FALL MEETING OF THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2015
1:30-3:00 p.m.
Chancellor's Conference Room
232 Kolligian Library

ORDER OF BUSINESS

I.	**ANNOUNCEMENTS**	**10 min**
	A. Division Chair Cristián Ricci	
II.	**CONSENT CALENDAR**	**5 min**
	A. Approval of the Agenda	
	B. Approval of Draft Minutes of the April 23, 2015 Meeting (Pg. 4-16)	
	C. Annual Committee Reports AY 14-15[1]	
	Division Council (Pg. 17-20)	
	Committee on Academic Personnel (Pg. 21-28)	
	Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (Pg. 29-36)	
	Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom[2] (Pg. 37-46)	
	Undergraduate Council (Pg. 47-51)	
	Committee on Research (Pg. 52-64)	
III.	**CONSULTATION WITH PROVOST/EVC PETERSON**	**35 min**
	A. Strategic Academic Focusing and Status of Foundational Hires	
	B. Updates on Project 2020 Planning	
	C. Plans to Fill Vacant Endowed Chairs	

IV.	**STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS**		**30 min**
	Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Chair Mukesh Singhal	(oral)	
	Committee on Academic Personnel, Vice Chair Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas	(oral)	
	Committee on Committees, Chair Patricia LiWang	(oral)	
	Committee on Diversity and Equity, Chair Tanya Golash-Boza	(Pg.65-66)	
	Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom, Member Laura Hamilton	(oral)	
	Committee on Research, Chair Ajay Gopinathan	(oral)	
	Committee on Rules and Elections, Chair Peter Vanderschraaf	(oral)	
	Graduate Council, Chair Michael "Mike" Dawson	(oral)	
	Undergraduate Council, Chair Christopher Viney	(oral)	

V.	**PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (None)**	
VI.	**NEW BUSINESS**	**10 min**

---

[1] The annual reports for Graduate Council, Committee on Committees and Rules and Elections are not available due to major staffing changes in the Senate Office. They will be distributed once the Senate Office is fully staffed.
[2] Changed its names from Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom to Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom

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

CAP - Committee on Academic Personnel
CAPRA - Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
CoC - Committee on Committees
COR - Committee on Research
CRE - Committee on Rules and Elections
D&E - Diversity and Equity
DivCo - Division (al) Council
FWAF - Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom
GC - Graduate Council
L (A) SC - Library and Scholarly Communication
P&T - Privilege and Tenure
UGC - Undergraduate Council

BOARS - Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
CCGA - Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs
COUNCIL - Academic Council
UCAF - University Committee on Academic Freedom
UCAP - University Committee on Academic Personnel
UCAAD - University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
UCCC - University Committee on Computing and Communications
UCEP - University Committee on Educational Policy
UCOC - University Committee on Committees
UCFW - University Committee on Faculty Welfare
UCIE - University Committee on International Education
UCOLASC - University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication
UCPB - University Committee on Planning and Budget
UCOPE - University Committee on Preparatory Education
UCORP - University Committee on Research Policy
UCPT - University Committee on Privilege and Tenure
UCRJ - University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Glossary of UC Merced and Systemwide Academic Senate Committee Acronyms

Meeting of the Merced Division
Minutes of Meeting
April 23, 2015

Pursuant to call, the Merced Division of the Academic Senate met at 3:00 pm on April 23, 2015 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library, Senate Chair Jian-Qiao Sun presiding.

I.   **Announcements**

    A. Division Council Chair Jian-Qiao Sun

       --Chair Sun welcomed Academic Council Mary Gilly, Chancellor Leland, and Provost/EVC Peterson.

       --Chair Sun provided a historic overview of shared governance in the UC system and reiterated its importance to the University's mission.

Chair Sun then summarized the systemwide and campus issues reviewed and discussed by Division Council thus far in this academic year:

- Revised Copyright and Fair Use policy.
- Proposed amendments to Senate Bylaw 128 pertaining to committee vice chairs.
- Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 182 that would expand the purview of the University Committee on International Education.
- Guidelines on accepting and managing equity in return for access to university facilities and/or services.
- Proposed revisions to APM 80,133, 210-D, 220, 330, and 760.
- AY 2015-2016 3% faculty salary increase.
- Compensation for the General Education subcommittee chair.
- Creation of a new, standing Senate committee on Library and Scholarly Communication.
- Split of FWDAF into the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Committee for Diversity and Equity.

- Pilot program for undergraduate chairs proposed by VPDUE Whitt and ALO/CIA Martin.
- Policy on graduate emphasis areas and graduate programs.
- Proposed procedures for ORU review drafted by Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development (VCORED) Traina.
- Proposed procedures for the establishment of centers drafted by Provost/EVC Peterson.
- Review and endorsement of the Community Research and Service (CRS) minor proposal.
- Review of the Global Arts Studies Program (GASP) major proposal.
- Revised medical education taskforce.
- Public Health CCGA proposal.
- Project 2020 updates.
- Revised policy on academic degree programs.
- Senate committees bylaw revisions.

B. Academic Council Chair Mary Gilly

Chair Gilly thanked UC Merced faculty for their service and reiterated the importance of shared governance. She then provided the following updates:

The "Committee of Two", Governor Brown and UC President Napolitano, are still in budget negotiations. The Governor's staff recently visited UC campuses, including UC Merced, but faculty were not given the opportunity to meet with them. Chair Gilly also related that the Governor's staff expressed an interest in observing systemwide Senate meetings at UCOP.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), comprised of the UC, CSU, and Community Colleges systems, visited the state capitol for Advocacy Day. ICAS met with legislative staff and one Assembly member. While the Legislature is supportive of the UC receiving a budget increase, it also wants to increase enrollment significantly and raise non-resident tuition up to 18%.

Chair Gilly then reported on the status of the Transfer Initiative which is intended to clarify the transfer pathway to UC for community college students

who want to prepare for multiple UC campuses in the same major. This has been a priority for the systemwide Senate; both the Legislature and President Napolitano are supportive of the Initiative and it was endorsed by BOARS last year. So far, 10 majors have been identified as a transfer pathway and faculty on all campuses are in favor. (California Senate Bill 1440, signed in 2010, guarantees holders of Associate Degrees for Transfer admission to CSU and a bachelor's degree upon completion of 60 upper division units.)

II.   Consent Calendar
        Minutes from the November 14, 2014 Meeting of the Division.

ACTION: Minutes were approved as presented.

III.   Consultation with Chancellor Leland and Provost/EVC Peterson

Provost/EVC Peterson provided the following updates on Strategic Academic Focusing (SAF):

Last week, Provost/EVC Peterson submitted a proposed six-year ladder-rank hiring plan to campus faculty which was based on the SAF process. Three open fora have been scheduled for faculty to give input to the Provost/EVC on the SAF process.   The Provost/EVC acknowledged that there is disagreement both over the content of the hiring plan and the execution of it. He intends to modify the hiring plan based on the feedback he receives. Each session was and will be recorded and comments will be distributed to faculty.

The Provost/EVC pointed out that the underlying logic of the SAF process is that UCM has to demonstrate how it fits into the UC system as a whole. He expressed gratitude at the support of UCOP and the other nine campuses for UCM, however, UCM must evaluate how to build strong programs given the reduced resources.   That is why UCM must maximize funds and resources by identifying academic areas of focus in which all faculty members can participate.

Provost/EVC Peterson also stated that the numbers associated with the proposed hiring plan will be reviewed each year and if some bylaw 55 units are disadvantaged, the

process will be altered. Flexibility is built into the SAF initiative so an element of trust must be present in the process.

Chancellor Leland provided the following updates on Project 2020:

The Chancellor briefly discussed the new MOU with UCOP. A major challenge for her is to convey to the system and the Regents that the growth of UCM to 10,000 students will not negatively impact the other campuses.

The procurement model that UCM is employing for Project 2020 is known as "Design, Build, Finance, Operate, and Maintain" and is intended to provide the campus with buildings as efficiently as possible with an acceptable amount of risk. The model will be financed by private partnerships that bring in a significant amount of equity. While it is cheaper for the UC to give more equity up front, the private partners have more leverage if they instead put more equity up front.   About 90% of the up front financing will come from the private entities that receive a loan that finances the construction. They get paid back over time in two ways: 1) milestone and 2) availability. Milestone: buildings are up to the specs listed in the contract. Availability: Buildings continue to be available to UCM per the specifications in the contract over the life of the contract. If there is a breach in contract, they get paid less. UCM will always own the buildings - this is not a lease.   By specifying performance in the outcome of the buildings, our liability and risk is reduced. We are also honoring our union contracts. The private partner is responsible to ensure the buildings are maintained to our specifications over the life of the building.

As a result of the Request for Qualifications process, UCM selected three multinational teams that will compete for the construction bid.   Currently, we are in the Industry Review period with the three teams.   In July, the Chancellor intends to hold an informational workshop for the Regents to provide in depth background on the process. In September, she will go to the Regents for approval to release the Request for Proposals (RFP). The three teams will then have six months to respond. When the RFP is issued, a group of technical experts in various areas will rank different components of the proposal. (Prior to this, a group of external experts will provide their point of view to the technical experts to advise them on their rankings.)   A faculty member will be asked to participate and he/she will be bound by the same confidentiality agreement as

the other individuals.   Steve Rabedeaux, Director of Academic Facilities Planning, will also be part of the process for his expertise. Rankings will be submitted to the Chancellor and the final decision will be made by her and Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of the UC. They in turn will make a recommendation to the Regents to approve the contract with the team that is selected. The terms of the contract will be almost entirely spelled out in the RFP.

A faculty member inquired about contingency plans if the Regents do not approve of the contract. The Chancellor replied that the Regents are supportive and are vested in helping UCM to succeed, however, if the contract is not approved, we will have to break up the plan into smaller packages and therefore lose economies of scale.

IV.   Discussion Items – Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) Chair Peter Vanderschraaf
CRE chair Peter Vanderschraaf delivered a PowerPoint presentation to summarize the items that require discussion and an electronic vote of the faculty after this meeting:
- New committee formation. The Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF) has proposed a split into the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Committee for Diversity and Equity. The Committee on Research (COR) has requested the creation of the Library and Scholarly Communication committee. Division Council endorsed both actions prior to this meeting.
- Proposed Division bylaw change to allow ORU directors to serve on a Senate committee and as members of a UCM task force, committee, or agency.
- Proposed Division committee bylaw changes. Earlier this semester, Division Council asked each standing committee to review its bylaws and propose desired changes. A number of standing committees have submitted proposed changes.

V.   2015-2016 Division Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary/Parliamentarian

Committee on Committees (CoC) member Kevin Mitchell made the following announcements:

- Cristián Ricci will serve as next academic year's Senate Chair and Peter Vanderschraaf will serve again as next year's Secretary/Parliamentarian. As of today, a Vice Chair has not been identified. Professor Mitchell requested that faculty members send him their recommendations for Vice Chair nominations.

VI.   Standing Committee Reports

The Graduate Council Chair reported the following committee business for AY 14-15 thus far:

- Several CCGA proposals in various stages of review.
- Reviewed catalog sections, bylaws, and policies and procedures for graduate groups.
- Reviewed numerous CRFs.
- Awards subcommittee reviewed nominations for fellowships for new and continuing students and made recommendations to the Graduate Division.
- Policies drafted and/or revised: 1) revise minimum standard for TOEFL scores 2) non-academic faculty teaching graduate courses and 3) graduate concentrations and designated emphases
- Policy subcommittee is working on Graduate Policies and Procedures Handbook.
- Opined on campus and systemwide review items previously mentioned by Senate Chair Sun in his earlier update.
- Ongoing consultation with VPDGE Zatz.

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) Chair reported the following committee business for AY 14-15 thus far:

- In the absence of a traditional call for FTEs, the committee devoted its fall semester activities to analyzing the SAF process and its own role in

it. In anticipation of a potential review of FTE proposals this spring, the committee drafted a document of review and evaluation of FTE proposals and submitted it to the Provost/EVC.

- This month, the Provost/EVC met with CAPRA to present a preliminary six-year hiring plan for ladder-rank faculty. CAPRA provided several suggestions on the details on the plan, many of which he incorporated into the plan that was later issued to the faculty.
- CAPRA will be involved in future hiring plans and analyzing results of each year's faculty hiring, but details are not yet established.
- In response to the critical space shortages on campus, the committee developed space allocation principles and submitted to the campus as a whole. The Provost/EVC asked for more specific information and CAPRA will proceed with this.
- Opined on campus and systemwide review items previously mentioned by Senate Chair Sun in his earlier update.
- CAPRA heard updates on Project 2020 and participated, with Division Council, in meetings with administrators and RFP teams.
- The CAPRA chair benefits from attending UCPB meetings where she hears updates on the solvency of the UC Care health care plan, UC Path, the state budget, and the UC Retirement Program.

