UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE – MERCED DIVISION

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, May 6, 2015, 3:00pm-4:30pm

LOCATION SSB 238

I.   **Chair's Report – Jack Vevea**   **5 min**
A. Highlights from the April 23 Meeting of the Division
B. 4/30/15 Division Council Meeting

II.   **Consent Calendar**
A. Approval of the Agenda
B. Meeting Minutes *(pp. 3-27)*

III. **Systemwide and Campus Committee Reports:**
A. 5/1/15 BOARS Meeting - Vice Chair Viney *(pp. 28-29)*   **5 min**
B. 5/4/15 UCEP Meeting– Chair Vevea *(p. 30)*   **5 min**
C. 4/30/15 GESC Meeting – Chair Zanzucchi   **5 min**
The GESC convened on 4/30 and approved revisions to the subcommittee' charge and membership *(p. 31)*
Action requested: Approve revised GESC charge and membership. Send final document to GESC members, the Senate and the administrative leadership.

IV.   **Honors Task Force – VPDUE Whitt and Chancellor's Special Assistant Lawrence**   **15 min**

V.   **Discussion: Withdraw Policy – Chair Vevea**   **10 min**
▪ UCM Withdraw Regulation *(p. 32)*
▪ Policy (from the registrar's website) *(p. 33-34)*

VI.   **Grade Appeals Policy – Dr. Anne Zanzucchi**   **5 min**
A draft policy was proposed by UGC on 2/18/15 and comments were solicited from key campus constituents. The UGC ad-hoc committee revised the draft policy based on comments received in early April.
Actions requested:
1. Approve revised draft *(pp. 35-38)*
2. Send approved policy to standing Senate Committees, General Counsel, Provost/EVC, and Registrar for final review.

VII. **Request from SOE Curriculum Committee – CSE Entry on AP/IB Chart – Dr. Kelvin Lwin**   **5 min**
(pp. 39- 46)
Action requested: Approve CSE addition to the AP/IB Chart.

VIII. **Request from the WSCUC Steering Committee - UCM's Review under the WSCUC Standards 10 min**

Dr. Marcos Garcia-Ojeda
This semester UC Merced initiated its efforts to re-affirm accreditation by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC, formerly "WASC"). This process, which involves several stages, will conclude with an Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 and, in June 2018, the WSCUC Commission decision to re-affirm accreditation for a period of 6, 8 or 10 years. The first step in the Institutional Review Process for re-affirmation is to complete, as an institution, the *Review under the WSCUC Standards*. Senate Committees and School Executive Committees are asked to review the document, with a particular focus on Standards 2, 3, and 4. *(pp. 47-80)*
Action requested: Review the report and send comments to the Senate chair by May 15.

IX.   **Revised GC Policy for Review and Approval of Graduate Courses**   **5 min**
Graduate Council recently revised its policy for review and approval of graduate courses. UGC is asked to provide any comments on the policy before it is widely distributed and published on the Senate website. *(pp. 81-83)*
Current policy is available here (*a tracked changes version of the policy is not available*).
Action requested: review policy and send comments to senateoffice@ucmerced.edu by May 14, 2015.

X.   **Report from the Library Staff - Susan Mikkelsen and Sara Davidson Squib**   **10 min**
Susan Mikkelsen and Sara Davidson Squibb have been working in collaboration with the Merritt Writing Program to integrate the research process into the writing process in some Writing 10 sections. They are also evaluating this collaboration as part of an Assessment in Action (AiA) initiative from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL).

XI.   **Executive Session - Voting Members, VPUDE Whitt, and Interim VCSA Nies**   **10 min**

[Undergraduate Council](#) (UGC)

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, January 28, 2015

I. **Chair's Report – Jack Vevea**
   A. DivCo Meeting – January 21, 2015
   - A committee has been charged with assessing proposals for Medical Education. There has been a proposed restriction to limit the number of HSRI faculty on the Medical Education Task Force. There was a general consensus at DivCo to remove the restriction.
   - The Provost's Office sent a memo to the Senate regarding revisions to academic degree policies. DivCo plans to request additional information regarding the rationale for those revisions and possibly solicit comments from Senate committees.
   - The Committee on Rules and Elections is evaluating the proposed Bylaw changes for splitting the FWDAF committee into the Faculty Welfare and Academic Freedom and the Committee for Diversity and Equity.
   - Committee Chairs were asked to review their Bylaws for potential changes.
   - The Committee on Committees reported on ongoing problems trying to find a Humanities faculty member for CAP. CoC is considering sending out multiple requests at the same time to accelerate the process.
   - Karin Groth, Director of Parking and Enforcement, will attend the February 18 DivCo meeting to discuss parking problems.
   - The Provost wants to get a sense of DivCo's approach to the cost-living adjustments and how they should be allocated. Some campuses want control over allocation of those funds. Most campuses believe in an across the board quality allocation of the funds. The issue of contention is whether this should be applied to base salary or base plus off-scale salary. DivCo's position was if this is just a small increase, it should probably be based on base plus off-scale.

II. **Consent Calendar**
   The agenda and the December 10 Meeting Minutes were approved as presented.

III. **[1/9/2015 BOARS Meeting](#)– Vice Chair Viney**
   Systemwide Senate Chair Gilly updated BOARS members on the following.
   - Governor Brown released the 2015-16 State Budget which includes a 120M increase for the UC contingent on tuition remaining the same; however the proposed tuition increase assumes that the 120M will be in the University's budget. President Napolitano is working with the Legislature and Governor Brown to identify ways to increase the State's investment in the UC.
   - There is no funding for the lab fee research program this year which will most likely affect funding for tuitions and for TAs salaries.
   - BOARS is preparing its annual report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review. Members were asked to provide feedback and consider data in the report and possible additional recommendations. The final report will be sent to the Regents.

   Vice Chair Viney reminded UGC members that the Compare Favorably Report will be discussed at the February 6 BOARS meeting. The Admissions subcommittee and the Office of Admissions were previously asked to send their comments to Senate Analyst Paul.

IV.   **Update on 1/26/15 PROC Meeting – Vice Chair Viney and Dr. Kelvin Lwin**
        A.   Principles of Assessment
At the October PROC meeting, a member raised the issue of diversity and a comment was made that it may be appropriate to establish principles of program review. The PROC/GC/UGC policy subcommittee convened in November and December and concluded that program review should have some goals and concise principles and thus, drafted a Principles of Program Review document. The document was circulated for review.

        B.   Global Arts Program (GASP) request to change Annual PLO Assessment Report from March 1 to July 31, 2015
Typically, every academic program submits an annual assessment report by March 1. The GASP program made a one-time request to delay its submission until July 2015 because the program faculty are piloting a new assessment approach. GASP also plans to propose a major in the future. PROC had no concerns with the request for delay and with delegating the decision-making for similar requests to ALO Martin. PROC would also like to be able to track these requests for delays and the rationale for each request. PROC is interested in having access to a report of requests at the end of each academic year. PROC Co-Chair Peterson suggested that such reports be discussed at Deans meeting at the beginning of each year.

