

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE UC MERCED DIVISION**  
**APRIL 4, 2013**  
**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Pursuant to call, the UC Merced Division Academic Senate met on Thursday, April 4, 2013 in Room 232 of the Kolligian Library. Senate Chair Peggy O'Day presiding.

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**A. *Division Chair Peggy O'Day***

The Senate Chair thanked everyone for attending and introduced Systemwide Chair Robert Powell, Systemwide Vice Chair William Jacob, and Provost/EVC Thomas Peterson. Chair O'Day explained one of the purposes of the meeting was to allow members to ask questions on pressing topics. Chair O'Day then introduced the new Academic Senate Executive Director Dejeuné Shelton and thanked the Senate staff, Mayra Chavez and Fatima Paul, for their outstanding work. Chair O'Day encouraged attendees to complete the election ballot and submit the Committee on Committees preference survey.

**Faculty Research Grant Awards:** Graduate Council sent the call for faculty research grant awards with a deadline of April 30, 2013. Chair O'Day reported that recipients may receive up to five thousand dollars and the call for proposals is available on the Senate website.

**Commencement:** Commencement will be split into two ceremonies May 18, 2013 and May 19, 2013 each beginning at 9:00 am. The School of Natural Sciences and the School of Engineering ceremonies will be on Saturday, May 18, 2013 and the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, & Arts ceremony will be on Sunday, May 19, 2013.

**Joint CAP/APO Meeting:** The joint CAP/APO meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 20, 2013. This meeting is a venue for faculty members to discuss with CAP members and APO staff issues related to academic personnel advancement and promotion.

**Active Searches:** Senate is currently participating in several administrative searches including: Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost and Dean for Graduate Education, Vice Provost for Faculty, and Chief Information Officer. Sessions will be scheduled for faculty to meet with candidates and faculty input is welcome on all searches.

**B. *Provost/EVC Peterson***

Provost/EVC Peterson provided a timeline on the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The draft plan was provided to the Office of the President the third week of March and the deadline for campus feedback is April 8, 2013. The Long Range

Enrollment Plan's (LREP) first draft was also circulated to faculty members and comments should be submitted to the Senate Office. The deadline to send the LREP to the Office of the President is April 30, 2013.

Provost/EVC Peterson thanked everyone for providing their budget proposals and acknowledged that the significant change in the process caused many unknowns in the budget process this academic year. The estimated cost for next year's investment is six to ten million dollars. Provost/EVC Peterson discussed the need for strategic academic planning in collaboration with the LRDP. In the past, most budget proposals were created primarily around the FTE process. Moving forward, the goal will be to encourage strategic budget plans based on an academic strategic plan.

A Senate member asked: How do you see the ratio of student to ladder-rank faculty evolving over the next few years?

Provost/EVC Peterson reported that during the campus visit by UC Provost/EVC Aimée Dorr, statistics were discussed that indicated that UC Merced has a good faculty to student ratio. Clarification is needed on what data was used to make this assessment. As the campus works to increase the number of graduate students, a joint effort will need to be made to balance faculty/student ratios. These are the types of constraints that fit in the strategic planning process. Provost/EVC Peterson also discussed the small number of graduate students who are supported on external research grants or contracts, and emphasized that this type of metric plays an important role in determining the faculty/student ratio.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

The November 8, 2012 minutes were approved as presented.

## **III. Discussion Items**

### ***A. Proposed Revisions to Division Bylaws- CRE Chair Rick Dale***

Chair O'Day opened a discussion regarding the proposed Bylaw changes that will allow the Senate to split one of the standing committees (GRC), provide reconfigurations of others to streamline workloads, make them more effective and manageable, and increase the number of faculty willing to serve. Chair O'Day then turned the floor over to the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) Chair Rick Dale.