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) Vice Chair reported the following committee business for AY 14-15 thus far:

- CAP conducted its usual business of advancements, appointments, and promotions.
- CAP participated in the Academic Personnel/UCM faculty meeting in fall semester and answered several questions from UCM faculty members on the academic personnel review process.
- The CAP Vice Chair represents CAP on UCAP where one of the major items under discussion is APM 210-D. This APM section relates to the contributions of diversity in the review process.

- In addition to reviewing the campus and systemwide items mentioned by Chair Senate Sun, CAP also opined on the remuneration study and the distribution of the 3% increase in faculty salary.

CoC member Kevin Mitchell reported the following committee business AY 14-15 thus far:

- CoC appointed 20 Senate faculty members to serve on various committees, subcommittees, and task forces.
- CoC is attempting to fill remaining slots on the AY 15-16 Senate committee slate. Faculty are encouraged to serve.
- CoC submitted the Senate committee preference survey to all faculty, and faculty are encouraged to complete and return the survey.

The COR Chair reported the following committee business AY 14-15 thus far:

- Annual Senate faculty research grants program.   The committee conducted a survey of previous awardees to discover the positive impact of these grants on faculty members' research programs. Funding for this program has not increased commensurate with the growth in faculty numbers. COR submitted a memo to the Provost/EVC to request an increase in funding. This year, the committee plans to incorporate the school executive committees in the review process to ensure a wider range of expertise in the evaluation of grant proposals.
- Indirect Cost Return. In an effort to generate a return of some portion of grants to deans, bylaw 55 units, and PIs, COR met with relevant administrators and imparted the need for consistency and transparency in this process.
- Consulted with and advised Research Development Services (RDS). COR heard a presentation from RDS on the software system currently being tested in SNS that is designed to expedite the obtaining and managing of extramural funds.

- COR requested the creation of the Library and Scholarly Communications committee and drafted proposed committee bylaws.
- COR members served on the Hellman Family Grants Committee.
- COR reviewed VCORED Traina's procedures for ORU review to ensure they aligned with the comprehensive set of policies on the establishment and review of research units that were drafted and approved by the Senate last year.
- COR reviewed the Provost/EVC's procedures for establishing centers to ensure they were consistent with the aforementioned polices approved by the Senate last year.
- Opined on campus and systemwide review items previously mentioned by Senate Chair Sun in his earlier update.

The CRE Chair reported the following committee business for AY 14-15 thus far:

- Issued a vote on the Division Regulations and was approved by the faculty.
- Will issue a vote after this meeting on the items presented in the chair's earlier discussion (creation of three new committees, ORU director memberships on committees, and proposed Division committee bylaw changes).
- Previously submitted a call for nominations for four vacancies to be filled on CoC and one opening for an at-large member of Division Council.   The deadline has been extended as not enough nominations were received.
- Reviewed proposed revisions to the SSHA bylaws.
- Reviewed campus and systemwide items previously mentioned by Senate Chair Sun in his earlier update.

The FWDAF Chair reported the following committee business for AY 14-15 thus far:

- Proposed the splitting of the committee into two new committees due to the workload both on campus and at systemwide.
- The committee's vice chair represented the committee on the Chancellor's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion.
- Co-hosted, with the Academic Personnel office, a faculty world café event in fall semester. Topics included faculty grant writing support and the work/life balance.
- The committee chair and vice chair attended a faculty mentoring workshop at the University of New Mexico and the plan henceforth is to send one UCM faculty to this workshop each year.
- Continued its work, with IRDS, on the UCM faculty salary equity subcommittee. (Each UC campus was tasked with completing and submitting this report). The report was submitted to UCOP well before the January 2015 deadline.
- Facilitated a new competition to fund six assistant professors to enroll in the online Faculty Success Program (under the auspices of the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity).
- Consulted with the campus Ombuds
- In concert with UCAAD, the committee is discussing a uniform process for the hiring of Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows.
- Continued, with the Academic Personnel office, the faculty professional development workshop series.
- Opined on campus and systemwide items previously mentioned by Senate Chair Sun in his earlier update.

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) Chair reported the following committee business for AY 14-15 thus far:

- Reconsidered the grade appeals policy and received comments from Senate committees and administrators. UGC is incorporating the comments and hopes to have a final policy by the end of this academic year.

- CRS minor. Received a revised proposal from SSHA in response to last year's comments. Recommended approval of the minor to be implemented in fall 2015 with the caveat that resources be assessed after two years.

- GASP major proposal. The major will be effective fall 2016 but UGC identified areas that needed attention such as demand for the major, the need for specialized staff, the use of LPSOEs, funding feasibility, and clarification of the role of Arts courses currently offered through College One.

- Public Health CCGA proposal and its impact on undergraduate education.

- Last year, UGC passed a 60-unit cap on enrollment in Core 1. Due to the volume of requests for exception from students arriving on campus with more than 60 units ("super freshman"), UGC voted this year to allow advisors, at their discretion, to waive the restriction when appropriate.

- Allowed the bioengineering major to adopt ABET A-K outcomes as its PLOs.

- Approved revised SSHA transfer admission criteria related to the History major and the Management major, and the removal of POLI 10 from that major's requirements.

- Recommended minor changes to committee bylaws.

- Approved academic calendars proposed by the Provost/EVC and Interim VCSA Nies.

- Participated in the General Education program review in February of this year. The review team report is currently being sent to PROC. A General Education retreat is scheduled for June to allow for faculty and staff input in re-envisioning of general education on this campus.

- Recommended that the review of the Chemistry program remain open until a more complete response from the relevant faculty and dean is submitted.

- Recommended that the review of the Cognitive and Information Sciences program be closed.

- Currently handling the Psychology program review. Review team report has been reviewed by PROC and sent to the program.
- Spanish minor program underwent program review and is preparing its response to the review team report.
- Will propose revisions to the academic degree policy, in concert with the Graduate Council.
- Reviewed over 75 CRFs and approved the AY 15-16 catalog.
- Opined on campus and systemwide items previously mentioned by Senate Chair Sun in his earlier update.

All aforementioned committee chairs voiced their thanks for the committee support provided by the two Senate staff members, Assistant Director Fatima Paul and Principal Analyst Simrin Takhar.

VII.   Senate Awards
        Senate Chair Sun announced and presented the following Senate awards:
- Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching: (tie) Professor Jack Vevea (SSHA) and Professor Rudy Ortiz (SNS).
- Distinguished Graduate Teaching and Mentorship: Professor Harish Bhat (SNS).
- Distinguished Early Career Research: Professor Masashi Kitazawa (SNS).
- Distinction in Research: Professor Ming-Hsuan Yang (SOE).
- Dr. Fred Spiess Award for Distinguished Service to the Academic Senate: Professor Will Shadish (SSHA).
- Distinguished Scholarly Public Service: Professor Robin DeLugan (SSHA).
- Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching for Non-Senate Lecturer: Dr. Christopher Ramirez (SSHA).
- Excellence in Faculty Mentorship: Professor Jennifer Manilay (SNS).

VIII.   Petitions of Students
        None.

IX.   Unfinished Business
       None.

X.   New Business
- A faculty member in attendance pointed out the lack of a question and answer period following the Provost/EVCs earlier updates on SAF. The faculty member encouraged the Senate to take a leading role in gauging faculty members' views on the SAF process and the proposed hiring plan either by vote or survey.
- Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF) Camfield announced that his office will revise the MAPP this summer and submit the proposed revisions for Senate and campus review in fall 2015. The VPF also mentioned that he is working with the Office of Governmental Relations to identify faculty members who have good research stories that the campus can use in budget negotiations. He encouraged faculty members to contact him with their compelling anecdotal information.

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Attest: Jian-Qiao Sun, Senate Chair

DIVISION COUNCIL
Merced Division of the Academic Senate
Annual Report 2014-2015

The Division Council (DivCo) held a total of seven meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Bylaw I.IV.3. In addition, DivCo members met with CAPRA, Provost/EVC Peterson, Interim VPF Camfield, VC for BAS Services Reese, VP Feitelberg and Interim Librarian Barclay. Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate Senate Committees, followed by full Division Council review. The issues that DivCo considered this year are described briefly below.

Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative (SAFI)
DivCo (and CAPRA) discussed the SAFI throughout the academic year. Two joint DivCo/CAPRA meetings with the administration took place to address the FTE allocation process in light of this initiative. Mainly, the Council conveyed its concerns to the administrative leadership with the length of time the process took and the diminished engagement of the faculty due to uncertainties around the FTE process and implementation plan.

Provost/EVC Peterson met with the Senate regularly to report on the SAFI and the FTE process.

Project 2020
- Consultation with VC for Planning and Budget
On December 3, 2014, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget (VCPB) Feitelberg provided an update on Project 2020, specifically, plans for development and financing for the next phase of capital projects. The goal of the next phase is to create a mixed use learning environment with the ability to adapt to periodical change, reduce liability and transfer a portion of building maintenance obligations. It was reported that the campus is at a point where the academic themes derived from the strategic focusing exercise could be used to solicit additional information/qualifications from firms submitting proposals to implement the project. The structure of the project differs from the traditional process due to UCM's capacity constraints. The proposed public private partnership will allow the university to issue a combination of debt and commitment payments, maintain the ownership of the land, and minimize maintenance cost.

- Faculty input into Project 2020
In its 3/26/15 memo to the Administration, the Division Council expressed concerns about the lack of faculty input in the process and requested that the Senate be provided with a version of the relevant parts of the draft RFP, those related to academic space in particular, to enable the faculty to comment and suggest changes before the final document is sent to the development teams.

Space and Parking
DivCo discussed space concerns and suggested providing the Administration with general principles, specific recommendations. CAPRA drafted a set of Space Principles. Next year, DivCo will pursue the establishment of a space committee with faculty representation. Chair Sun conveyed these concerns to the Chancellor and the Provost during their monthly meetings.

DivCo considered campus parking concerns that stemmed from the system used to renew permits. VCBAS Reese and Interim VPF Camfield attended the October 8 and November 5 DivCo meetings respectively, to discuss these concerns related to priority issuance of permits, communication, and explore the possibility of implementing an automatic renewal system. At the November 5 meeting, Senate Chair Sun requested that FWDAF draft procedures pertaining to the renewal of parking permits. FWDAF provided recommendations to VPF Camfield and DivCo in December 2014. The automatic renewal system is now implemented.

Program Review

Last year's changes to the program review process resulted in revisions to the program review policies and the establishment of the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) as a replacement for SACAP and PRC. The goal was to better integrate the senate and administrative periodic review processes. DivCo discussed staff workload issues for both undergraduate and graduate program review needs. Up until February 2015, support for all program review activities was provided by one Senate staff member.