        C.   Schedule of Administrative Reviews
PROC agreed to send the periodic review schedule to VCs to solicit their feedback on the accuracy of unit structures and review timelines.

        D.   General Education Program Review
Members discussed the GESC memo requesting that some site visit participants for sessions scheduled on Feb 9 and Feb 10 have access to the self-study. PROC discussed the confidentiality of academic review self-study reports, appendices, and who should or should not have access to those materials.

PROC recommended that the self-study (without the appendices) be shared with <u>all</u> campus participants who are scheduled to meet with the review team. A cover page will be included stating that this document should be treated confidentially.

V.   **Update on General Education Program Review – GESC Chair Zanzucchi**
The site visit is scheduled to take place on February 9 and 10. The GESC has sent the self-study to the external team. Senate Assistant Director Paul and ALO Martin participated in a conference call with the review team to provide the team with an opportunity to ask questions about the self-study, the campus, and request additional information. The team requested supplemental items which would be added to the self-study appendix: WRI 1 information and materials about GE activities in the spring, mainly the GSS, outreach to students, and the GE retreat.

Assistant Director has invited the most relevant campus constituents to meet with the review team in various sessions. The agenda is available [here](). The open session for Senate faculty currently does not have wide participation. It is critical to have a cross section of faculty participation. Given the high percentage of GE provided by Psychology, Chair Vevea volunteered to encourage the Psychology faculty to attend. Assistant Director Paul will also send reminders to the various groups.

VI.   **Update on Grade Appeals Policy – Dr. Anne Zanzucchi**
Members: Elizabeth Whitt, Anne Zanzucchi, Carrie Menke, Christopher Viney, Charles Nies

The committee has reviewed all UC policies and created a draft policy. The subcommittee met recently and revised the draft to put more responsibility on the Deans and the Provost in terms of arbitration and emphasized the importance of informal petitioning with the faculty before engaging in the formal process. At this point, it might be useful to have a simultaneous review of the policy, with input from Ombuds Acker, Director of Compliance Smith, General Counsel Gunther, and the Provost.

VII.   Revised Proposal for a Minor in Community and Research in Service
The original proposal was reviewed in Fall 2014 by standing Senate Committees, the VPDUE, the ALO, and the Provost. SSHA submitted a revised proposal based on comments it had received. Comments from CAPRA, COR, and FWDAF have been received. GC and ALO Martin had no objections or comments. The Senate Director was informed that UGC comments within the proposed 1/26 deadline would not be possible.

At the last iteration, the concerns raised by various constituencies were partly related to clarification of resources, cross-schools administration of the minor e.g., how to manage double-dipping, how Core 1 will be integrated, and plans for growth. The CRS faculty have been responsive to previous concerns and the SSHA Dean is committed to providing resources. The administration across schools is pre-empted because it is clarified in the CRS response that the administration currently exists in SSHA. Plans for growth, however, are not very clear possibly due to the uncertainty of campus resources.

The opinions from other committees somewhat echo UGC's. There are some residual concerns about funds; the FWDAF endorsed the proposal and thus, there seem to be fairly consistent opinions; however COR pointed out a concern about the $2000 research stipend. The proposal states "The CRS minor will recognize faculty effort by providing $2000 research stipends and also staff support (for example, through the Academic Coordinator) each semester to those faculty who teach CRS relevant undergraduate research experiences. Initially we anticipate being able to support a maximum of 5 courses per semester [5 x $2,000 = $10,000]." UGC echoes COR's concern about this aspect of the proposal. As described in the Academic Personnel Manual, [APM 662-16](#) bans faculty from receiving compensation beyond their salary for teaching at UC. This could be addressed by clarifying that the research stipends may not be used to supply summer salary.

A member expressed concerns about the sustainability of the minor and wondered if two years is enough time to assess the success of a program. Alternatively, what if the minor is very popular and there are no funds to sustain it? UGC Chair noted that the minor is a well-conceived idea and major efforts are underway to keep it sustainable. If those efforts are made in good faith, they probably will not fail.

A member requested clarification about the role of the CRS coordinator and whether that person will also serve as the program FAO.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to: 1) recommend approval of the minor effective Fall 2015; 2) encourage the administrative leadership to closely monitor the sustainability of the minor as it develops.

VIII.   Expansion of Admissions Subcommittee Charge
Membership was revised at the last meeting to include the BOARS representative.
Assistant Director surveyed the duties and memberships of Admissions committees at other UCs. Findings show that one common theme at other UCs relates to issues of outreach and articulation with Schools. At UCM, the issue of articulation was discussed by UGC a few years ago, sometimes in the context of

Education Abroad. Decisions about articulation of particular courses are made by faculty within the Schools. UGC wonders if those decisions are still being made by faculty in the Schools and how they relate to the Admissions subcommittee charge.

Comments:
- This is a delicate topic because should UGC decide that articulation and outreach be part of the Admissions subcommittee, it may potentially affect the current campus structure.
- Faculty in the various disciplines would appreciate some guidance on how to address issues of articulation but it is unclear if faculty would be willing to give up that responsibility.
- A member inquired if it would be possible to have a description of the mechanisms at other UCs for handling such cases.
- A member noted that the advisors in the Sciences have been helpful in providing advice on various requests for articulations, and often solicit faculty input for certain cases.
- A member noted that assessment of cases for articulation should only be made at the time of admissions. BOARS, the systemwide committee that oversees matters related to admissions, does not assess cases for articulations for various campuses.
- Articulation cases will increase because of the external pressures on UCM to increase enrollment and expand the transfer route so it might make sense for UGC and its Admissions subcommittee to have some degree of participation in the matter.

Members were asked to send specific queries about the functions of Admissions subcommittees to Assistant Director Paul who will contact the UCs admissions support staff to request a description of mechanisms for handling articulation cases.

IX. **Discussion: Reading, Review/Recitation Week (RRR Week)**
Final examinations are required for all undergraduate courses by systemwide regulation.
UCB has a policy under which the last week of official class meetings is the RRR week when classes don't meet and faculty and teaching assistants are available to students for completion of projects and preparation for final exams. This officially counts as instructional time. Final exams cannot be scheduled during the RRR week.

There is some history for this issue on the Merced campus. In 2010, UGC proposed a policy whereby individual faculty had the option of having an RRR week, and some faculty did not endorse the proposal. Subsequently, the proposal was not implemented.

Some students whose final exams are scheduled the last week of class undergo a considerable degree of stress and disruption.

A concern was raised about the very short amount of time for faculty to turn in grades after final exams. For example, some faculty in SNS had only two days to grade 165 papers, including essays.
A member inquired about the availability of institutional data about how exams are scheduled. The registrar responded that her office no longer tracks final exams, except those scheduled on Saturdays. Some exams are scheduled on Saturdays to accommodate multiple section and large classes.

It seems that there is some evidence that if UGC were to propose a policy, it may be not be well received by faculty. Therefore, UGC has to carefully research how to propose this policy. A member noted that the implementation of a reading week would not affect the grades timelines.