Chair Dale provided an overview of the Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) duties and reported that the current proposal for Bylaw changes happened in collaboration with Senate standing committees. The first change involves the division of the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) into the Graduate Council (GC) and the Committee on Research (COR). The split would help streamline the diverse committee workload and provide a more focused agenda. The membership of the new Graduate Council would

remain the same with six members of the Senate, one graduate student representative, and the addition of the new Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education serving as ex-officio (when the position is filled). Duties would include graduate education and graduate affairs in general. The Committee on Research is a new committee with five members and the Vice Chancellor of Research serving as ex-officio. The committee will focus on issues of research, faculty grants, review of ORU's and CRU's, library matters, and issues related to research safety.

Chair Dale then opened the floor for comments or concerns.

A Senate member asked: What was the motive to split Graduate and Research Council (GRC) as opposed to the Undergraduate Council (UGC)?

Chair Dale responded there was discussion of splitting UGC and the conclusion was that further discussion was needed before a bylaw revisions occurred.

Chair O'Day explained Division Council discussed the issue of splitting committees and expressed concerns with moving too fast partly in terms of being able to adequately staff the committees with faculty and have sufficient Senate Office staff support. Division Council proposed splitting GRC first given the current focus on increasing our graduate student numbers over the next few years. It is imperative to have a faculty body who will be paying attention to the growth of graduate students population and one paying attention to research. UGC and DivCo also discussed the possibility of creating a joint Program Review Committee. Currently the independent subcommittees of UGC and GRC handle program review. Since there is no program review committee in our Bylaws, the Division can make changes and next year will operate with a joint program review committee that will conduct Graduate and Undergraduate program reviews. Those serving on the program review committee will not have to serve on UGC or GRC. Next year it would be advantageous for Division Council to consider how UGC should be split.

Chair Dale continued stating the second set of Bylaw changes involving the change of the name and charge of the Faculty Welfare committee. The committee is currently charged with considering issues of salary and benefits across the campus. The reason for expanding the role and renaming is a result of the current need to address crucial topics of diversity and academic freedom, and establish consistency with other campuses. The committee will be expanded to five members of the Senate and the Vice Provost for Faculty serving as ex-officio (when the position is filled). The chair of the committee will also now sit on Division Council as a voting member.

There is also a proposal to change the composition on the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA), with the primary concern being that the current Bylaws specify that the vice chair of UGC and GC serve as members on CAPRA.

The change to the committee would alleviate the vice chairs of those duties and provide closer ties to the Schools by having members from each School serve on CAPRA.

A Senate member asked: We have never had School representatives on committees before; will this mean that Schools will be appointing their representatives?

CAPRA Chair Amussen responded they would not be School representatives; rather there would be one member on CAPRA from each School. Last year CAPRA added an extra member to the committee to ensure there were representatives from each School. CAPRA felt it was more important to have membership from each School, which is more valuable for the discussion. The changes are merely specifying that representatives from each School are needed.

CoC Chair Gopinathan advised that CoC would continue to populate the committees and request nominees from the Schools. In many cases CoC tries to have representative from every School.

Chair O'Day reiterated we are not changing anything in the Bylaws on how faculty are placed on the committees, but simply we are emphasizing the importance of having good communication about planning and budget between Senate and the Schools.

A Senate member suggested changing the wording to "one Senate member from each School" to ensure it does not imply they are representing their School.

CRE Chair Dale advised that this is simply trying to explicitly accomplish balanced representation, which CoC has been trying to accomplish.

Chair Dale went on to state the proposed final revision is the change to the voting membership of the Division Council to include the chairs of the committees that were just discussed.

Chair O'Day explained the process of ensuring everyone is aware of the changes, which includes holding the ballot by email, having links to the changes, and holding the vote in a few weeks after CRE reviews and approves the changes.

***B. Graduate Degree Program Growth and Student Funding- GRC Chair Valerie Leppert***

Chair O'Day introduced Graduate and Research Council Chair Leppert to discuss graduate programs and expansion challenges over the next years.