DivCo reviewed, approved and/or made recommendations on the following items:
- Endorsed the proposal to establish a Senate Administration IT Advisory Council (10/20)
- Approved a policy for the Review Process for Research Units (8/22)
- Approved a Conflict of Interest Policy proposed by Graduate Council (10/20)
- Endorsed the SSHA/UGC request to suspend the Appraisal Form (10/20)
- Endorsed the proposal for compensation of the General Education Subcommittee Chair (10/17)
- Commented on the Undergraduate Chairs Pilot Program (Dec. 2014)
- Endorsed revisions to the Medical Education Task Force charge and membership (1/30/15)
- Endorsed the proposal to split the FWDAF committee into two committees: the Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom committee and the Diversity and Equity committee.
- Endorsed the COR proposal to establish a permanent Library and Scholarly Communication committee (LASC)
- Endorsed the Space Principles proposed by CAPRA
- Responded to the Provost's request for representatives on the WSCUC Steering Committee
- Reviewed the Public Health CCGA proposal
- Endorsed proposed revisions to the UCM Bylaws to include the newly formed Library and Scholarly Communication, the Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Diversity and Equity committees
- Endorsed UGC's recommendation to establish a Community and Research Service Minor (3/2)
- Made recommendations to the administration on the revisions to the Policy for Establishment/Revisions of Academic Programs (3/2). As a result, a joint Administrative/Senate working group was established and charged with revising the undergraduate and graduate policies
- Endorsed CRE's recommendation to remove some language in the Bylaws that restricted ORU/MRU Directors from participating on Senate committees
- Opined on the proposed policy for the Review of ORUs proposed by VC Traina (3/11)

- Endorsed the GC's substantive revisions to the procedures for submitting proposals for Graduate Emphasis Areas and Graduate Programs (3/23)
- Provided comments to Interim VPF Camfield on revisions to the MAPP – L(P)SOE Titles (5/4)
- Made recommendations to the SSHA Dean on the establishment of a GASP major effective Fall 2016 – the proposal is undergoing revisions (5/6)
- Commented on the draft version of UC Merced's Review under the WSCUC Standards (5/19)
- Endorsed the Economics CCGA proposal (6/12)
- Provided comments to the Director of Compliance on the Draft UCM Diversity Statement (6/15)
- Endorsed the establishment of the UCM Presidential Chair in Humanities (6/25)
- Provided comments to the Provost/EVC on the COACHE report and on shared governance, in the context of the SAF initiative (6/30)

DivCo also opined on the following systemwide items:
- Amendment to Senate Regulation 682
- APM 133-210-220-760
- Senate Doctoral Student Support
- New UC Policy on Open Access
- APM 080 and 330
- Guidelines for Equity AFS
- Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence
- Senate Bylaw 182
- APM 360 and 210-4
- APM 133-17-g-j, Limitation on Total Period of Service with Certain Academic Titles
- Guidelines on Accepting and Managing Equity in Return for Access to University Facilities and/or Services
- APM 210-1-d

Respectfully Submitted:
Jian-Qiao Sun, Chair and Academic Council Representative, (SOE)
Cristián Ricci, Vice Chair, (SSHA)
Peter Vanderschraaf, Secretary/Parliamentarian, CRE Chair (SSHA)
Jack L. Vevea, UGC Chair and UCEP Representative (SSHA)
Kathleen Hull, GC Chair and CCGA Representative (SSHA)
David Noelle, COR Chair and UCORP Representative (SSHA)
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas, CAP Member (SSHA)
Anne Kelley, CAPRA Chair and UCPB Representative (SNS)
Patricia LiWang, CoC Chair and UCOC Representative (SNS)
Rudy Ortiz, FWDAF Chair and UCAAD Representative (SNS)
Robin DeLugan, At-Large Member, Assembly of the Academic Senate (SSHA)
Thomas Hansford, At-Large Member (SSHA)

Senate Office Staff:

Fatima Paul, Interim Executive Director
Simrin Takhar, Principal Analyst

<div align="center">

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2014-2015

</div>

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2014-2015.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included three members from UCM and five external members. The UCM members were David Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (Natural Sciences), Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts), and Michael Modest (Engineering).   The external members were Raymond Gibbs, CAP Chair (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science); John Leslie Redpath (UCI, Biology); Rajiv Singh (UCD, Physics), and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages).

The CAP analyst this year was Simrin Takhar.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

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

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

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

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

<div align="center">

1

</div>

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

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

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

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

Recommendations
Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2014-2015 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 92 cases during the year, compared to 128 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 83 (90%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). In addition, CAP agreed with the School recommendations but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step) for another 4 cases (4%). For 5 other cases (5%), CAP voted against the recommendation or had a split vote for a merit, promotion, or appointment case.

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

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

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

In keeping with tradition, in the spring semester, the Provost/EVC and APO issued revised sections of the MAPP document for campus wide review. Along with the other Senate standing committees, CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process. This year's proposed revisions to the MAPP involved the LPSOE/LSOE titles. CAP raised an issue concerning the role of peer evaluation of teaching in the academic review process. One section of the proposed revisions referred to peer evaluation as being central to the review process while another section stated that opinions of colleagues "may" be included in the assessment of teaching.

Our question is whether peer evaluation should be included as a *necessary* part of any teaching review. CAP always appreciates multiple sources of evidence in evaluating teaching performance, including peer evaluation, if possible. We note that external reviewers on promotion cases to the rank of LSOE sometimes explicitly inquire about the lack of peer evaluation in the materials they receive.

However, as much as we welcome feedback from peers, especially related to direct observation of classroom instruction, we also acknowledge the difficulties associated with creating a fair, widely agreed upon plan for obtaining peer evaluation of teaching.

For now, CAP simply raised the issue of the slight inconsistency in the MAPP document as to whether peer evaluation is required or not in the assessment of LPSOE and LSOE faculty. But we also urge APO and the Provost/EVC to initiate broader discussions with faculty about how best to fairly, consistently include peer evaluations in these academic personnel reviews.

CAP continues to emphasize the importance of Units/Schools getting their personnel reviews completed in a timely manner. Although there has been significant improvement this past year regarding this problem, CAP still is receiving files in late Spring and early Summer that should have been presented to us many months earlier. These delays are all originating at the Unit/School levels.

CAP continues to receive files in which Units/Schools have not properly enumerated the number and types of published materials that were specifically considered for the present review period. In some cases, the number of publications cited as relevant to a case will differ between the faculty member's statement, the Unit/School letter and the Dean's letter. We urge all when preparing their own contributions to case files to carefully review the number and types of materials and to note when discrepancies are found.

Finally, and related to the above, there remain cases in which publications are being advanced for a review which have already been evaluated in one form or another in past personnel actions (and this is a particular problem for merit reviews). With the exception of career reviews (i.e., promotions), individual publications can only count once in the review process. It is appropriate to acknowledge when a faculty member has been given additional rewards for a prior publication (e.g., when a previously published article or book has now won an award). But personnel letters should not again count papers from a previous review as part of the present review period just when, for example, an article that was earlier in press has now been published. In spring

3

semester, CAP submitted this feedback to APO in response to APO's request for input on Digital Measures, the system used to generate the bio-bibliography.

Overall, CAP hopes to push Units/School to be more specific and accurate in its count of various publications and other scholarly activities in its letters.

IV. Counsel to Provost/EVC

The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendation, with the Provost/EVC and the Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF). These discussions mostly focus on individual cases, but there were other general discussions regarding the preparation of academic personnel files, differences between the Academic Divisions in their recommendations, and CAP procedures. For example, we had several discussions this past year with the Provost/EVC and VPF regarding the MAPP and when best to make change to this document.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at UCM, the Provost/EVC and the VPF requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, held on October 23, 2014, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Raymond Gibbs, Vice Chair David Kelly, along with two other internal members, an additional external member, and one external member who joined via teleconference. The committee participated in three discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. A second, lunch, meeting was held involving CAP members, Provost/EVC, VPF, AP Chairs, and UCM faculty. This was followed by an afternoon session and was open to all faculty members, School APC Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Brief minutes from both sessions are available in the Senate office. Significant discussion items raised by faculty concerned criteria for promotion to Full Professor, the evaluation of teaching, and extramural funding success.

Spring Meeting

At the discretion of the VPF, there was no spring meeting this academic year. The CAP/Academic Personnel meeting will henceforth be on an annual basis only, in the fall semester.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Division Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, including proposed revisions to APM 80, 133, 210-D, 220, 330, and 760. CAP also gave feedback on campus items (including APO's draft frequently asked questions document on the academic review process) and systemwide review items (including the remuneration study widely discussed at UCOP this year). We also, as mentioned above, gave feedback on the MAPP. Finally, CAP submitted a memo to the VPF with the suggestion of changing the timeline to

tenure in the MAPP; currently, UCM Assistant Professors are reviewed for tenure at the end of their fifth year but we suggested that reviews occur at the end of the sixth year, as is done on most other UC campuses. CAP has reviewed requests for one-year postponements and has been struck by the amount of labor that faculty candidates, academic units, and deans must put into assembling the materials for these requests. This time and effort may be better used by faculty candidates, especially, engaging in scholarly activities that would concretely increase their chances at successfully obtaining tenure when they come up for review one year later. However, our suggestion that UC Merced revise its policy for tenure reviews to be conducted in the same time period as at other UC campuses does not prevent certain Assistant Professors to request to come up for tenure at an earlier time (e.g., in the sixth-year). These requests should be made only after careful consultation with the academic unit and dean.

VII. Acknowledgments

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

Respectfully,

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., Chair (UCSC)
David F. Kelley, Vice Chair (UCM)
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (UCM)
Michael Modest (UCM)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
John Leslie Redpath (UCI)
Rajiv Singh (UCD)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

5

APPENDIX A

2014-2015 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE

	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	**83**	**4**	**5**	**0**	**92***

 ***Includes 1 request for postponement of tenure**

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	**Agreed**	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
Assistant Professor (2 Adjuncts, 1 Acting)	9	0	0	0	**9**
Associate Professor	3	0	0	0	**3**
Professor (1 Adjunct)	1	0	1	0	**2**
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	**2**
Chairs	0	0	0	0	**0**
Total	**15**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**16**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**94**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**94**

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	**Agreed**	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
Associate Professor	3	1	1	0	**5**
Professor	6	0	0	0	**6**
Professor VI	1	0	0	0	**1**
Above Scale	2	0	0	0	**2**
LSOE	2	0	0	0	**2**
Total	**14**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**16**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**88**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**94**

	CAP Recommendation				
TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	**Agreed**	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
LPSOE/SOE	1	0	0	0	**1**
Assistant	27	0	1	0	**28**
Associate Professor (3 Adjuncts)	18	1	1	0	**20**
Professor	7*	0	1	0	**8**
Total	**53**	**1**	**3**	**0**	**57**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**93**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**95**

*Includes 1 merit review with no advancement

6

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				
	Agreed	**Modification**	**Disagreed**	**Pending**	**TOTAL**
Assistant	3	0	0	0	**3**
Associate	0	0	0	0	**0**
Professor	0	0	0	0	**0**
Total	**3**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3**
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					**100**
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					**100**

TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2014-2015

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	**Modify-Up**	**Modify-Down**	**Disagree**	**Pending**		
Engineering (MCA)	**21** **2**	16	1	1	3	0	76	86
Natural Sciences (MCA)	**31** **4**	30	0	0	1	0	97	97
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (MCA)	**40** **4**	37	1	1	1	0	93	98
TOTALS (MCA)	**92** **10**	**83**	**2**	**2**	**5**	**0**	**90**	**95**

7

TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2015

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

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

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

8

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2014-2015

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) held a total of 12 regularly scheduled in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw II.IV.1.

For the third consecutive academic year (see annual reports from 2012-2013 and 2013-2014) the campus experienced another transition year in terms of a new budget and planning process. The Provost/EVC, in conjunction with a steering committee comprised of faculty members, continued to refine the strategic academic focusing (SAF) initiative and the research pillars that will guide investment of resources and ladder-rank faculty hiring for the next six years. While CAPRA conducted normal Senate business, much of the academic year was focused on determining CAPRA's role in the SAF initiative and how CAPRA should request the traditional academic plans and FTE allocations from the Schools or request FTE proposals in concert with the Provost's SAF process.

FTE Requests Process
CAPRA met with Provost/EVC Peterson over the summer of 2014 to discuss updates on the strategic academic focusing (SAF) process and the activities of the SAF steering committee.

At the end of spring semester in the last academic year, CAPRA submitted a memo to the Provost/EVC with a request for a listing of faculty lines that were allocated last year and a list of all lines that were allocated in previous years. CAPRA's intention was to formulate a tracking system to better plan for future FTE allocations. The Provost/EVC sent a response in fall 2014 semester which CAPRA considered and will keep in its records for future planning.

In an effort to gain a better understanding of the SAF process and its timeline, CAPRA met with two members of the SAF steering committee in fall 2014. The committee's main concerns were 1) deliverables from the SAF process and the deliverables' rationale

and 2) defining the role of the Academic Senate in this new process and the expectation for CAPRA's involvement.

A joint meeting of CAPRA and Division Council was held in October which the Provost/EVC attended and indicated that he welcomed faculty input on narrowing down the broad, five thematic research areas/pillars defined under the SAF initiative. He also requested CAPRA's assistance in prioritizing the areas in terms of FTE allocations versus allocations to the traditional, disciplinary areas. Faced with a second year of no faculty hiring, CAPRA expressed its concerns in a response memo to the Provost/EVC, suggesting that he proceed with either 1) developing a campus strategic academic plan with continued faculty input and for search year 2015-2016 and releasing a set of disciplinary faculty lines following a process and criteria similar to what CAPRA recommended last year or 2) bring the SAF process to a conclusion and use all of the information gathered thus far to select the pillars and define approximately how this will translate into a faculty hiring plan.