A member proposed the following model:
Tuesday: classes end
Wednesday: study day
Thursday and Friday: exams
Saturday and Sunday: study day

This would provide students with a full study day and exams, and all grades due 72 hours after the exam.

UGC members are interested in pursuing this topic. Thus, it was agreed that a small group be establish to lead this initiative. Members are Carrie Menke, Paul Gibbons, and ASUCM representative Desiree McClain.

Previous Senate comments on this topic are available on the 1/28 CROPS meeting folder.

[Undergraduate Council](#) (UGC)

Minutes of Meeting

Wednesday, February 18, 2015

I. **Chair's Report – Jack Vevea**
    A. DivCo/CAPRA Consultation with VCPB Feitelberg – February 12, 2015
        On February 12, Division Council and CAPRA met with Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget Dan Feitelberg to discuss Project 2020. Three short-listed developer teams for the 2020 Project want to meet with campus stakeholders, including representative faculty, between now and the issuance of the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) this spring. The most salient topic was the assignable square footage per faculty, which will be around 2000sq ft., substantially lower than what is typical for a research university (e.g., Community Colleges are typically over 2000). Faculty will be working with some constraints.
    B. Reminder: Expansion of Admissions Subcommittee Charge
        At the last meeting, members were asked to contact Fatima Paul with questions about the various committee structures. Chair reminded members to send queries to Assistant Director Paul.

II. **Consent Calendar**
    Agenda approved as presented.

III. **Systemwide Committee Reports**
    A. [2/2/15 UCEP](#) Meeting – Chair Vevea
    UCEP consulted with Ellen Osmundson, ILTI Project Coordinator. In AY 13-14, 39 courses (hybrid and online) were funded. UCEP discussed articulation issues of online courses with the UCs and the need to make decisions at the campus level. There was also some discussion about the political impact of online education.

    UCEP was asked to opine on the five year planning perspective. It was not clear to UCEP why their comments were solicited. The committee was eventually asked to approve the disbanding of programs.

    Undergraduate Completions Conference took place in January. Discussion topics included the completion rates for Pell Grant recipients.

    The UCEP March meeting will probably be cancelled due to lack of business.

    A. [2/6/15 BOARS](#) Meeting – Vice Chair Viney
    The Legislature wants the UC to ease the transfer pathway to UC and improve articulation for transfer students. Last year, President Napolitano's [Transfer Action Team](#) made a number of recommendations related to transfer processes and representation of transfers from colleges to the UC. The report identified a number of UC majors that would prepare students for admission to any UC campus

    This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of UGC Members.

offering those majors. BOARS noted that Senate Regulation 476 guarantees a comprehensive review, not admission.

UCOP will forward BOARS members a list of 10 majors asking members to identify individuals on their campus who should be consulted about the recommendation and serve as the primary campus contacts. UCOP administrative leadership will contact the chairs of the various majors or equivalents of department chairs. There will be some pressure on some campus constituents to articulate some majors.

IV.   **PROC and General Education - Vice Chair Viney and Dr. Lwin**
A. 2/17/15 PROC Meeting
PROC discussed the Psychology and Chemistry program reviews. Regarding the latter, PROC encouraged the School Dean and the Chemistry faculty to provide a sustainable action plan by the end of this academic year. PROC also discussed the administrative periodic review schedules.

B.   General Education Program Review Site Visit
The site visit went well. The review team was very engaged and is working on its report.
The Review relayed that the campus needs a clear sense of its mission and identity and needs to consider plans to address the cancellation of Core 100. GE should be outcome-driven rather than principle-driven. The Team also would like to see some more central oversight and coordination of GE and more faculty buy-in, incentives.

V.   **Report from CRF Subcommittee**
Members: Jack Vevea, Christopher Viney, Carrie Menke, Sholeh Quinn
UGC discussed the subcommittee's recommendations and made the following recommendations.

CRFS	UGC Recommendation
1. GASP 033: Popular Bombay Cinema (cross-listed with ARTS 033 - #6 below)	Recommend approval
2. ENG 033: Literature and Sexuality	Recommend approval *Recusal: Dr. Katie Brokaw (absent on 2/18/15)*
3. PSY 147: Health Psychology (Discontinued – replaced with PSY 120 - #11 below)	Recommend approval *Recusal: UGC Chair Jack Vevea*
4. ENG 021: Jane Austen and Popular Culture	Recommend approval *Recusal: Dr. Katie Brokaw*
5. PSY 131: Social Psychology (Discontinued – replaced with PSY 156 - #13 below)	Recommend approval *Recusal: UGC Chair Jack Vevea*

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of UGC Members.

6. ARTS 033: Popular Bombay Cinema (cross-listed with GASP 033)	Recommend approval

7. WRI 104: Personal Style and Formal Writing	Pending approval
	The number of units is 3 for this course. Most of the writing courses are 4-unit courses. Approval pending clarification from SSHA.
	Recusals:
	  ▪ *Dr. Paul Gibbons*
	  ▪ *Dr. Anne Zanzucchi (absent on 2/18/15)*

8. USTU 010: Introduction to Undergraduate Studies	Recommend approval
	Recusals:
	  ▪ *Dr. Paul Gibbons*
	  ▪ *Dr. Anne Zanzucchi*

9. ENG 166: Nineteenth Century Drama and Adaptation	Recommend approval *Recusal: Dr. Katie Brokaw*

10. WRI 121: International Rhetoric	Recommend approval
	Recusals:
	  ▪ *Dr. Paul Gibbons*
	  ▪ *Dr. Anne Zanzucchi*

11. PSY 120: Health Psychology	Recommend approval *Recusal: UGC Chair Vevea*
12. PSY 152: Psychological Perspectives on Cultural, Racial and Ethnic Diversity	Course submitted as satisfying GE. Approval contingent upon detailing the GE principles that are satisfied by this course *Subcommittee's comments:* "The GenEd description seems to correlate to 'Self & Society', but not any other. At least 3 principles must be specified to qualify for GenEd designation. Given 20% weight for term paper, 'Communication' may apply. So may 'Ethics & Responsibility' especially given topics covered and reading The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down." *Recusal: UGC Chair Vevea*
13. PSY 156: Social Psychology	Recommend Approval *Recusal: UGC Chair Vevea*

14. [PSY 150: Psychological Perspectives on Culture, Race, and Ethnicity](#) (Discontinued – renumbered to PSY 152)	Pending approval -- See above recommendation for PSY 152 *Recusal: UGC Chair Vevea*

VI.   PROC Memo to UGC and GC - Advanced Notifications of Program Review
The Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) asked UGC (and GC) to contact programs scheduled for review in AY 2016-2017 to request confirmation of the scheduled review date. Undergraduate Program Review Schedule available [here](#)

UGC members had no objection to PROC's request and will respond to the Committee's memo.

