliance issues as well as space and matching fund requirements that may be critical to the proposal's success. It will also provide a degree of flexibility should last minute issues arise with collaborative arrangements with other institutions or with electronic proposal submissions, as they frequently do.