At the beginning of spring 2015, the Provost/EVC again met with CAPRA and Division Council and confirmed that currently unknown numbers of new faculty lines would be allocated to both the disciplinary or "foundational" areas and the "strategic" areas, and that the process for evaluating the prioritizing the former should be similar to what has been done in previous years. CAPRA then submitted to the Provost/EVC its proposed statement of FTE process and criteria (a revised process the committee drafted last year in the hopes of a call for FTEs) in anticipation of a call for new foundational faculty line requests.

As the semester progressed, and in the absence of a response and wary of the timeline for an FTE request, CAPRA sent a memo to the Provost/EVC stating its assumption that no new faculty lines would be allocated for next year. However, as the committee previously communicated to the Provost/EVC, a number of searches carried over from previous years were ongoing and the committee expected that some subset of those will be carried forward again into AY 2015-2016. CAPRA therefore requested an update indicating the disposition of the positions that were still in play at that time as well as the current enrollment target for next fall and the expected student to faculty ratio if that target is met.

Finally, the Provost/EVC attended an April CAPRA meeting and proposed a six-year, ladder-rank faculty hiring plan detailing the percentage of hires placed into foundational and strategic areas. He requested CAPRA's input and after several iterations, the Provost/EVC submitted his hiring plan to the campus on April 17.

CAPRA members were approached by several faculty members who expressed their concern about the six-year hiring plan and their general dissatisfaction with the high percentage of FTE lines allocated to the strategic areas. After much debate, the majority of CAPRA approved the issuing of a survey to all campus ladder-rank faculty, asking if faculty support the Provost/EVC's six-year hiring plan, inquiring what percentage of FTE lines ought to be allocated to foundational areas, and asking faculty to enter their own comments.   The survey indicated broad disagreement with the Provost's hiring plan with many comments indicating widespread concern about the future of the traditional disciplines, although about 35% of the respondents were in favor of the hiring plan with comments expressing support for the SAF process. CAPRA forwarded the survey results and verbatim comments to the Provost/EVC, with a memo indicating the committee's hope that the Provost/EVC modify the six-year hiring plan.

At the end of the semester, the Provost/EVC expressed his potential willingness to alter the hiring plan based on faculty members' comments. At the final joint CAPRA/Division Council meeting of the academic year, the Provost/EVC announced his intention to further revise the hiring plan to include additional foundational hires and additional hires into three of the strategic areas. CAPRA subsequently submitted a list of questions to the Provost/EVC asking him to consider the following points in his revised hiring plan: 1) distribution of foundational FTE lines across school and bylaw 55 unit, 2) whether allocated lines can be rolled over into next year at the request of the faculty. As of August 12, no response had been received.

Space Planning and Allocation
CAPRA's other main function, in addition to advising the Provost/EVC on FTE allocation, is space planning and allocation. In response to the critical space shortages faced by faculty, graduate students, and researchers, CAPRA drafted a set of space principles based on its meeting with the Provost/EVC, members of the strategic academic focusing committee, and the all-faculty forum held on September 24. These space principles were sent to all Senate committees and school executive committees for review and a final version was submitted to the Provost/EVC.

Throughout the academic year, research space was one of the main issues that served as a source of much dismay for faculty members. As the Senate committee charged with representing faculty members' interests with regard to this issue, CAPRA held continuing conversations with the Provost/EVC. Towards the end of spring 2015, the Provost/EVC requested that CAPRA formulate explicit guidelines/formulas for space allocation and reallocation to assist him in his decision making. CAPRA will continue its work on this project in AY 2015-2016.

CAPRA also opined on the following issues:

Project 2020
CAPRA consulted with key members of the Administration on Project 2020 updates as they affect faculty members. The main issues surrounding Project 2020 that concern many faculty are 1) whether adequate academic space will be built and whether there will be enough laboratory space to provide to the additional faculty the campus will need to hire in order to reach the goal of 10,000 students by 2020 and 2) every component of the new buildings, including planning, construction, parts of the financing structure, and maintenance and operation, will be handled by a consortium. While this authority gives the consortium incentive to build excellent buildings, it is unclear how responsive they will be to faculty members in an emergency, such as equipment failures on weekends.

CAPRA heard updates throughout the year on assignable square feet of research space and its allocation from the appropriate members of the Administration. UC Merced's Project 2020 team leaders also delivered a presentation at a February 2015 University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) meeting. In addition, the CAPRA chair took a leading role in developing talking points for Senate faculty to use when meeting with the three, short-listed Project 2020 developer teams competing for the construction projects. The final RFP will be issued by the campus later this year.

Assessment
CAPRA benefited from updates from its Vice Chair, who, by virtue of this position, serves on the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC). The Vice Chair requested that PROC share with CAPRA the deans' analysis that accompanies submission of PLO Reports as the deans' comments include evaluations of resource requests made by

programs in response to assessment results. While these analyses are informational only, CAPRA will begin receiving and reviewing them next academic year.

Systemwide Review Items

- APM revisions. CAPRA reviewed several proposed revisions to various sections of the APM as requested by systemwide and Division Council. Many proposed revisions were deemed outside of CAPRA's purview and the committee therefore declined to opine.
- Systemwide Senate bylaws. CAPRA reviewed two proposed revisions to Senate bylaws, one pertaining to the expanded role of the University Committee on International Education and the other focusing on making the vice chairs of all standing systemwide committees at-large members.
- Proposals for Doctoral Student Support. CAPRA reviewed the proposal and supported changing Regental policy to charge no non-resident supplemental tuition after the first year. In addition, CAPRA supported offering 100% funding to all first-year students through some combination of fellowship, TA, and GSR.
- UCPB updates. UCPB discussed the following issues this academic year: the solvency of the UC Care health plan, the UC Retirement Program, the state budget, the distribution of the 3% increase in faculty salaries, the remuneration study, and UC Merced's Project 2020.

Campus Review Items

- MAPP revisions for campus review.   CAPRA reviewed the annual, proposed revisions to the MAPP as requested by the VPF and Academic Personnel office. This year's proposed revisions pertained to the L(P)SOE titles.
- Revision of CAPRA's section of UC Merced Division bylaws.
- Proposed split of FWDAF into two new committees: 1) Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and 2) Diversity and Equity.
- Undergraduate Chairs Pilot Program in SNS and SSHA. CAPRA was divided on whether to recommend approval of this pilot program. The committee agreed that each major should 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, CAPRA members were divided as to whether the proposed approach is the best way to proceed for majors associated with a single bylaw unit that already has an appointed chair. CAPRA recommended that if the proposed pilot program is initiated, the following points be considered: 1) The program faculty should recommend the appointment to the Undergraduate Dean, 2) The duties of the undergraduate program chair should include curriculum planning, and 3) pay all undergraduate program chairs the same stipend unless the FAO duties are taken by a different person, in which case the stipend would be split.

- Provost/EVC's proposed procedures for the establishment of Centers. CAPRA requested clarification on the mechanism for determining the reappointment or removal of Center directors.

- Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development's (VCORED) ORU Review Policy. The VCORED expanded on the set of comprehensive policies to establish and review research units that were drafted by the Senate Committee on Research and approved by the Senate in the last academic year. CAPRA requested clarification on the alignment of these policies with the original Senate policies and on the appointment of ORU directors.

- PhD Program Proposals.
    - Public Health. CAPRA found that the proposal was sound in the areas of academic planning, budget, and resource allocation, and recommended approval to Division Council.
    - Economics. CAPRA had several concerns, including the feasibility of requesting additional FTE lines, the cohort size of graduate students, and the reliance on non-resident tuition. In spring 2015, CAPRA reviewed the revised proposal, noted the inclusion of the previously requested changes, but still had concerns about the revised proposal, particularly graduate student support and TA ships. Pending clarification on these questions, CAPRA recommended the proposal's approval to Division Council.
    - Mechanical Engineering. CAPRA reviewed the proposal in the last academic year and expressed reservations about the proposal's

ambitious growth profile. CAPRA reviewed the revised proposal in summer 2015 and had concerns about the projected faculty hires in light of the Provost/EVC's ladder-rank hiring plan and strategic versus foundational hires, teaching plan, research space, and staffing needs. The committee recommended approval of the revised proposal to Division Council contingent upon the aforementioned points being addressed.

o Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology. CAPRA decided to defer its vote until it is given an opportunity to review the Master's proposal in order to better judge the sustainability of this new, proposed graduate program.

- Proposal for a SSHA major in Global Arts Studies Program (GASP). CAPRA deemed the resources request to be minimal, but posed several questions, including that of per-student costs. Nevertheless, CAPRA recommended the proposal's approval to Division Council.

- Revised proposal for a SSHA minor in Community Research and Service. CAPRA opined on the original proposal in the last academic year. The committee requested clarification on faculty numbers and teaching assignments. In this academic year, the committee reviewed the revised proposal and after judging that the revisions were appropriate, recommended the minor's approval to Division Council.

- Proposal to establish an honor's program in the School of Natural Sciences. At the request of the Undergraduate Council, CAPRA reviewed the proposal and pointed out issues regarding instructional resources and faculty credit for extra teaching.

- Proposal to establish a Public Health Bylaw Unit in SSHA. CAPRA deemed the resources implications to be minimal and as such, endorsed the proposal.

Respectfully submitted:

CAPRA members:
Anne Kelley, Chair (SNS) – UCPB representative
Joshua Viers, Vice Chair (SOE)

Marilyn Fogel, (SNS)

Cristián Ricci, Senate Vice Chair (SSHA)

Mukesh Singhal, (SOE)

Jan Wallander, (SSHA)

Ex officio, non-voting members:

Jian-Qiao Sun, Senate Chair (SOE)

Student Representatives:

Danielle Bermudez, Graduate Student Representative, GSA

Daisy Pelayo-Figueroa, Undergraduate Student Representative, ASUCM

Senate Staff:

Simrin Takhar

**COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY, AND ACADEMIC
FREEDOM
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2014-2015**

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom (FWDAF) held 5 regularly scheduled in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw II.III.5.

At its first meeting of the academic year, FWDAF identified five areas on which to focus during the year: 1) encouraging diversity in the faculty recruitment process, 2) addressing faculty retention, 3) increasing faculty mentoring, 4) finalizing the faculty salary equity study as required of all campuses by UCOP and 5) addressing space challenges as they affect the welfare and morale of faculty and graduate students. These main issues served as the focal points for all the committee's activities during the AY.

FWDAF conducted the following business:

Consultation with Ombuds
At the beginning of the AY, FWDAF met with campus Ombuds, De Acker.   The Ombuds is neutral, independent, and does not have a formal reporting structure. Now in her third year in this position, Ombuds Acker related that the three main issues she hears from faculty members are: workplace treatment, work/life balance, and career progression before and after tenure.   Indeed, all of these issues affect retention rates.

The Ombuds informed FWDAF members that the Academic Personnel office has formulated a family leaves policy brochure to provide guidance to faculty members on their rights under the law. This brochure was distributed in hard copy form to all faculty.

At the final meeting of the year, Ombuds Acker provided the following updates to FWDAF members on her AY 14-15 activities: 1) faculty members comprised 20% of her visits, 2) this year she conducted more mediations and facilitated group meetings, and

3) the main issue of concern for faculty members is space and its impact on research and, eventually, tenure. This invariably leads to retention issues as the lack of adequate space is causing faculty to feel less valued and wanted. The second most contentious topic is career progression and the third is the work/life balance.

Workshop Series for Untenured Faculty

FWDAF and the Academic Personnel office (APO) continued offering the professional development workshop series for untenured faculty, first established in the last academic year. Monthly topics included: 1) the work/life balance, 2) publishing advice, 3) starting and managing a lab/students, and 4) writing an effective self-statement. This year, FWDAF and APO were pleased to host an external speaker, Dr. Phillip Clifford, to speak about navigating a successful academic career. The workshop series was well-received by the faculty. For AY 2015-2016, FWDAF hopes to offer a session on implicit bias in the faculty search and hiring process.

FWDAF and APO began the academic year with a faculty world café event whereby faculty members were assigned to tables and FWDAF members facilitated each conversation. Discussion topics included support for faculty who are applying for grants, mentoring of faculty to support professional development, and how the campus can support a better work/life balance.