VII.   Bioengineering Program Response to UGC re: Program's PLOs
Background: The BioE program had requested to change its current program learning outcomes to the ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) A-K outcomes, in preparation for programmatic accreditation. ABET requires that engineering programs regularly assess the A-K learning outcomes. In its December 2014 memo to BIOE, UGC recommend that BIOE consider either (1) adapting the program-specific criteria (which map to ABET's a-k criteria) into their PLOs or (2) including PLOs that are specific to the BIOE program in addition to the a-k criteria.

UGC members unanimously voted in favor of allowing the BIOE major to adopt the ABET a-k outcomes as the program's PLOs and will encourage the BIOE program to:

1. Ensure that the BIOE program learning outcomes are aligned with the standards and requirements set by professional organizations that ABET is aligned with.
2. Develop a curriculum map for the program that is compliant with the ABET criteria and process.

VIII.   Grade Appeals Policy
Members: Elizabeth Whitt, Anne Zanzucchi, Carrie Menke, Christopher Viney, Charles Nies
Action Requested: Review and approval of proposed draft policy.
Comments will be solicited from the Provost, General Counsel, GC, the Director of Compliance for Title IX, and the Registrar.

Chair suggested a few edits to the current draft.

A motion was made, seconded and unanimously carried to approve the policy with the edits proposed at the meeting.

IX.   Review of UGC Bylaws
Members were asked to review the UGC section of the Bylaws and send revisions to Fatima Paul.

[Undergraduate Council](#) (UGC)

Wednesday, March 4, 2015

Minutes of Meeting

I.   **Chair's Report – Jack Vevea**
  - Chair reminded members to contact Senate Analyst with questions about the various UC Admissions committees' structures. UGC's goal is to expand the charge and membership of the Admissions subcommittee.
  - Grade Appeals policy will be discussed at the next meeting. GC has provided comments.
  - Chair asked for volunteers to serve on the review committees for the Non-Senate and Senate Faculty Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching Awards.
  - On Friday, March 13, a Nuventive demonstration for faculty will take place. Chair Vevea cannot attend and asked for an alternate. Senate Analyst will follow-up with an email to the membership.
  - There are several CRFs on the agenda today and 15 are forthcoming. UGC will review and vote on them electronically.

II.   **Consent Calendar**
   Agenda approved as presented.

III.   **Update on Admissions – Director Ruiz**
   As of March 2, UCM has notified 4600 freshmen of admissions decisions. Director Ruiz hopes that decisions will be finalized by April 15. The goal is to enroll 1606 freshmen and 146 transfers . Transfer admissions will be completed by the end of April. The Office of Admissions has some targets but it is planning conservatively.

IV.   **Update on General Education – GESC Chair Zanzucchi**
   The site visit took place last week and it is anticipated that the review team report will be received in mid-March. Since the site visit, the GESC reflected on GE. Recently, VPDUE Whitt led a group of GESC members to Kansas City to attend an AACU conference primarily focused on GE. This gave participants a sense of GE programs at other institutions, particularly ones that are more established. The GE programs that seemed to be the most successful were those that were innovative, had a high profile, had recruited competitive students, and involved a multi-disciplinary group of faculty and instructors who had worked with co-curricular units.

   At the conference, participants also had team conversations about capstone experiences and about sophomore year as a turning point. There were some interesting examples about signature experiences from lower to upper division that led to the capstone experience. There was a real sense of sequences and scaffolding in the more developed GE programs. It was interesting to witness what those kinds of

1

requirements and experiences can drive and what courses are contributing to those models. Almost all the campuses have struggled with the identity of the GE crisis; what people call it and how they understand it. AACU has also done a lot of research with employers about GE and analyzed the usefulness of GE for recent college graduates.

A good portion of the discussion was about faculty development and incentives. Many campuses have workshops for submissions of course proposals and assignments. There is a considerable amount of information about ways to set GE expectations for proposal processes, not so much for capstones, but the principle is very similar in terms of giving faculty input for proposals.

V.   Report from the CRF Subcommittee
UGC made the following recommendations:

1. ANTH 131: Space and Place: An Anthropological Perspective - approved
2. ANTH 111: The Anthropology of Globalization – approved
3. ENG 153: Robert Louis Stevenson - approved
4. ANTH 113: Urban Anthropology – approved
5. HIST 124BR: African American History 1877 to Present: Research - approved
6. SPAN 172: History of the Spanish Language – approved
7. SPAN 175: Spanish in the U.S. - approved
8. ANTH 122: Anthropological Perspectives on Religion and Healing - approved
9. ANTH 120: Introduction to Medical Anthropology - approved
10. PH 111: Social Epidemiology - approved
11. SPAN 177: Sociolinguistics and Latino Health - approved
12. ANTH 117: The Anthropology of Citizenship - approved
13. PH 103: Health Communication - approved
14. PH 105: Introduction to US Health Care System - approved
15. PH 108: Health Care in the San Joaquin Valley - approved
16. PH 112: Research Methods: Health Services Research and Public Health - approved
17. PSY 134: Adolescent Development – approved
18. WRI 114: Environmental Writing - approved
19. PH 100: Introduction to Epidemiology - approved
20. PH 102: Health Promotion - approved
21. ENG 140: The Novel in the United States Across the Twentieth Century – pending approval. The course outline for this upper division course is identical to the lower division course ENG 54.
22. ENG 054: Introduction to the American Novel - approved
23. ENG 118: Literature and Philosophy - approved
24. ENG 055: Introduction to the Short Story - approved

Recusals:

ANTH, Linda-Anne Rebhun

ENG, Katie Brokaw and Nigel Hatton (absent)

HIST, Sholeh Quinn

PSY, Jack Vevea

WRI, Paul Gibbons and Anne Zanzucchi

VI. **Revised SSHA Transfer Admission Criteria**

Changes are as follows.

- Updates to History Major Options as there are no U.S. or World tracks any longer
- Updates Management Major title to Management and Business Economics (title change approved by UGC Spring 2014)
- Removal of POLI 010 from the POLI major requirement as POLI 010 should be taken at UC Merced

If approved, changes are effective Fall 2015.

Comments:

- The proposal makes it difficult to identify what is being proposed vs. what is information for UGC's interpretation of the document.
- The nature of the changes appears to be innocuous and is related to a decision to stop requiring a particular lower division course (POLI 10). The issue with the Statistics course is that a comparable course would be difficult to identify and articulate. In this particular case, the course is available at Community Colleges and students are denied UC admission because they could not have a satisfactory course.
- There are many students who could not transfer to Political Science because of requirements that could not be fulfilled at CCs. This revision is a positive step as it allows students to transfer to the POLI major and it also puts limits on transfer students who are coming from other 4-year institutions.
- There are some CCs that are much larger and have a larger curriculum where the requirement could be met. If an articulation exists, we should continue to allow students to fulfill that requirement.
- There are a few typographical errors in the proposal and some sections need to be clarified.

    Action: Senate Analyst will contact SSHA staff to request a revised proposal.