Chair Leppert explained that all Interim Individualized Graduate Program (IIGP) emphasis areas would need to submit a stand-alone graduate program proposal to the UC Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) for approval in the next few years. The campus and IIGPs will need to determine an appropriate strategy for growing and making appropriate resources are available. Graduate and Research

Council reviewed three CCGA proposal this academic year and may receive two more proposals. An overarching concern for GRC is the need to determine how to grow all graduate groups to a sustainable size and maintain the high academic quality of the programs. In order to accomplish a sustainable growth of graduate programs, the funding streams for supporting graduate students cannot vary from year to year. Acting Dean of Graduate Studies Christopher Kello has proposed a permanent model to use year by year to enable us to identify the resources available to support our graduate students. The suggested model is under consideration by GRC and has been distributed to graduate groups for feedback.

Provost/EVC Peterson noted there was a new model on how funds were distributed this year and it was agreed that model needed revisions. He requested information on the reason so few graduate students are on externally funded research support and recommended finding a way the university can ease that burden, possibly by talking to other campuses.

GC Chair Leppert responded that a few years ago the campus began recycling all of our non-resident tuition on campus. The challenge is finding a way to grow that specific type of funding to help support international students.

Chair O'Day asked if the Systemwide Chair Powell or Systemwide Vice Chair Jacob could share their perspective on this endeavor.

Systemwide Chair Powell responded there were two reports that came out two years ago, one was a Senate report and one was a Joint Senate-Administration report that was prepared by his predecessor and Provost/EVC Peterson's counterpart at UCSD. Both reports identified problems and made different recommendations on the graduate non-resident tuition (NRT) issues. There was some interest among those he has spoken to at UCOP on expanding the duration of the NRT forgiveness. Right now it is three years after the advancement to candidacy, and one opportunity would be to expand it to four years. One could imagine a model that international students for the first five years would look just like a non-resident US student. They would come in the first year as a non-resident and the next four years their NRT would be forgiven. Then if they stayed beyond five years they would have to pay the full NRT. The Senate would like to put all students on an equal footing and the three years is a Regents policy.

Provost/EVC Peterson asked if there was the same sentiment within the Regents or Office of the President for graduate students and the number of international students.

Systemwide Chair Powell replied that as each campus is impacted differently it's a bit of a challenge to make it systemwide sentiment.

A Senate member asked: Part of the difficulty in increasing graduate school population is no doubt due to the NRT problem. Another part of the problem may be that we may not be simply pulling in enough external funds, so to what extent is it simply a matter of how our funding streams are set up versus the low external grant funding?

Provost/EVC Peterson answered that the difficulty of growing the student population is due to both the funding streams and low external grant funding. But when you see the higher fractions of hiring post-docs for example than graduate students it could be indicative of a number of things. On a purely financial basis or a work product per unit time basis, faculty are making the decision to invest in post-docs rather than graduate students.

Chair O'Day and Provost/EVC Peterson then discussed the relationship between the campuses ability to recruit graduate students and the choices currently made.

Chair Leppert mentioned that as the funding streams have been done on an ad-hoc basis, every year we are late allocating the graduate support that is available for admissions for the following year. We need to regularize the funding stream and have a model that we can carry over year to year.

Provost/EVC Peterson acknowledged the timing issue and indicated that he will work on that.

Chair O'Day agreed that since we have a variety of graduate programs that cross Schools, there are some differences that can be improved and worked out in terms of who is making the admission decisions and timing of admission offers. In the bigger picture it is worth thinking about how the budget will align with the projections and the targets we are trying to hit with graduate students. Chair O'Day reiterated this is a topic that Senate and the Administration will be focusing on next year.

**C. *UC Online Initiative- Systemwide Senate Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacob***

Chair O'Day then turned the conversation to the UC Online Initiative and introduced Systemwide Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacob.

Chair Powell started by thanking Chair O'Day for inviting them to today's meeting and stated how much he has grown to appreciate the deep way the system works and it is truly special watching Merced develop. Merced is a special place and Chair Powell hoped that one of Merced's faculty will consider being the Systemwide Senate Chair.

There are several issues being discussed by the Legislature. One is SB 520 that would basically outsource courses to online for profit providers. Systemwide Senate has opposed this measure and written a letter that led to a very strong statement from CSU also disagreeing with the bill.