Faculty Success Program

In an effort to create more mentoring opportunities for untenured faculty, FWDAF worked with the Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF) to earmark funds to enroll a cohort of assistant professors in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity's Faculty Success Program. The online program is a 15-week instructional tool to assistant faculty members in balancing research, teaching, and service, refine their time management skills, increase research productivity, and develop a network of mentors.

FWDAF drafted a call for proposals that was submitted to all untenured faculty members. The three school deans agreed to conduct the first round of review and submitted their short lists to FWDAF for final selection. Initially, FWDAF was to choose three assistant professors from each school dean's short list, but was pleased that each dean offered matching funds that enabled FWDAF to enroll six applicants into the Faculty Success Program.

FWDAF, in conjunction with APO, held an inaugural luncheon that was attended and facilitated by the six assistant professors enrolled in the program. The topics of discussion included a review of the 15-week program thus far, and event planning for AY 2015-2016.

In an effort to increase faculty mentoring opportunities on campus, the FWDAF chair and vice chair attended a conference at the University of New Mexico Mentoring Institute. They debriefed FWDAF on the faculty mentorship programs on other campuses: some provide faculty members with funds to start their own, small faculty mentoring programs within their schools, some campuses conduct targeted mentoring programs on specific topics such as publishing, and other campuses have established a new faculty cohort program in which all new faculty members complete a sequence of courses. The FWDAF chair spoke with a representative from Virginia Tech whose campus implemented a faculty mentoring program in the form of a logic model.

Proposed Parking Permit Renewal Policy
In fall 2014, the Senate Chair requested that FWDAF draft a proposed procedure for the VPF's review pertaining to the renewal of parking permits. FWDAF's main suggestion was for all permanent employees, including postdoctoral fellows with multiple-year contracts, shall have automatic renewal of their current permit in August, unless the employee opts out by informing TAPS after being notified of the automatic renewal by email. This proposed procedure was adopted by TAPS in spring 2015 and notices were sent to all campus faculty and staff.

Senate Award for Excellence in Faculty Mentorship
Traditionally, the Merced Division issues seven awards to faculty members to recognize distinction in research, teaching, and service. This year, with the financial assistance of the VPF and APO, FWDAF received approval from Division Council to establish a new award for Excellence in Faculty Mentorship. The award recognizes faculty mentorship of post docs, visiting faculty, and junior faculty and/or other faculty or staff. The inaugural winner of this award was announced at the April 2015 Meeting of the Division.

Senate-Administration Faculty Salary Equity Subcommittee
Originally formed in AY 2012-2013 as a result of UCOP's directive, the subcommittee this year once again included two members from FWDAF as well as staff from

Institutional Research & Decision Support (IRDS) and APO. A report was previously submitted by each UC campus in January 2012. In AY 2013-2014, the subcommittee was tasked with drafting a progress report that was submitted to UCOP in November 2013. That report was completed after the subcommittee reviewed the results of both an analysis of compensation and commitments made at time of hire for evidence of gender and ethnic inequity, and a pilot study that adapted widely accepted intra-institutional equity methodology to smaller campuses like UC Merced by using inter-institutional salary data.   The final report was submitted by the subcommittee in summer 2014, well before UCOP's deadline of January 2015.

Space and Faculty Moves – SE 1 and SE 2
In spring 2015, several critical issues arose as faculty members moved in and out of Science & Engineering (SE) 1. Many faculty members contacted the FWDAF chair to make the committee aware of the issues. As a result, the FWDAF chair met with the VPF, the deans of the Schools of Natural Sciences and Engineering to try to assist in a rapid and equitable resolution for all faculty impacted. FWDAF recommended various solutions, most notably that the deans and administration consider allowing untenured faculty to stop their tenure clock in light of the "down time" associated with the moves and that all faculty affected be given either course release or a reduced teaching workload so their time can be devoted to organizing their laboratories. FWDAF also recommended a well-defined and adhered-to timeline that specifically outlines the details of the expectations of both the faculty and the administrative units overseeing the management of the proposed moves.

Consultation with the Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education (VPDGE)
In spring 2015, FWDAF consulted with VPDGE Marjorie Zatz on space challenges experienced by faculty members and graduate students as well as inadequate financial support for graduate students. The VPDGE shared her plans to increase the number of fellowships and to work with the administration on non-resident tuition and discretionary funds through indirect cost return. The VPDGE is also consulting with graduate groups on their expectations for faculty-to-student ratio which she will use in her projections.   Another goal identified by the VPDGE is increased professional development opportunities for graduate students. Taken together, all of these new financial activities will serve to enhance the graduate student population at UC Merced.

Consultation with ECEC Advisory Council Member

In spring 2015, a faculty member of the Early Childhood Education Center (ECEC)'s Advisory Council attended a FWDAF meeting to inform the committee of possible changes to on-campus child care. One possible plan by the campus administration would involve offering privatized child care services to the campus community. The faculty member summarized for FWDAF the data she and others on the Advisory Council collected from other campuses that have experienced privatized child care. Many parents and faculty members are concerned over the potential changes. FWDAF will review the data when it is shared and plans to keep this issue on its agenda for AY 15-16.

Committee Split

In spring 2015, FWDAF requested from Division Council – and received approval – to split into two, standing Senate committees to more efficiently address workload and to ensure appropriate UC Merced representation at systemwide Senate meetings: 1) the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and 2) the Committee for Diversity and Equity. As this would require a revision of the UC Merced Bylaws, this item was included for discussion on the agenda for the spring Meeting of the Division and presented by the Chair of the Senate Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE). Following the Meeting of the Division, the campus faculty approved the revised Bylaws and the creation of the two new committees via electronic vote. The new committees will convene in AY 15-16.

Provost/EVC's Proposed Six-Year Ladder-Rank Faculty Hiring Plan

The Provost/EVC's Strategic Academic Focusing (SAF) process, begun in the last academic year, resulted in the Provost identifying five strategic areas ("pillars") that would receive resources and faculty FTE lines.   In spring 2015, the Provost/EVC issued his six-year ladder-rank faculty hiring plan to the campus. Many faculty members expressed their concern to FWDAF over the future growth of traditional disciplinary ("foundational") areas and questioned their future career trajectories at UC Merced. At the end of the academic year, FWDAF submitted a memo to the Provost/EVC and offered what it hoped was feedback on the six-year hiring plan. FWDAF commented on the following: 1) the plan should include a better defined direction of process and governance 2) the disproportionate percentage of hires going to the strategic areas is

concerning, 3) the plan is rather ambitious in terms of filling FTE lines in a given cycle, 4) consider alternative hires such as targets of opportunity hires and Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows, 5) provisions to help ensure diversity in the cluster hiring process, 6) potential for the disenfranchisement of faculty who feel that their discipline does not align with the chosen strategic areas, 7) potential impact on faculty retention, 8) space considerations, and 9) considerations to teaching efforts.

Endowed Chairs
FWDAF submitted a memo to Division Council pointing out that UC Merced has fourteen endowed chairs ad of these, seven are occupied by men. Only one is occupied by a woman – representing a gross gender disparity. Furthermore, there is also little diversity (e.g. gender, racial, ethnic) among the chair holders. The remaining six endowed chairs are vacant; APM 191 indicates that Chairs should not be vacant for prolonged periods. There is thus an opportunity for the campus to fill these vacant chairs and to make an effort to distribute them in a more equitable fashion. FWDAF recommended that a call for nominations for these vacant chairs be distributed across campus such that Deans can more readily identify candidates. If there are no eligible candidates on campus that would help to create a more equitable pool, these endowed chairs should be used in recruitment efforts.

Consultation with Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF)
FWDAF benefited from updates and input from ex-officio committee member, VPF Gregg Camfield.   Topics of discussion included: the successful purchasing of two institutional memberships related to faculty professional development, the use of contributions to diversity in faculty hiring, and/or the development of evaluation criteria of contributions to diversity in recruiting and academic review, strategies for obtaining a more diverse applicant pool, bridge funding, Guidelines for Evaluation of Service in Faculty Performance Review from UC Berkeley, and the balance between shared governance and shared management and the fact that faculty are burdened with much administrative work. The VPF was also instrumental in working with FWDAF on issues surrounding faculty preparedness for tenure and faculty morale and stress factors.

The VPF also coordinated and delivered a workshop session on drafting an effective self-statement for personnel reviews.   The session was well-received and faculty conveyed their positive feedback.

Consultation with the Chancellor and Provost/EVC
At the last meeting of the academic year, FWDAF invited the Chancellor and Provost/EVC to hear the committee's updates over the academic year. Most notably, the conversation with the Chancellor and Provost/EVC included discussion on the Provost/EVC's proposed six-year ladder-rank faculty hiring plan and space challenges experienced by faculty and graduate students.   The Chancellor and Provost/EVC appreciated the update and expressed their enthusiasm on collaborating with FWDAF on these various issues. The Chancellor welcomed FWDAF's input on space and suggested that a statement of space principles would help aid her future decisions. The Chancellor, Provost/EVC, and VPF will draft a statement and FWDAF will review it in AY 15-16.

Systemwide Review Items
- APM revisions. FWDAF opined on several proposed revisions to various sections of the APM as requested by systemwide and Division Council.
- Systemwide Senate bylaws. FWDAF reviewed two proposed revisions to Senate bylaws, one pertaining to the expanded role of the University Committee on International Education and the other focusing on making the vice chairs of all standing systemwide committees at-large members.
- Proposal for Doctoral Student Support. FWDAF endorsed the proposal but advised the steering committee identified in the proposal to assemble the systemwide expertise that currently exists, i.e. the NIH/NSF program directors, and devise a plan that allows for state money to leverage existing federally-funded programs.
- University Committee on Affirmative Action & Diversity (UCAAD) updates. UCAAD discussed the following major issues this academic year: 1) President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (FWDAF's representative, Chair Ortiz, served on a subcommittee that was tasked with drafting guidelines for the hiring of Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows), 2) UC President Napolitano's Advisory Council on LGBT students, faculty, and staff, and 3) micro aggression and sexual

violence issues. UCAAD empaneled three subcommittees this year: 1) faculty review and hiring practices, 2) campus climate, and 3) President's Postdoctoral Fellowship program. Lastly, UCAAD discussed how to distribute the proposed 3% increase in faculty salary.

- University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) updates. UCAF discussed the following major issues this academic year: academic freedom and civility, APM 210-D and contributions to diversity (specifically, there is concern that faculty members will count diversity-related research twice in personnel reviews. While this issue is addressed by campus personnel review committees, UCAF is drafting a statement about this item) and department chairs' ownership of courses rather than the instructor of record.

- University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) updates. FWDAF was represented at two meetings in fall 2014 by member Shawn Newsam. Due to the frequency of these meetings and associated workload that posed a burden on current FWDAF membership, the FWDAF chair asked the Committee on Committees to select a UCM faculty member to officially represent the campus at UCFW meetings. Professor Sean Malloy, a former FWDAF member, was selected to represent FWDAF for the academic year's remaining meetings. Professors Newsam and Malloy reported to FWDAF the following major UCFW discussion topics this academic year: challenges with child care accessibility and affordability on many campuses, the problems with the new health care plan UC Care, and challenges faced by several campuses with implementing adequate faculty mentoring programs. With regard to UC Care, towards the end of the academic year, a proposal was introduced systemwide to institute a UC Care HMO product but the date of implementation is unknown. UCFW drafted an opposition letter as some on the committee feel that current health plan options should not be replaced without a detailed study on access and affordability issues, the effects on the academic mission of the medical centers, and what would occur should the UC Care HMO fail.

Campus Review Items
- MAPP revisions for campus review. FWDAF reviewed the annual, proposed revisions to the MAPP as requested by the VPF and APO. This year's proposed revisions pertained to the L(P)SOE titles.