VII. **Review of the Catalog**

Review Assignments:

- o **SOE** – Carrie Menke (SNS); Paul Gibbons (SSHA); Christopher Viney (SOE)
- o **SSHA** – Marcos Garcia-Ojeda (SNS); Sholeh Quinn (SSHA); Kelvin Lwin (SOE)
- o **SNS** – Harish Bhat (SNS); Jack Vevea (SSHA); YangQuan Chen (SOE)

A copy of the SSHA Catalog was previously sent to UGC on 2/27 and a reminder to provide comments was sent to the SSHA review subcommittee on 3/2.

Comments on the SSHA Catalog have been submitted to UGC and are available on CROPS.

SNS and SOE Catalog are pending Deans' approvals.

UGC will review the Catalog in its entirety at a future meeting.

3

VIII.   SSHA Proposal for a Global Arts Studies Major – Effective Fall 2016
Members were asked to read the proposal and be prepared to discuss and formulate a recommendation at the March 18 or April 1meetings.

Preliminary Comments:
-    It is difficult to interpret the teaching workload tables in the proposal because they do not mention specific courses. A member noted that a legend is provided on p. 201 of the meeting packet.
-    A question was raised about the three vocal music courses that were moved out of GASP into Undergraduate Education, which is not an academic program. A member expressed concerns about academic courses being in a non-academic unit.

IX.   Executive Session

Upcoming Business: Systemwide Review Items

      A. **Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Presidential Policy - Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence**

If UGC chooses to opine, comments are due to the Senate Chair no later than April 10, 2015

      B. **Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 128.D.2** (Vice Chairs)

These revisions are proposed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and would provide that Vice Chairs for all standing systemwide committees whose memberships are governed by SBL 128 be at-large members. This change would affect UCAF, UCIE, UCOLASC, UCOPE, UCP&T, and UCACC; all six of these committees currently have Vice Chairs appointed from among Divisional representatives. UCR&J has reviewed the proposal and found it consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

If UGC chooses to opine, comments are due to the Senate Chair no later than April 15, 2015.

Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

Minutes of Meeting

I. **Chair's Report – Jack Vevea**
- UCEP will convene this month.
- CRTE Periodic Review – Chair called members' attention to the following: 1) Senate analyst sent UGC a confidential email address for members to provide comments or concerns; 2) Chair is scheduled to meet with the CRTE periodic review committee and he would like to get a sense of UGC's perspective on the CRTE. Members provided the following comments:
  - Summer sessions and graduate students as instructor of record is a topic of interest.
  - A member utilized the center and believes it is a very reliable resource. People should take advantage of the services provided by the Center.
  - A member noted that he utilized the SATAL and it has been valuable resource.
  - At times in the past, there have been questions about continuing support for SATAL.
  - A member reported that he had satisfactory interactions with the Center and suggested that some professional development in survey design for CRTE staff could be useful A UGC member had used CRTE to help in assessment and ended up with less-than-useful survey data because the response format was forced ranking of concerns.

II. **BOARS Report (3/6/15 meeting - teleconference) – Vice Chair Viney**
- Activities are underway for the transfer streamlining. The UC systemwide Senate and Administrative leadership asked UC administrators to identify faculty and staff responsible for determining the pre-major preparation expected of transfer students in 21 majors. A similar request was made of BOARS. Representatives from the UCs will meet in the Spring, beginning with the Life Sciences group on April 2. The Senate will be asked to discuss recommendations before any decisions are made.
- The Texas Governor is proposing more funding for TX universities with the purpose of replacing UC in the top ten list.
- BOARS was asked to review the area "d" to make sure it aligns with the science curriculum, partly due to the fact that next year, the state wants to begin its assessment of students against the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).
- The President has announced that UC will cap non-resident enrollment next year at UCLA and UCB but allow it to rise at other campuses. Campus admissions offices are relying on wait lists to help them adhere to the precise enrollment targets.

III. **Update on the 3/17 General Education Meeting - GESC Chair Zanzucchi, VPDUE Whitt**
The Subcommittee has received an update from the review team and it seems that plans are on target. Yesterday's meeting focused on future plans for the semester and for next year. A GESC member provided an analysis of faculty feedback on the GE Retreat synthesis. Members discussed the value of holding another Retreat (to be scheduled in May or June). The discussion at the Retreat may include some topics related to the review team report. The overarching aim is to change GE and to engage as many people as possible in

the conversation. Any changes to GE will be implemented in Fall 17 and broad input will be solicited from campus stakeholders.

A member suggested that the candidates for the SOE Dean position, scheduled to visit this month, be asked about their GE intentions.

IV. Discussion: Core 1 60-Unit Cap – VPDUE Whitt

There are two issues with the 60 unit cap on Core 1 (approved by UGC last year). Because Core 1 is intended to be a first-year experience, students are expected to take Core 1 before they reach 60 units. If students exceed the 60-unit cap, they would have to petition to enroll in Core 1. This comes with two challenges: 1) according to the advisors, we suddenly have many more "super freshmen" (students who come in with sufficient AP credit), who are coming in with sophomore-level credit or even beyond and are therefore very close to the 60-unit limit; 2) we have a group of students who have chosen not to take Core 1. As Dean of Core 1, the VPDUE has received four petitions. Core 1 is a Senate-mandated graduation requirement. If students do not take it, there is a potential that they will not be able to graduate. It is unclear how many students are on that track. There are a number of students who were notified a year ago that they were about to reach the cap and were provided with options. There is also a group of students who take Core 1 repeatedly, fail it and are still exceeding the unit cap. GESC Chair Zanzucchi is pursuing the issue of "super freshmen". She is currently trying to figure out what this cohort looks like in terms of placement record, scale, and number of units upon entering the University. The scale of the topic is still unclear. Dr. Zanzucchi met with the advisors last week and it was learnt that Cognos reports might be very helpful to advisors.

It is within UGC's purview to make any decisions related to Core 1 from a policy standpoint.

Comments:
- It would be useful to gather data and could the solution be as simple as excluding college credit (AP credit) that is not transfer credit from the 60-unit cap?
- It is crucial to be certain that students who did not take Core 1, didn't due to lack of seats in the classroom. However, if students did not take the course because they didn't want to, it is logical to tell them that they cannot graduate.
- There are cultural messages to students that work against the notion of the importance of Core 1 as a graduation requirement. There are several ways to fulfill graduation requirements to get additional credit. Core 1 is unique to UCM and cannot be fulfilled anywhere else.
- Advisors have reported that some students come in expecting to transfer, and know that it is not required at other UCs, but end up not transferring.
- A conversation about data would help UGC get situated.

UGC Chair encouraged members to think about this topic. UGC will make a recommendation on this issue at its April 1 meeting.