The other “force” that is out there that will lead to a discussion about online education is the 2013-2014 budget, which looks to be a good budget. The 2014-2015 is not a great budget and the Governor is very forceful that if we can’t abide by a 5% tuition increase then the support from the State will change. The next thing is that all UC employees will see their contributions to the retirement plan go from 5% to 6.5% on July 1, 2013. There is a likely a proposal to raise those from 6.5% to 8% on July 1, 2014 along with the payer contribution to 14%. This has not been discussed in the Senate and it will be discussed first by UC Committee on Faculty Welfare. Chair Powell believes that the Senate will support this with the caveat that there would be an increase in 3% for salary in 2013-2014 July 1, 2013 or October 1, 2013.

Chair O’Day noted on our campus we haven’t had that much discussion on the increases in the retirement program. Many do not know how much they currently pay or how much it will go up. Given that we haven’t had any salary increase but have had retirement increases, this is a pretty strong case for salary increases.

Chair Powell explained the systemwide Senate vision is like a three-legged stool made up of systemwide funding streams, rebenching, and enrollment management. Systemwide funding streams will change next year, UC San Francisco and UC Merced had been taken out of the equation for this year, but the idea is to treat all students the same in terms of funding. Finally every campus has a budgeted enrollment so there is a real question right now of how many unfunded students are there in the UC system. We have been talking about enrollment management and systemwide says their expectation for Senate input is at the campus level and then the systemwide level. It’s important to know there is input from Senate at the campus level for enrollment management plans. BOARS sets the conditions for enrolling undergraduates and the traditional tool has been campus administration does enrollment terms, but now with all of these things working in concert it becomes a faculty welfare issue because the conditions in which people are enrolling affects faculty. Do you have a faculty to teach the numbers who are enrolling? Systemwide, we are not recruiting as many people as we lose every year. So you have these terrible demographics and at the same time you have these students who are coming in.

Vice Chair Jacob continued with discussion of his position on the BOARS and stated one of the rights of faculty is setting admissions requirements, but we don’t really engage in enrollment management. That is something that is left largely to the administration but obviously these things are interlinked. One way is from the financial point of view with the non-residence issue and rebenching. The issue of the master plan, the issue of UC eligibility, and the guarantee of admission to some campus is where the enrollment management exercise will be extremely important to Merced. Somehow, once all of the campuses turn in their enrollment plans, there will be a systemwide allocation of the California resident target because the legislature still believes we are honoring the

master plan. UC Merced is now becoming a selective campus and not everyone who meets that guarantee admission is getting admitted. I want you to understand that you pay an absolutely crucial role in the system and part of my year as Chair will be reviewing the role and impact of Merced with the referral pool, and rebenching.

Provost/EVC Peterson replied we have no intention to move away from what we are expected to do in the master plan but we are trying to get closer to our enrollment projections.

Chair Powell announced there are two systemwide meetings being held to discuss the UC Online Initiative and encouraged faculty to attend.

Chair O'Day affirmed that invitations were sent to faculty and there are still a few slots available if anyone wanted to attend the meeting on April 14, 2013 in Oakland.

Chair Powell stated that the Senate would like to encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration and cross-campus collaboration for online courses

Vice Chair Jacob reiterated that this initiative is faculty driven. There has been tension in the Senate over previous attempts when it was not faculty driven and it's also for UC students. This is not about selling a product to someone outside of UC; this is for UC students and it really should benefit the academic community.

Chair O'Day echoed and this is not just for developing online only courses but it is also for technology development that facilitates the creation of hybrid courses or new technology for learning platforms. More information will be made available on how to submit proposals once the RFP process is finalized.