- CAPRA space principles. CAPRA drafted a statement of space principles for Senate committee review and campus distribution. FWDAF endorsed the principles and requested that individuals who assist with managing training programs and grants also be considered for allocation of office space.
- Project 2020. FWDAF, with other standing Senate committees, heard updates and provided input on Project 2020 items that affect faculty including assignable square feet for research space.
- PhD Proposals. FWDAF reviewed the following PhD proposals and found no implications for faculty welfare, diversity, or academic freedom: Economics, Public Health, Mechanical Engineering, and Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology.
- Proposal to establish a SSHA major in Global Arts Studies Program. FWDAF reviewed the proposal and found no implications for faculty welfare, diversity, or academic freedom.
- Revised proposal to establish a SSHA minor in Community Research and Service. FWDAF echoed the concerns raised by CAPRA and Undergraduate Council as to faculty teaching workload, student enrollment, and resources needed to deliver the minor. FWDAF will endorse the proposal if these concerns are addressed.
- Campus Climate Action Plan. FWDAF reviewed the plan drafted by the Chancellor's office in response to the March 2014 campus climate survey and made suggestions on timeline and the assessment of retention and attrition numbers.
- UC Merced Diversity Statement. FWDAF reviewed the statement as drafted by the Chancellor's office and offered several suggestions including the importance of faculty and staff demographics reflecting the composition of the student population and UC Merced's status as an Hispanic Serving Institution.
- Provost/EVC's proposed procedures for the establishment of Centers. FWDAF suggested that all center proposals include discussion of "Broader Impacts" and how the proposed center would contribute to diversity in academic disciplines, research topics, and societal considerations.
- Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development's (VCORED) ORU Review Policy. The VCORED expanded on the set of comprehensive policies to establish and review research units that were drafted by the Senate Committee

on Research and approved by the Senate in the last academic year. FWDAF suggested that the reviews should take into account the ORU's contribution to diversity and/or broader participation of traditionally underrepresented groups.

- Pilot Program for Undergraduate Chairs in SNS and SSHA. FWDAF supports the pilot program's implementation as it will give faculty recognition for work they are doing as well as allow for a more effective distribution of labor in those units where the AP Chair has been doing the work of an undergraduate program chair. However, the committee suggested that if the data are not sufficiently definitive for evaluative purposes, there should be an option for an additional pilot period that incorporates the necessary changes for continuation.
- Proposal to establish a Public Health Bylaw Unit in SSHA. FWDAF judged that the proposal had no direct impact on faculty welfare, diversity, and academic freedom and therefore had no comments.

Respectfully submitted:

Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom members:
Rudy Ortiz, Chair (SNS) – UCAAD representative
Tanya Golash-Boza, Vice Chair, (SSHA)
Linda Cameron, Vice Chair (SSHA) – UCAF representative, spring semester
Wei-Chun Chin, (SOE) – UCAF representative, fall semester
Shawn Newsam, (SOE) – UCFW representative October 10 and December 12
Néstor Oviedo, (SNS)
UCFW representative Sean Malloy – spring semester

Ex officio, non-voting members:
Gregg Camfield, Vice Provost for Faculty
Jian-Qiao Sun, Senate Chair
Cristián Ricci, Senate Vice Chair

Staff:
Simrin Takhar

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
ANNUAL REPORT
2014-2015

The Merced Division of the Academic Senate: The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its standing subcommittees held a total of 13 regularly scheduled in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw II.IV.2.B. Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate subcommittee(s), followed by full Council review. The issues that UGC considered this year are described briefly below.

Undergraduate Council Organization
The Undergraduate Council designated several subcommittees that met separately throughout the year:
- General Education (GE)
- Admissions/Financial Aid
- Undergraduate Academic Programs/Policies/Courses

In addition, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed for the Undergraduate Distinguished Teaching Awards for Faculty and for Non-Senate Lecturers.

General Education
Throughout the academic year, UGC received regular updates from Dr. Anne Zanzucchi, Chair of the General Education Subcommittee (GESC), on activities related to the program review of General Education. The GESC's objective was to prioritize and expand institutional efforts to develop a comprehensive and sustainable GE program, in the context of GE's program review. During Fall 2014, the GESC authored a self-study that focused on (1) Development of a broadly inclusive GE program that is reflective of the institutional context; (2) Processes for systematic and sustainable assessment of GE; and (3) Structures for allocating appropriate resources and incentives to engage Senate faculty in the oversight and delivery of GE.

In February, a visiting team, representing national and systemwide expertise in GE[1], came to campus to meet with faculty, staff, and students.

The GESC contacted academic programs to request feedback on the undergraduate hallmarks and found that it was challenging to solicit responses from Engineering and the School of Natural Sciences and considered outreach strategies to increase feedback from across disciplines. A memo summarizing common threads, particular to GE competencies, specific topics or courses, and program structure, became the basis for retreat planning.

In April, the external team report was transmitted to the GESC. The review team report provided an analysis of campus needs and highlighted established GE models for consideration with program development. Shortly thereafter, PROC provided guidance with the following emphases:

---

[1] External team members included Barbara Sawrey from UC San Diego (Review Team Chair), Jillian Kinzie from Indiana University, and Terry Rhodes from the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- Continue to act as the "chair" of the GE program
- Pursue multiple avenues for enlisting faculty participation
- Ensure administrative inclusion in the response phase
- Evaluate the Strategic Academic Focusing pillars as an organizing structure for the redesign of GE
- Attend to the WSCUC accreditation expectations that intersect with General Education

In May, the GESC revised its bylaws with Undergraduate Council's review and approval. Those revisions were intended to strengthen the subcommittee's bylaws and diversity of membership by including Unit 18 lecturers and expanding the disciplinary scope of Senate faculty involvement. To develop capacity and leadership structure, a GESC Vice Chair role was added, too.

In June, the GESC hosted another retreat that involved Senate and Non-Senate faculty, and staff. The foci of both retreats were a discussion about the meaning of a degree and the role of the GE program within it; the development of a mission statement and learning outcomes that reflect the role of GE at UC Merced. Following the retreats, the GESC committed to summarizing a planning process that includes the GE mission statements and outcome description drafts. Working in small teams during July, the Subcommittee identified common threads and distinctive ideas from retreat team projects.

GESC members agreed that the action plan would include a GE program proposal template with draft notes. That action plan and proposal would feature a mission statement and learning outcome descriptions, with opportunities for campus input to confirm priorities and emphases.

Academic Program Reviews
In accordance with the Undergraduate Program Review policy, UGC made recommendations to PROC and to the GESC on the academic program reviews of the following:
- Computer Science and Engineering Major(September 22 2014)
- Chemistry Major (January 22 2015)
- Cognitive and Information Sciences Major (April 7 2015)
- Psychology Major (April 9 2015)
- General Education (May 19 and July 10 2015)

Catalog
In accordance with the UGC Academic Program Calendar distributed to Schools early each academic year, the three Schools submitted their respective sections of the Catalog for review and approval by UGC. UGC provided feedback to the Registrar and to the Schools.

UGC approved a flowchart, proposed by the Registrar, describing the Catalog review process.

Courses and CRF System
According to the UCM Bylaws, UGC is charged on behalf of the Division to review and approve all new undergraduate courses and modifications to existing undergraduate courses, including withdrawal, conduct, credit evaluation, description, and classification of existing courses. The UGC

analyst transmitted CRFs to UGC via the web-based system. UGC reviewed and approved over 200 courses, changes to existing courses and discontinuation of courses.

Community and Research Service (CRS) Minor – Effective Fall 2015

This proposal was previously discussed by UGC and standing Senate committees. Several questions were raised and subsequently addressed by the faculty who proposed the minor. A revised proposal was submitted for review and was approved in March, 2015, with the caveat that it be reviewed within two years of its implementation.

SSHA Proposal for a Global Arts Studies Major – Effective Fall 2016

UGC reviewed this proposal and requested additional information from SSHA. The review of this item was carried over to AY 15-16.

Public Health CCGA Proposal

UGC reviewed this proposal and requested additional clarification in April 2015.

SSHA Suspension of Appraisal Form

The form was no longer serving a useful purpose so members agreed to approve its suspension.

SSHA Transfer Admission Criteria

UGC approved the SSHA request to revise its transfer criteria for History, Management, and Political Science to be consistent with current UCM course offerings.

Bioengineering Program PLOs

The BIOE program requested to change its program learning outcomes to the ABET A-K outcomes, in preparation for programmatic accreditation. UGC endorsed the program's request and encouraged BIOE to:
- Ensure that the BIOE PLOs are aligned with the standards and requirements set by professional organizations that ABET is aligned with.
- Develop a curriculum map for the program that is compliant with the ABET criteria and process.

CSE Entry on AP/IB Chart

UGC approved the School of Engineering's request to add CSE to the AP/IB exam Chart.

Senate Administration IT Council Charge

In response to a request from the AVC of Information Technology, UGC responded that it had no objection to the establishment of the Senate Administration IT Council and recommended that its membership be expanded to adequately represent research and pedagogy.

Grade Appeals Policy

A UGC subcommittee was established and tasked with revising the Grade Appeals policy.
The policy was re-written to provide criteria or grounds for students to pursue an appeal, to make sure that the implementation process is homogeneous across the schools, and to clarify the role of

the faculty. UGC solicited input from Senate committees and various key campus constituents before approving the policy in May, 2015.

Core 1 60 Unit-Cap
Background: The Core 1 unit-limit restricts Core 1 enrollment for freshmen and sophomores to maintain its pedagogical purpose. Under this restriction, if Core 1 is not completed within 60 units of coursework, students have a registration hold placed on Core 1 and must petition to enroll. As Core 1 is a campus-required GE course, students who fail to complete the course are ineligible to graduate. At the request of the VPDUE, UGC discussed the large number of petitions filed by students who are incoming freshmen and are referred to as "super freshmen"; who enter the university exceeding the unit limit through AP credit, CC credit or other UC or non-CC credit. UGC approved granting academic advisors the authority to override the 60-unit cap policy for "super freshmen", at their discretion.

SNS and SSHA Undergraduate Chairs Two-Year Pilot Program
This was proposed as a pilot program by the VPDUE and the Coordinator of Institutional Assessment. This program's main goal was to 1) organize responsibilities; 2) identify points of contacts within SNS and SSHA; 3) provide a venue for faculty to be recognized and compensated for their work towards ensuring undergraduate students' success through the delivery of the curricula and assessment of learning outcomes. UGC reviewed the proposal and recommended that a report on the assessment of the pros and cons of this pilot be submitted to the Senate in January 2017.

Steering Committee for WSCUC Reaffirmation of Accreditation
The Provost requested a UGC representative to serve on the Steering Committee for WSCUC Reaffirmation Accreditation. Dr. Marcos Garcia-Ojeda agreed to serve as the UGC representative. The committee is tasked with overseeing, coordinating, and ensuring successful completion of all aspects of UCM's reaffirmation of accreditation process.

CAPRA Space Principles
In response to the crisis of research and laboratory space for faculty, researchers, and graduate students, CAPRA drafted a statement of space principles. UGC provided comments on the principles and suggested a few edits to the document.

UGC Bylaws
At the request of the Division Council, UGC reviewed and proposed amendments to its Bylaws (March 17 2015).

University Honors Task Force
UGC Chair Jack Vevea and Member Mario Sifuentez agreed to serve on this task force. The task was co-chaired by VPDUE Liz Whitt and Jane Lawrence, Special Assistant to the Chancellor.
The group worked on a proposal during the spring and summer with the goal of submitting a report to the Senate at the beginning of AY 15-16.

Pending/Carried Over Items
Reading, Review/Recitation Week (RRR Week)

4

In 2010, UGC proposed an optional policy whereby faculty had the option of having a RRR week. Some faculty did not endorse the proposal; therefore, it was not implemented. During AY 14-15, a UGC member requested the implementation of a RRR week at UCM. It was agreed that a small group of UGC members would lead the drafting of a RRR policy proposal.

Withdraw Policy

A concern was raised by a faculty member about the implementation of the policy and how it seemed to overrule an instructor's discretion in the assignment of grades. This item will be revisited by UGC at the beginning of AY 15-16.

Revisions to the UGC and GC Program Review Policies

PROC recommended that the UGC and GC Policy Subcommittees each join the PROC Subcommittee for collaborative revisions of the undergraduate and graduate program review policies. The joint PROC-GC-UGC subcommittee will pursue its work on policy revisions in AY 15-16.