V. Report from the CRF Subcommittee

Members: Jack Vevea, Christopher Viney, Carrie Menke, Sholeh Quinn
UGC recommendations:

1. ESS 147: Astrobiology*- approved
2. BIO 120L: General Microbiology Laboratory – approved (recusal: Marcos Garcia-Ojeda)
3. CHEM 008: Principles of Organic Chemistry - approved

4. MATH 146: Numerical Linear Algebra – approved (recusal: Harish Bhat)
5. BIO 047: Astrobiology – not approved. The GE guiding principles need to be expanded. Senate analyst will request a revised CRF. Course will be reviewed and voted on via email.
6. BIO 147: Astrobiology* - approved
7. NSUS 010: Success in NatSci Preparatory – not approved. Need to clarify why the course can be repeated for credit 12 times. Senate analyst will request a revised CRF. Course will be reviewed and voted on via email.
8. NSED 130: Technology in Education - approved
9. NSUS 020: Success in NatSci Excellence – not approved. Need to clarify why the course can be repeated for credit 12 times. Senate analyst will request a revised CRF. Course will be reviewed and voted on via email.
10. BIO 174: Stable Isotope Ecology - approved
11. ESS 047: Astrobiology – not approved. Include and expand GE guiding principles. Senate analyst will request a revised CRF. Course will be reviewed and voted on via email.
12. CHEM 008L: Principles of Organic Chemistry Lab – Not approved. Not Approved - CLOS missing and Catalog description should be modified to reflect that this is a lab component. Senate analyst will request a revised CRF. Course will be reviewed and voted on via email.
13. CHEM 160: Introduction to Scientific Computing (conjoined) – Not approved. Title seems generic. Could the title be revised to make it more chemistry-specific? Recommend revision of text in course description to include some language related to the context of chemical computation. Senate analyst will request a revised CRF. Course will be reviewed and voted on via email.
14. ESS 174: Stable Isotope Ecology – approved.
*Discontinued

SOE:
15. BIOE 106: Cell Biology for Engineers - approved
16. ME 144: Introduction to Multi-body Dynamics - approved
17. CSE 135: Introduction to Theory of Computation - approved

VI.   **Revised SSHA Transfer Admission Criteria – Associate Dean Ortez**
The proposal was discussed on March 3 and recommendations were sent to SSHA. School revised the proposal as suggested by UGC.

Action: Members unanimously approved the revised SSHA Transfer Admission Criteria proposal. Senate Analyst will notify the School, on behalf of UGC.

VII.   **Review of the Catalog**
Review Assignments:
SOE – Carrie Menke (SNS); Paul Gibbons (SSHA); Christopher Viney (SOE)
Comments were provided as hyperlinks to the Box site:
https://ucmerced.box.com/s/frionjogo3vhuplsfdvfhbcaiyw29el6
https://ucmerced.box.com/s/zsmzrt9qyjerpbonitiad84rpirjcmz3

- o **SSHA** – Marcos Garcia-Ojeda (SNS); Sholeh Quinn (SSHA); Kelvin Lwin (SOE)
- o **SNS** – Harish Bhat (SNS); Jack Vevea (SSHA); YangQuan Chen (SOE)

Action: UGC recommends approval of the SOE section of the Catalog subject to changes, most of which are copy-editing. UGC also requested that the core courses for the Nanotechnology emphasis be pulled from the electives for the MSE major. UGC will review a revised copy by email and vote next Friday.
    This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of UGC Members.

The SSHA and SNS sections will be discussed at a future meeting.

VIII.   **Curriculum Revisions and Catalog – Registrar Herbrand**
Flowchart for review of the Catalog is proposed by the Registrar.
The timing of this proposal is very good. The flowchart's main goal is to make sure UGC's time is used efficiently.

Action: UGC unanimously approved the proposed flowchart. The issue of substantial vs. non-substantial changes of the Catalog will be addressed in the future.

IX.   **SSHA Proposal for a Global Arts Studies Major – Effective Fall 2016**
Comments are due to the Senate Chair by April 6. UGC is the lead reviewer.
This proposal was previously discussed on March 4.
  - p. 158 of agenda: "1.4. Availability of suitable preparatory at community colleges". A word is missing.
  - The issue of the Arts courses currently sponsored by College One instead of an academic unit, needs to be addressed.
  - There are resources concerns connected to the two LPSOEs positions.
  - p. 160: "Total units to graduate with GASP Major: 44 ". Computation of number of units in the proposal totals 48 units.
  - Professor Ramicova's name is misspelled

UGC and VPDUE comments will be sent to the Division Council. UGC will be asked to make a recommendation on this proposal at a future meeting.

UGC members were asked to send additional comments and concerns on the proposal to the Senate analyst.

X.   **Public Health CCGA Proposal Next meeting**
Public Health has submitted a proposal to establish a PhD program. If UGC chooses to opine, comments are due to the Senate Chair by April 9. Graduate Council is the lead reviewer.
  - Proposal
  - Appendix
The proposal will be discussed at the next UGC meeting.

XI.   **Systemwide Review Items**
    A.   **Systemwide Review of Proposed Revised Presidential Policy - Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence**
UGC declines to opine on this item.

    B.   **Proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 128.D.2** (Vice Chairs)
These revisions are proposed by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and would provide that Vice Chairs for all standing systemwide committees whose memberships are governed by SBL 128 be at-large members. This change would affect UCAF, UCIE, UCOLASC, UCOPE, UCP&T, and UCACC; all six of these committees currently have Vice Chairs appointed from among Divisional representatives. UCR&J has reviewed the proposal and found it consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.
    UGC declines to comment on this item.

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of UGC Members.

C. [**Proposed Amendments to Senate Bylaw 182**](University Committee on International Education) – Professor Chen

The proposed revisions expand the UCIE's purview from student exchange associated with UCEAP to international research collaborations, the welfare of international students and scholars, and international engagement initiatives.

If UGC chooses to opine, comments are due to the Senate Chair by May 5.

The idea is to have a centralized role for this committee. The revisions also aim at giving UCIE the right to implement policy. These revisions may positively affect UCM. The UC didn't have a centralized authority for international collaborations. It was suggested that these revisions be endorsed.

This item will be discussed further at the April 1 meeting.

XII.   Executive Session – No minutes are taken in executive session.

Wednesday, April 15, 2015

Minutes of Meeting

I. **Chair's Report – Jack Vevea**
    - Reminder – Meeting of the Division: April 23, 2015, 3:00-5:00pm, KL 232. Followed by reception.
    - A lecturer is needed to sit on the Award Committee. Senate Analyst will follow-up with an email.
    - Memo from GESC to UGC, DivCo, and CoC regarding the composition, leadership, and stipend of GESC next AY. The term limit for the GESC Chair needs to be articulated in the Subcommittee's charge. Professor Bhat indicated that he is willing to chair GESC if he doesn't have to sit on UGC. It is not clear if the stipend for the GESC chairmanship is an ongoing commitment but this will be clarified by the Division Council (please see GESC memo to DivCo).
    - A member noted that at the April 14 PROC meeting, there was some discussion about the perceived importance of GE and the need to elevate it to a level of urgency across disciplines. To be able to achieve that goal, it might be better to establish the GESC as a stand-alone committee. In its report, the external review team recommended that UCM redesign its GE program. One way to do that is to have a stand-alone committee. Members welcome the idea of GESC as a stand-alone committee rather than a subcommittee of UGC as long as there is communication and connection between both UGC and GESC. Broad representation of the disciplines on the Subcommittee is also strongly encouraged.