#### ***D. Faculty Workload- Systemwide Senate Chair Powell and Vice Chair Jacob***

Chair Powell reported there is going to be an item in the May or July Regents meeting about the faculty workload issue as there are rumors that the Governor wants faculty to teach more courses. The Academic Council would like to turn the discussion around and talk about undergraduate outcomes like time to degree or graduation rates. Academic Council unanimously endorsed the idea of setting strategic targets across the system on a campus-by-campus basis. This has worked in the past with the first compact between the Governor and the Regents. This is how the UC Provost Aimée Dorr wants to turn the conversation around by talking about outcomes, and that may be the way the Governor is going as well.

Chair O'Day responded that those metrics for us are not particularly great. If you look at our time to degree and graduation rates, they are not great compared to other campuses or nationwide. By thinking about strategic planning, long range enrollment



planning, and academic quality the campus could demonstrate the quality of the institution and these areas could be improved upon.

A Senate member asked: Are we handicapped by being on the semester system?

Chair Powell responded that UC Merced is not negatively impacted and gave the example of the Berkeley campus whose graduate rates are the highest and is on a semester system too.

Chair Powell reported that this idea was presented at the Council of Chancellors as a joint project that impacts teaching, curricula and student advising. One of the biggest problems is having adequate staff advising students.

Chair O'Day stated it relevant to the campus as students need that support system and we need to make sure our academic objectives are well aligned with our support system. Going forward in terms of our growth, we have to pay attention to some of these quality metrics.

Vice Chair Jacob stated the Senate doesn't agree with the proposal that the faculty need to teach another course as the data for student credit hours over the last four years show an increase on average from 7 to 10 percent in faculty teaching. We are going to tell the Regents and Legislature that we are teaching more and our job is to keep the quality up but we are not adding classes.

#### **IV. Standing Committee Reports**

##### ***Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP)-Vice Chair David Kelley***

CAP has been looking at advancement, MCA and promotion cases. Systemwide CAP has been looking at a number of issues and one of them is the section in the APM that deals with the criteria for advancement and promotion (APM 210-1.d). APM 210-1.d states that contributions to diversity will be considered as part of one's service. There has been some ambiguity on whether this is relevant to a faculty member's individual contribution to service or whether that is a special form of service that is given some extra credit. UCAAP and UCAAD are discussing language revisions for this paragraph, which seems to indicate a fundamental difference in philosophy between the two committees. UCAAP feels that contributions involving diversity should get equal weight to other service contributions, and UCAAD feels they should be weighted differently in order to increase faculty diversity. A memo was sent to Chair Powell stating the systemwide committees agreed on everything except one point where there is a fundamental difference in philosophy.

Chair Powell was asked to elaborate on this request and the Academic Council voted to adopt the language from UCAAD. However, as this section is also on research, not just service, agreement from all campus committees will be needed. The question will be:

should the administration and systemwide Senate open that part of the APM up for revision? Chair Powell believes that the administration will hesitate to revise this section of the APM and further discussion will happen within the systemwide Senate.

***Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation- Chair Susan Amussen***

CAPRA has mainly focused on setting up the FTE criteria and process. School FTE plans have been received and are being reviewed to make recommendations to the Provost. Chair Amussen emphasized that CAPRA's role is to make recommendations to the Provost and does not make final decisions. The Provost has also asked CAPRA to provide some guidance on how to balance the different needs for new faculty and staff support given that we have a finite budget.

***Committee on Committees- Chair Ajay Gopinathan***

Chair Gopinathan announced the AY 2013-2014 Senate Chair will be Professor Ignacio López-Calvo who is currently serving as Vice Chair of the Division. Current CRE Chair Rick Dale will continue to serve as the Secretary/Parliamentarian of the Division. CoC is currently voting on the Vice Chair of the Division and once ratified a formal announcement will be made. The majority of the standing committee chairs and vice chairs have been identified and CoC will focus on completing the Senate slate. Chair Gopinathan stated that some of the issues CoC faced in this academic year have to do with streamlining the internal workload and process of the committee. It would be great to have an online system or perhaps a database that allows members access to faculty service records. Moving forward, CoC will rely more on the School Executive Committees so it will be asking for the schools to put forward suggestion for people to serve. The last comment is the general difficulty in getting people to serve on committees. This is not a poor reflection on the faculty, but there is no incentive for faculty to serve.