Respectfully Submitted:

Jack Vevea, Chair	SSHA
Christopher Viney, Vice Chair	Engineering
Anne Zanzucchi	SSHA
Carrie Menke	Natural Sciences
Harish S. Bhat	Natural Sciences
YangQuan Chen	SOE
Katherine Steele Brokaw	SSHA
Kelvin Lwin	Engineering
Linda-Anne Rebhun	SSHA
Marcos Garcia-Ojeda	Natural Sciences
Mario Sifuentez	SSHA
Nigel Hatton	SSHA
Paul Gibbons	SSHA
Sholeh Quinn	SSHA
Jian-Qiao Sun, *ex-officio*, non-voting	Senate Chair, Engineering
Cristian Ricci, *ex-officio*, non-voting	Senate Vice Chair, SSHA
Jane Lawrence, *ex-officio*, non-voting	VC for Student Affairs
Elizabeth Whitt, *ex-officio*, non-voting	VP and Dean of Undergraduate Education

Staff: Fatima Paul

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2014-2015

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

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

Annual Goals and Areas of Focus

In the first meeting of fall semester, COR members outlined seven overarching goals for the committee to pursue throughout the academic year. They also identified committee members who would play leadership roles for each of these issues. The seven general goals were:

1) *Improve and administer the Academic Senate annual faculty research grants program.* Of the responsibilities of COR, administering the faculty research grants program has historically required the most attention and labor, and this task is seen as an important contribution of the committee. The committee devoted a portion of each meeting, this year, to discussing ways to improve the program and the processes leading to the competitive assignment of awards. COR had previously submitted two memos to Division Council clearly stating the need for an increase in funding from the Provost/EVC for this program, as funding had not increased commensurate with the growth in faculty numbers. In recent years, many meritorious proposals had not been funded due to the low levels of available funding. In the absence of additional funds from the Provost/EVC, COR worked to reevaluate the criteria used to evaluate grant proposals, focusing on (i) the criteria that would allow the program to have the maximum impact on campus research productivity, (ii) improving consistency and fairness in the proposal assessment process, and (iii) managing the large labor load, both on the part of the committee members and also on faculty members recruited to conduct ad hoc reviews, of the evaluation process.

2) *Prepare for the formal review of campus research units.* Since the Senate approved the policies drafted by the AY 2013-2014 COR membership on the establishment and review of research units, COR focused on beginning the implementation of those policies during AY 2014-2015. The Sierra Nevada Research Institute (SNRI) was scheduled for a five-year review, and COR planned to collaborate with ex-officio committee member Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development (VCORED) Sam Traina to launch this endeavor and evaluate SNRI's research contribution to the campus. While the review process was clarified by early planning, the actual review of SNRI was postponed until AY 2015-2016.

3) *Advocate for a robust indirect cost return policy for extramural funding and monitor the efforts of the administration to implement such a policy.* COR identified its role as that of imparting to the administration the importance of faculty bridge funding, as well as consistency and transparency in any indirect cost return policy. COR also made plans to work with the administration to clearly communicate to the campus faculty any and all changes to indirect cost return processes.

4) *Monitor laboratory safety policy issues.* The move of faculty research laboratories from the Science & Engineering 1 building to the Science & Engineering 2 building introduced new issues concerning the need to ensure both the safety and efficient functionality of campus laboratories. These issues are varied and complex, and it is expected that they will persist for at least the next few years. VCORED Traina co-chairs a campus research safety committee with faculty representation, and COR continued to monitor and advise on associated safety issues.

5) *Provide advice concerning a new grants management system and campus responses to associated federal research guidelines.* COR planned to assist the VCORED, Research and Development Services (RDS), and the Sponsored Projects Office (SPO) by providing guidance on a new system for lifecycle grants management before its scheduled deployment in 2015. The COR membership was in a good position to comment on training materials and other components of the new system.

6) *Monitor research space allocation decisions and decision-making procedures.* COR planned to work with other Senate committees, including CAPRA, in order to advise the administration on space issues as they affect the campus research mission. Various

space committees have been convened over time, but COR recognized a pressing need for more faculty representation on these committees.

7) *Provide guidance concerning limited submission grant proposals.* Decisions concerning the selection of extramural funding proposals in cases where only a limited number of proposals are allowed from each campus have been mostly handled by School level decision-making bodies and rapidly convened ad hoc committees at the campus level. COR intended to offer recommendations on the review process, focusing on the need for consistency and transparency.

While COR conducted regular Senate business throughout the year, these seven issues served to guide the direction of much of the committee's work.

Annual Academic Senate Faculty Research and Travel Grants

A Case for Increased Funding
COR conducted lengthy discussions on the impact of static funding for the faculty research grants program on the committee's ability to allocate awards in a manner that optimally supports the research goals of the campus. In order to build a compelling case to the Provost/EVC for increased funding, COR conducted a survey of faculty research grant awardees from the past five years, asking faculty members to describe how their awards impacted their research in terms of publications, research presentations, related competitive grant awards, students supported, and new collaborations formed. COR summarized the results of this survey and submitted a memo to the Provost/EVC in spring 2015, requesting that funding for this program track growth in faculty numbers.

The poll revealed that, from the 35 responses received, these awards have led to at least 20 extramural grants, 54 publications, 46 presentations, support for 23 graduate students, and the creation of 16 new collaborations. As one of the only internal competitive research awards on campus, COR asserted that this grants program needed to be bolstered to support interim and bridge funding, maintenance of research capabilities, the initiation of collaborative and interdisciplinary work, the support of fields lacking sources of extramural funding, and a sense that the administration is committed to expand research activities on the campus as it grows. COR asked the Provost/EVC to consider increasing funding to a per capita level equal to that at the

time of the program's inception (i.e., $1,000 per Senate faculty member), or $159,000, as well as committing to the maintenance of this funding level as the campus grows.

Revised Process for the Evaluation of Proposals
In addition to being underfunded, the faculty research grants program has consistently suffered from problems with the proposal evaluation process. These problems generally have involved the labor needed to review proposals, both in terms of quantity and in terms of qualifications. Recruiting campus faculty to volunteer their time to evaluate proposals has been met with an abundance of polite refusals, and the relatively small size of the campus has introduced a large number of conflict-of-interest situations, restricting the potential pool of reviewers further. Past efforts to shift the bulk of the evaluation workload to the COR membership has produced an unmanageable labor burden, and this approach has greatly limited the expertise brought to bear on the proposal assessment process. The AY 2014-2015 COR membership deliberated extensively on these problems, searching for evaluation methods that might improve on those used during previous years.

COR made two major modifications to the proposal assessment process. First, it introduced a standardized cover sheet for proposals, motivated by a desire to ensure that all proposals provided a common array of basic information. Second, in an effort to introduce more relevant expertise into the evaluation process, COR required each proposal to identify an originating School, and faculty Executive Committees of the Schools were asked to formulate strategies for rating their subset of the proposals, leveraging the expertise of their faculty as much as possible. Given the quality ratings provided by the Schools, COR would merge proposal rankings based only on general and fairly objective criteria, reflecting the goals of the funding program, such as faculty juniority, time since last award, availability of alternative funds, and the presentation of explicit and detailed plans for the pursuit of further extramural funding. The idea was to "outsource" quality assessment to the expertise found in the Schools and to make any remaining criteria clear and transparent.

A call for proposals, providing extensive information concerning the new procedures, was delivered to all Senate faculty members in March 2015. At its May 6 meeting, COR members conducted their final deliberations, and selected awardees were notified shortly thereafter.

While informal positive feedback was received from the faculty concerning the procedural changes that were made to the evaluation process, two major concerns were raised and communicated to COR.

First, the fact that COR members were allowed to participate in the program as proposal authors was seen as problematic. It is worth noting that this aspect of the process was unchanged from previous years. Furthermore, COR deliberations included a number of mechanisms to protect the ranking process from conflicts of interest. COR members were certainly not allowed to rate properties of proposals (e.g., the degree to which a plan to obtain extramural funding appeared in a proposal) or comment on proposals in any way whenever there was a conflict of interest, which included both authorship and close collaboration with authors. Also, proposal authors on COR were not allowed to see the property ratings provided by other committee members, reducing the risk of introducing some form of implicit collusion bias. In the end, very few proposals were discussed by the COR membership directly, with almost all deliberation focusing on the appropriate weighting of previously established criteria.

The second problem involved the unintended result of producing a proposal ranking that left humanities proposals without funding. The COR membership had recognized the desirability of using this funding program to support research in fields for which there are limited opportunities for extramural funding. Rather than explicitly identifying those fields, however, the COR membership opted to directly evaluate the degree to which a proposal made a case that extramural funding was unavailable for the proposed project. When combined with other criteria, this raised the ranking of both humanities proposals and some of the social science proposals, but, in the end, the humanities proposals still fell below the threshold introduced by the small size of the program fund. Based on this experience, there is reason to suspect that the goal of using this program to support humanities research will only be met by segregating humanities proposals from others, introducing separate evaluation criteria and, perhaps, pre-allocating a proportion of the program funds to supporting research of this kind.

Finally, it is worth noting that some faculty expressed the opinion that the expertise of School faculty was still insufficiently specific to consistently evaluate the quality of proposals. Given that COR has neither the financial resources nor the labor resources needed to recruit ad hoc reviewers in specific research areas from off campus, and given

that such reviews would still leave the problem of comparing proposals from disparate research areas during the final ranking process, these comments suggest that efforts to produce reliable proposal quality estimates may be futile. In the future, COR may need to choose between a process that is clearly fair and a process that continues to heavily weight some measure of proposal quality.

Indirect Cost Return

During AY 2013-2104, COR drafted a proposed indirect cost return model and submitted it to Vice Chancellor for Business & Administrative Services Michael Reese and Vice Chancellor for Planning & Budget Dan Feitelberg. Both VCs attended a COR meeting at which COR members stressed the faculty's critical need for discretionary research funds, such that the implementation of a considered plan to reallocate unused faculty start-up funds to non-research related purposes would greatly hinder the research mission of the campus unless an equivalent amount of money was cycled back into the campus research enterprise. It was explained that many faculty members keep their start-up funds unspent for an extended period of time due to the lack of other sources of laboratory/unit/departmental unrestricted funding. Moreover, while the Senate continues to maintain its annual faculty research grants program, the amount of funding allocated to this program by the Provost/EVC has not risen in proportion to the growth in faculty numbers. Another meeting was held in August 2014 with COR members, VC Reese and Feitelberg, VCORED Traina, incoming Controller Michael Riley, and incoming AVC for Finance Donna Jones.

Due to scheduling difficulties, the first meeting of the AY 2014-2015 COR membership with representatives of the administration on this topic was held in March 2015. At that time, COR met with VC Reese, AVC Jones, and Director of Accounting Services Kimberly Groesbeck. COR emphasized the faculty's concern about start-up funds, given the lack of departmental or other bridge funding available for emergency expenditures. VC Reese announced that an indirect cost return proposal had been presented to the Chancellor for her approval. If approved, the model would be implemented on July 1, 2015. The proposed model would stipulate 5% of indirect costs to be returned to faculty member PIs and Co-PIs, but only on grants that pay full indirect costs. This return would occur in arrears, and the policy would be implemented by the Office of Research and Economic Development. Another 5% would be allocated to the School Deans.

COR members provided the following suggestions with regard to the proposed model: 1) language should be added in the proposal clarifying that the funds allocated to the Deans are to be set aside for faculty research purposes; 2) the proposal should specify that the 5% for Deans should be used to benefit the research group of the PIs and Co-PIs, in preference to other faculty members in the School; 3) there should be greater decentralization of control over the funds, perhaps by distributing them to the graduate group and bylaw 55 unit chairs, and 4) funds should be allocated to the ORUs, when appropriate.

New Grants Management System

RDS Director Susan Carter and her staff were guests at a COR meeting this year to present information concerning a new electronic grants management system. A draft timeline for the grant submission process, meant to act as a guide for faculty, was also presented to COR and feedback was requested. The two-part management system is intended to provide a more efficient process for faculty members and to generate internal data for reporting to UCOP. RDS piloted the system with the School of Natural Sciences in early spring 2015. While COR ultimately decided to postpone providing detailed feedback on the system until later in 2015, when the pilot period concluded and the faculty could be polled, the committee nonetheless appreciated the RDS consultation

Creation of Library and Scholarly Communication Committee

During AY 2013-2014, the Senate-Administrative Library Working Group recommended the creation of a standing Senate committee on library and scholarly communication. The monitoring of library issues was one of COR's charges, but it became increasingly clear that this responsibility was poorly situated, as supporting research activities is only one part of the library's mission. COR held that issues involving both undergraduate and graduate education, as well as the intelligent allocation of limited campus resources (including space), should also influence the guidance provided by the Senate to the administration concerning the campus library.

In fall 2014, COR urged Division Council to approve the empaneling of a standing Senate committee on library and scholarly communication. The request had the widespread support of other Senate committees. At Division Council's request, COR

drafted proposed bylaws for the committee and proposed membership that draws on expertise from existing standing committees, allowing input from the perspective of resource allocation (CAPRA), support for research (COR), support for graduate education (GC), and support for undergraduate education (UGC).