        Another question was raised at PROC regarding timing and length of process for establishing a stand-alone committee.

        Chair requested that the GESC be discussed further at the next UGC meeting.

II. **Consent Calendar**
    A. Approval of the Agenda
    B. Minutes: all minutes will be uploaded on the "Draft Minutes" CROPS folder

III. **Systemwide and Campus Committee Reports:**
    A. 4/3/15 BOARS Meeting- Vice Chair Viney
       - There is a possibility that GE credit will be given for military experience. What sort of prior learning might be given credit?
       - At the March Regents meeting, the Regents voted to exempt some military veterans and their dependents from nonresident tuition. It was also suggested that UC should award general education credit for military service experience.
       - Governor's senior policy staff visited the UCs and plan to attend future systemwide committee meetings.
       - Compare Favorably report – BOARS is currently reviewing a draft. The final report will be released soon. It is anticipated that UCM's Admissions staff will be contacted with questions from the media.
       - A BOARS subcommittee is assessing the transferability of CC courses to UC. There was a discussion of whether research credit at CCs (or equivalent) can be transferrable as research into a UC.

1

B. [4/6/15 UCEP Meeting](#) – Chair Vevea
Chair Gilly has been asked to report back on the status of activities on UC campuses regarding Transfer Streamlining. Individuals with knowledge and authority over the transfer pathways to the most popular majors will meet in Oakland to discuss prerequisites. Ten majors have been identified. A point was made at the meeting about the political importance of Transfer Streamlining. Chair Vevea encouraged UGC members to be aware of this issue.

Dr. Garcia-Ojeda, who attended the April 7 meeting in Oakland, echoed Chair Vevea's comments and reported on the Transfer Admissions Pathway Project Life Sciences meeting: A large number of CCs and CSUs students are transferring to the UC. Several Senate committees are exploring similar transfer guidelines for Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics in the Sciences as well as Anthropology, Sociology and Economics in the Social Sciences. The Physics meeting is scheduled for April 16. Transfer requirements information across the system is extremely confusing, inconsistent, not easily accessible and difficult to understand for transfer students. For example, UCM is the only UC that requires upper division requirements for Physics while the other UCs do not have a Physics admissions requirement for Biology majors. Our sister institutions have an Associate Degree for transfer students. This allows CC students to fulfill all the requirements and thus become eligible to the CSUs. The push is for UCM to establish a system similar to the CSUs'. In the case of Biology, based on data collected from all the UCs, the goal is to allow a general sequence of Biology, Chemistry, Calculus (single linear equations), and Organic Chemistry, that would separate us from the CSU system. The issue at hand is not to change the requirements but to provide transfer students with clear expectations. Applications will be more comprehensively evaluated. It is possible that a recommendation may be made for UCM to remove its Physics requirement for Biology majors. Even if one thinks it is important for the Biology major to have calculus-based Physics; this can still be achieved through the Admissions process.

The issue of cheating was also raised at UCEP and there was some discussion of Course Hero. A faculty member's course materials were available for purchase on a website. A UGC member suggested that the addition of an explicit statement in the syllabus forbidding that kind of activity or access to the site.

C. 4/14/15 PROC Meeting – Vice Chair Viney and Dr. Lwin
Draft Principles for Periodic Review - PROC members had no objection to the proposed draft principles. A draft will be sent to the Senate, the Vice Chancellors and Deans, for review and comments.

Formal Notifications of Program Reviews - Five programs will soon receive advance notifications of upcoming reviews. PROC will consider the scope of reviews of these programs. A question was raised about the status of the American Studies minor and whether that program still exists, due to ongoing low student enrollment. PROC may consider recommending that this program be discontinued.

GE Review Program Review – A GE Retreat is planned for June 10 and 11. The preparation of the response to the program review team report should be led by GESC, in collaboration with the Provost, the VPDUE, and others as appropriate. GESC will update PROC at the beginning of the Fall semester on the status of the response to the review team report. With regard to the GESC membership, a suggestion was made to consider someone from the MWP as a member next year.

2

PROC endorsed GESC's recommendation to share the review team report with standing committees, ECs, and CCs.

PROC will send the review team report to UGC with a request to address salient points that should be considered during the preparation of the response to the report, due in 6 months. UGC will relay PROC's recommendation to GESC.

New WSCUC Requirement – In keeping with CFR 1.22, WSCUC is now requiring a student achievement URL that a) includes retention and graduation data for both undergraduate and graduate students, noting that multiple years of data help illustrate trends and data consistency; disaggregation of data by race, ethnicity, and gender is important to include; b) is readily and easily accessible, and prominently and centrally displayed on a webpage. External links to an institution's data should be user-friendly, i.e. resisting needing multiple links/clicks to find relevant data. c. Makes public data about student achievement, including …evidence of student learning. WSCUC notes that multi-page assessment documents may be useful to individuals with expertise in this area, but a brief, more focused summary of assessment results will be more helpful to the general public. WSCUC also notes that data displays should reflect an integration of institutional research and assessment priorities and display approaches. Institutions should consider including a brief contextual and interpretative explanation of the data. A recommendation was made to add some language in the footnote that clarifies the report is based on direct evidence. PROC had no objections to ALO Martin's proposal.

CAPRA Request for Deans' Analyses of Resource Requests in 2014-15 PLO Reports - PROC approved draft letter for sharing Deans' analyses of resource requests with CAPRA.

Expedited Site Visit for Environmental Systems Program - The Environmental Systems program is in the process of finalizing its self-study and has asked whether it might be possible to plan an external review team visit for May. PROC recommended that the site visit take place in September 2015, in accordance with the program review schedule.

Administrative Periodic Review Schedule - Finance and Office of Budget Planning's reviews will be moved to 2016-17 (currently scheduled for 15-16).

IV.   **Update on General Education Program Review – GESC Chair Zanzucchi**
GE is an intensive institutional process that engages the Senate, Student Affairs, students, lecturers etc. A retreat is planned for June 10, 11 and members should anticipate an invitation soon. The GESC will convene tomorrow to finalize a list of participants. The Subcommittee is also in the process of providing corrections to the review team report, as per policy. In terms of finding out more about what constitutes an action plan, given the scale of GE and the evolving nature of responsibilities, there are some surrounding questions that could benefit from some guidance. For example, who, in the broad inclusive collaborative sense, should be responsible for GE and its implementation plan? Up until the program review process and continuing forward, the GESC has acted as an academic unit.

The GESC has reached out to undergraduates and learned that the May 2014 retreat synthesis describing the hallmarks of GE had been endorsed.

V.   Discussion: Withdraw Policy – Chair Vevea
- UCM Withdraw Regulation
- Policy (from the registrar's website)

A concern was raised by a faculty member about the implementation of the policy and how it seems to overrule an instructor's discretion in assignment of grades. This will be discussed at the next UGC meeting.