***Committee on Rules and Elections-Chair Rick Dale***

Chair Dale reported that CRE opined on different issues affecting academic programs, setup the election ballot, coordinated revision to the Division Bylaws, and identified an approach for dealing with Conflict of Interest (COI) issues on standing committees. CRE is also working on the organization of committee documents in the Senate website.

***Committee on Faculty Welfare – Chair Sean Malloy***

Committee member Shawn Newsam provided a report on behalf of Chair Malloy. Faculty Welfare has been involved with the development of the Campus Climate Survey and will be discussing the results once they become available. The committee will also begin reviewing the need for faculty mentoring on campus and faculty welfare issues related to the UC Online Education and lactation rooms.

***Graduate and Research Council Chair Valerie Leppert***

GRC is divided into three subcommittees to process all of the committee business. The Awards subcommittee reviewed applications for graduate student fellowships, provided a

volunteer to the Provost for the Hellman Awards, reviewed the Graduate TA Award applications and revised the GRC Faculty research grants call. The policy subcommittee has been working on providing feedback to WASC on their proposed policies for graduate programs and proposed metrics for evaluating graduate education. They also considered revisions to graduate group bylaws and graduate group policy and produces. GRC is working on clarifying the critical examination outcomes policy defined in the Graduate Advisors Handbook. Graduate Dean Kello, has asked GRC to consider changing the possible outcomes to pass, partial pass and fail. GRC is all discussing the funding model that Graduate Dean Kello has proposed to streamline graduate group funding. The committee will also begin discussing the strategy for making sure that resources are available to graduate programs under the IIGP umbrella that allow them to submit CCGA proposals in the near future. GRC has a representative on the search committee for the Vice Provost for Graduate Education. It is a big priority for committee to get a permanent Graduate Dean in place. Research issues of great concern for GRC are the new safety policies rolling out from UCOP and the campus library functions alignment with the academic research mission of the institution.

#### ***Undergraduate Council- Chair Cristian Ricci***

UGC is looking forward to the UC Online Education meeting on April 13, 2013 as this has been consistent topic of discussion at the local and systemwide levels. The Council discussed courses that junior college students take to satisfy lower division requirements for the UC and CSU. UGC is working on the site visits for the four programs undergoing program review this academic year.

#### **V. Senate Awards**

Division Chair O'Day announced the 2012-2013 Senate Award recipients, which were presented as follows:

- The Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching for a Non-Senate Lecturer: Rolf Johansson (SSHA)
- The Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and Mentorship Award: David Ardell (SNS)
- The Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award: Tanya Golash-Boza (SSHA)
- The Award for Distinguished Graduate Teaching: Nestor Oviedo (SNS)
- The Distinguished Early Career Research Award: Laura Hamilton (SSHA) and Elliott Campbell (SOE)
- The Academic Senate Distinguished Research Award: Rudy Ortiz (SNS)
- The Dr. Fred Spiess Award: Valerie Leppert (SOE)

Chair O'Day went on to explain the significance of the Dr. Fred Spiess Award. Professor Spiess was the first chair of the UC Merced Task Force, which functioned as the campus Academic Senate. Professor Spiess was a renowned scholar in the Scripps Research Institute at UC San Diego, was a highly distinguished oceanographer, and also served as the systemwide Senate Chair and Vice Chair. He valued the importance of the Academic Senate and dual leadership. He was sincerely committed to the success of this campus, and the UCM Senate presents this award in recognition of those who are

outstanding in research, teaching and Senate service. The recipient of the award is Valerie Leppert who is one of our founding faculty members and our first faculty UCM member to receive tenure. She has served numerous times on GRC, on numerous other committees, and has committed herself to the success of UC Merced.

**VI. Petitions of Students (NONE)**

**VII. Unfinished Business (NONE)**

**VIII. New Business (NONE)**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Attest:

Peggy O'Day, Senate Chair