In spring 2015, Division Council approved the creation of the standing Senate Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (LASC). As this would require a revision of the UC Merced Bylaws, this item was included for discussion on the agenda for the spring Meeting of the Division and presented by the Chair of the Senate Committee on Rules & Elections (CRE). Following the Meeting of the Division, the campus faculty approved the revised Bylaws and the creation of LASC via electronic vote. The new committee will convene in AY 2015-2016.

Consultation and Monitoring

Consultation with VCORED
Throughout the academic year, COR members benefited from updates on various research-related issues from VCORED Traina, an ex-officio committee member. Major topics of consultation between COR and the VCORED included clarifying the campus limited submission process, issues about laboratory safety, and the establishment and review of ORUs. The VCORED also provided updates to COR throughout the year on discussion topics at the Council of Vice Chancellors.

Consultation with Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development
The Office of Research was restructured to include a new division entitled the Office of Business Development. This new office is led by AVC Peter Shuerman, who, at the invitation of the committee, attended a COR meeting to provide an overview of his office's services. AVC Shuerman's staff works on projects related to start-up companies and is introducing a development element by seeking partnerships, shared opportunities, and strategies for obtaining return on investment. The campus has acquired office space downtown to begin building teams in support of these business partnerships. Both AVC Shuerman and VCORED Traina reiterated the importance of partnerships and pointed out that the support for faculty research and the exploration of inventions could be had through careful integration with a business model.

Vice Chair Updates on PROC

COR benefited from updates from its Vice Chair who, by virtue of this position, serves on the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC). The Vice Chair reported the following major items of discussion in PROC: the VCORED's procedures on the review of ORUs and the need for a standardized review process across campus.

Provost/EVC's Proposed Six-Year Ladder-Rank Faculty Hiring Plan

The Provost/EVC's Strategic Academic Focusing (SAF) process, begun in AY 2013-2014, resulted in the Provost/EVC identifying five strategic areas ("pillars") that would receive resources and faculty FTE lines. In spring 2015, the Provost/EVC issued his six-year ladder-rank faculty hiring plan to the campus. Many faculty members expressed their concern to Senate committees over the future growth of traditional disciplinary ("foundational") areas. As this plan was discussed across campus over time, COR repeatedly returned to this topic in order to assess the implications of the evolving plan for the campus research mission.

Campus Review Items

- MAPP. As per policy, in the spring semester the Academic Personnel office, in conjunction with the Provost/EVC, submitted a set of proposed revisions to the *UC Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures* (MAPP) document. This year's proposed revisions largely pertained to the L(P)SOE titles.
- Campus Climate Action Plan. COR reviewed the campus climate action plan drafted by the Chancellor's office in response to the March 2014 campus climate survey. COR requested that the plan include pointed action items focused on improving research support and infrastructure, as the lack thereof is one of the main reasons for faculty attrition. COR also suggested that the plan indicate the individuals or organizations who will be responsible for implementing the proposed actions.
- CAPRA's Space Principles Document. CAPRA drafted a statement of space principles for Senate committee review and campus distribution. COR agreed with the principles but suggested that space for visiting scholars and research academic visitors should also be planned at an appropriate ratio.
- Split of FWDAF into Two Committees: 1) Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and 2) Diversity and Equity. COR endorsed the proposed split.

- Project 2020. COR, along with other standing Senate committees, heard updates and provided input on Project 2020 issues, including allocations of assignable square feet for research space.
- PhD Program Proposals.
  - Economics. COR endorsed the proposal but had several concerns, including the proposal's projected growth rate of faculty and graduate students, whether proposed interdisciplinary research and coursework for graduate students is viable, library resources, demand for the program, and issues surrounding the proposed curriculum. In spring 2015, COR reviewed the revised proposal, noted the inclusion of the previously requested changes, and offered its endorsement pending one minor revision.
  - Mechanical Engineering. COR reviewed the proposal in the last academic year and had numerous concerns, including growth in faculty numbers, the roles of core versus associated faculty, and how the program intends to become one of the core research areas on campus. In summer 2015, COR was given the opportunity to review the revised proposal and offered no further comments.
  - Management of Innovation, Sustainability, and Technology. COR endorsed the proposal but had several concerns, including the location of the proposed FTE lines, student demand for the program and career opportunities, and the availability of teaching assistantships and potential availability of extramural funding for graduate support.
  - Public Health. COR endorsed the proposal but had several concerns, including the current funding situation of participating faculty (needed to assess the probability that available resources will grow commensurate with graduate student enrollment), support for additional FTE lines, specifying the research facilities necessary for the program, and student demand and career opportunities.
- Revised Proposal for a SSHA Minor in Community Research and Service. While COR asserted that this minor would be beneficial to students, the committee echoed UGC's concerns about faculty teaching credit and resources. While the revised proposal intended to address these concerns, COR was not convinced that issues concerning sustainability with regard to resources were resolved by

this modified proposal. COR pointed out that the revised proposal's plan to offer unrestricted faculty research support stipends to faculty who deliver relevant community-based research experiences may be in violation of APM 662-16, if those stipends may be taken as additional compensation.

- Proposal for a SSHA Major in Global Arts Studies Program (GASP). COR deemed the research implications to be acceptable and, therefore, had no comments.
- Proposed Pilot Program for Undergraduate Chairs in SNS and SSHA. COR deemed the research implications to be acceptable and, therefore, had no comments.
- Proposal to Establish a Public Health Bylaw 55 Unit in SSHA. COR endorsed the proposal but requested the following revisions: 1) the proposal would benefit from including letters of support from Deans and representatives of graduate groups, indicating that SSHA is an appropriate home for this program and 2) the proposal should remove the language that states that the unit will manage a graduate degree program, as this is not in the standard purview of a Bylaw 55 Unit at UCM.
- Provost/EVC's Proposed Procedures for the Establishment of Centers. COR was concerned that the document did not recognize that the Senate had previously approved policies, created in conjunction with administrative consultation, that specify procedures for the establishment and review of Centralized Research Units (CRUs), which appear to be essentially identical to the Centers described in the document under review. COR requested that the Provost/EVC frame his document as proposed revisions to these previously approved policies, so the Senate and Administration can establish one unified policy for research groups of this kind.
- VCORED's ORU Review Policy. The VCORED expanded on the set of comprehensive policies concerning the establishment and review of research units. The general policies were drafted and approved during AY 2013-2014, but the VCORED's document provided additional procedural details. COR endorsed the VCORED's policy, finding that it aligns with the Senate's established policies on the topic.

- SPO Director Search. VCORED asked for COR's participation in the search to replace the retiring SPO Director in 2015. COR was also asked for general input concerning potential future directions for SPO.
- COR formed subcommittees to review nominations and select winners for the two Senate awards under the Committee's purview: Distinction in Research (tenured) and Distinguished Early Career (untenured) Research.
- Two members of COR served on the Hellman Awards review committee, chaired by the Provost/EVC.

Systemwide Review Items

- APM Revisions. COR opined on several proposed revisions to various sections of the APM, as requested by systemwide and Division Council.
- Systemwide Senate Bylaws. COR reviewed two proposed revisions to the Senate Bylaws, one pertaining to the expanded role of the University Committee on International Education and the other focusing on making the vice chairs of all standing systemwide committees be at-large members.
- Copyright and Fair Use Policy. COR found that the proposed revisions did not indicate who is responsible for the contents of the web site contained in the policy, and it recommended that the procedures, or at least guidelines for procedures, should appear in the policy document rather that solely on the website.
- Proposals for Doctoral Student Support. COR recognized that the establishment of mechanisms that remove (or, at least, reduce) the cost of non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST) to extramural grants would generally make the cost of having an international graduate student much lower. This could have a substantial impact on the research productivity of faculty members by saving them substantial funds, and those funds could be allocated to cover other costs. However, waiving NRST only for internally funded students would produce a disincentive to fund international students on extramural grants. COR, therefore, recommended the adoption of a unified and equitable policy for all doctoral students.
- Guidelines on Accepting and Managing Equity in Return for Access to University Facilities and/or Services. COR pointed out that the document failed to indicate the responsible party for determining whether a given business

affiliation advances the UC's educational objectives. There was also no indication of which individual or body would adjudicate any conflict of interest. Finally, COR noted that the proposed policy does not provide for Senate oversight and, so, recommended that an annual report be submitted to the Senate each year.

- Proposal for Open Access for Non-Senate Members. COR endorsed the proposal.
- University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) Updates. UCORP discussed the following major issues this academic year: funding for the multi-campus research programs and initiatives based on recommendations from the Portfolio Review Group, UC President Napolitano's formation of an Innovation Council, multi-million dollar investment into an initiative to commercialize UC research products, state budget negotiations between the Governor and President Napolitano, funding challenges for the UC Natural Reserve System, the UC Lab Fees Research Program, the future of the UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and general issues surrounding technology transfer.
- University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications (UCOLASC) Updates. UCOLASC discussed the following major issues this academic year: the open access policy and the UC Copyright and Fair Use Policy.

Respectfully submitted:

COR members:
David C. Noelle, Chair (SSHA) – UCORP representative
Deborah Wiebe, Vice Chair (SSHA) – UCOLASC representative
YangQuan Chen (SOE)
Jason Hein (SNS)
Masashi Kitazawa (SNS)

Ex officio, non-voting members:
Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research and Economic Development

Staff:
Simrin Takhar

Committee for Diversity and Equity

Chair's Report – *Tanya Golash-Boza*

Meeting of the Merced Division, December 2, 2015

The Committee for Diversity and Equity (D&E) identified the following goals for this academic year: 1) making recommendations to the Senate Chair and the Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) on the lack of diversity in endowed chairs at UCM and the number of unfulfilled chairs, 2) encouraging all schools to require diversity statements from faculty applicants, 3) recommending the appointment of faculty equity advisors in each school to provide guidance on diversity in faculty searches, and 4) ensuring that diversity is introduced in the program review process.

In October 2015, D&E sent a memo to the Senate Chair and the VPF on endowed chairs, recommending that a call for nominations for vacant endowed chairs should be issued immediately by the school deans; a clear explanation of the process, timeline, and criteria for nomination should accompany this announcement; this announcement should specify that, just as in any other review process, contributions to diversity will be considered; insofar as CAP is the reviewing body, CAP should be made aware of the current inequities; this call for nominations should lead to no more than four of the six vacant chairs being filled, and renewals for endowed chairs that expire should also go through this same process.

In November 2015, D&E sent a memo to the Senate Chair regarding the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) and the fact that assistant professors cannot serve as postdoc mentors. D&E argued that with its preponderance of assistant professors, UCM is placed at a disadvantage not being able to allow untenured faculty members to serve as post doc mentors for the following reasons: it diminishes assistant professors' roles in forming the collaboration with a postdoc and in attracting such applicants to the UC in the first place; postdocs often choose their advisors based on specific research interests and not allowing a postdoc to apply to be a President's Postdoctoral Fellow because their advisor is an assistant professor does a disservice to the specific postdoc and to the field as a whole; the majority of current postdocs at UCM are ineligible to apply to be a President's Postdoctoral Fellow simply because their advisors are assistant professors; assistant professors are often ideal advisors for postdoctoral fellows as they have more recent and relevant experience with modern-day job searches, and President's Postdoctoral Fellows are invaluable to assistant professors due to their substantial skill sets and the fact that they are prepared to immediately delve into research projects - postdocs play an important part in developing a lab community and culture as they mentor graduate students in the labs.

D&E tasked each committee member to identify two faculty members in his/her school who would be willing to serve as faculty equity advisors. D&E intends to continue these conversations throughout the academic year.

D&E Chair Golash-Boza represents the committee on the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE). Updates from UCAADE include discussion on the faculty salary equity study and the Regents' Statement of Principles Against Intolerance.

D&E continually consults with the VPF and the Director of Campus Climate.

At the request of the Senate Chair and systemwide Senate, D&E periodically reviews both campus and systemwide items:

Campus Review Items:
- Distribution of the 1.5% increase in faculty salaries
- Undergraduate program review policy. D&E recommended that external reviewers meet with diversity and equity representative during their site visit as it would add accountability to the program review process.

Systemwide Review Items:

- Proposed Revisions to Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment. D&E endorsed the proposed revisions and plans to work with campus units on these issues.