VI.   Grade Appeals Policy

Draft policy was proposed by UGC on 2/18/15 and sent for comments to key campus constituents.
UGC has received comments from:
- General Counsel Gunther
- Director of Compliance Smith
- Provost/EVC Peterson
- Graduate Council
- Registrar Herbrand
- A Senate Faculty Member

Actions:
1. Discuss comments and consider additional revisions to the policy.
2. Circulate Revised Draft
3. Approve revised draft at the May 5 meeting.
4. Send approved policy to standing Senate Committees, General Counsel, Provost/EVC, and Registrar for final review.

- Highlights of the General Counsel's comments were requests for clarification of the following.
  Policy (Initial steps):
  "The following are recommended preliminary steps that should be taken prior to filing a formal appeal to address grade concerns. These steps precede the formal appeal process, described in the next section. If a clerical or procedural error in the reporting of a grade by the instructor can be documented within the semester following when the grade was filed, a student may informally petition the instructor and/or the program's faculty lead for a change of grade. Grade changes to correct clerical and procedural errors may be filed by the instructor (or equivalent proxy) and approved by the Office of the University Registrar. Such grade changes should **ensure fairness and equity based on syllabus or other policies, especially for those students whose grades will be unaltered.** No final grade (except an Incomplete) may be revised by reexamination or additional coursework."
  Counsel Comments:
  Are these issues when we are talking about clerical and procedural errors? What does this mean here? This seems to add a discretionary element into what is seemingly clerical.
  UGC commented that the syllabus generally gives procedures for how the grades will be assigned so the syllabus is relevant to the implementation of the procedures. A revision might want to clarify that aspect of the policy, rather than remove language.

  Policy (appeal process):
  "If an appeal petition alleges discrimination, an initial assessment of the grounds for the case will be considered by the program's Dean. If it is determined that this is potentially a discrimination case, the petition will be handled as a Title IX consideration."

Counsel Comments:
What does this mean? Will it be referred to the Title IX Officer for investigation?
Will the Title IX Officer simply be consulted – I assume the Dean still makes the grade decision.
You may want to consult with Wendy and determine what position to refer to as Title Ix is limited to gender, I think.

- Provost Peterson endorsed the policy and deferred to Director of Compliance Smith and General Counsel Gunther to comment on any potential legal concerns.
- GC provided some helpful comments including clarification of what is meant by "written" and if it includes email. GC also called attention to potential conflict of interest. Per the GC memo: "As written, the policy indicates that if the program's Dean has a conflict of interest a Dean designate will review the case. Members expressed concern that the conflict of interest may be compounded if the Dean designates the designee. GC suggests that UGC identify the designee to avoid the perception of conflict of interest in such cases; for example, the designee be the program's School Executive Committee Chair." GC also suggested the addition of "no later than" at various points in the timeline.
- The Registrar recommended that the last paragraph in the Appeal Process section related to final semester before graduation be deleted "since any petition outlining an exceptional situation approved at the Dean's level or above would be cause for precedence over the practice in the Registrar's profession regarding changes to the student record after a degree is awarded. The Registrar also stated that she "would highly suggest changing language for the sake of clarity as well as for outlining timing due to the potential impact on Graduation Honors and Chancellor's/Dean's Honors. Example: "If a grade appeal is related to the final term before graduation, submission of an appeal must be made within 30 days after the last day of a student's final term and considered within 30 days after receipt." Again, I strongly believe that this statement is unnecessary and should be deleted."
- A faculty member commented: "I read the draft policy and have only one comment. In several places the document encourages the student to discuss the matter with the "program faculty lead". How does the student know who that person is? Presumably the course instructor would know, but perhaps not particularly if the instructor is a lecturer, and perhaps the student doesn't want to rely on the instructor to tell him/her who to talk to. The Dean could direct the student to this person, but if the student has to go to the Dean first, the policy might as well not mention the program lead. In a normal university, a student who doesn't get satisfaction from his/her instructor would normally go first to the chair of the relevant department, who is easily identified. Until we have departments, we need to either decide that all such conflicts will be handled directly by the School Dean or else provide some way to publically identify the program lead for each program."

Action: the UGC subcommittee will revise the policy based on the feedback discussed today. A revised draft will be discussed at the next UGC meeting.

VII.   [Proposal for a GASP Major](), effective Fall 2016
The Senate has received comments from:
- [Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education Whitt]()
- [Graduate Council]()
- [CAPRA]()
- [Provost Peterson and CIA Martin]()

Actions:
1. Discuss feedback on proposal.
2. Send request for clarification to the program leadership (SSHA Dean, GASP faculty with a cc to the Senate Chair).
3. Review revised proposal and make recommendation at a future meeting.

VPDUE was fairly supportive of the proposal and pointed out that better documentation of the demand that does not rely on an assumption that interest in the minor implies interest in the major, might be useful. VPDUE also wrote about the need for commitment from the Dean regarding resources and asked for clarification of the role of the Arts courses that are housed in College One.

In response to a question from the Chair, VPDUE noted that she is not seeking a specific response from the program but would like the issue of the Arts courses to be addressed. The faculty need to address and recognize that there are three Arts courses that are not part of this major and are currently sponsored by an administrative unit.

SSHA Assistant Ortez indicated that there is a desire in SSHA to transfer the Arts courses to the GASP curriculum.

The Provost requested the Dean's analysis of resource requirements; clarification of the Writing component as it seems underspecified. The proposal calls for an additional studio art classroom. The Provost wonders about the impact on the program should space not be available and asked for a detailed analysis of the roles of the two LPSOEs vs. one full time staff member. The number of units (44) seems very low compared to other programs. The proposal does not indicate if this is a B.A. or B.S.

> Assistant Dean clarified that the number of units is a typo and should be 48. This will be corrected in the revised proposal.

CIA Martin commented on the relation of PLOs to core competencies and suggested some reformatting of the assessment plan. She also recommended revisions to the curriculum map to clarify the assessment structure.

CAPRA raised the issue of whether it might be desirable to have "course materials and services" fees associated with the classes to help offset the cost of course delivery. The proposal suggests that all the faculty teaching resources will need to be allocated to the major. CAPRA wonders about the impact on graduate education and mentoring. CAPRA also raised the issue of staff vs. LPSOEs and the number of units.

GC called attention to the major significantly undermining GASP faculty commitment to graduate education.

It will be a challenge to address some of these points but they do need to be addressed.
The program faculty will need to address all the comments.

Action: UGC will send a memo to the Senate Chair summarizing today's comments. The program will be asked to address all comments before a recommendation is made on the proposal.

6

VIII.   Systemwide Review Items   **15 min**

    A. **Proposed Amendments to Senate Bylaw 182** (University Committee on International Education)
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/underreview/documents/ReviewofSB1823-15.pdf

The proposed revisions expand the UCIE's purview from student exchange associated with UCEAP to international research collaborations, the welfare of international students and scholars, and international engagement initiatives. Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **May 5, 2015**.

Professor Chen, who serves as the UCIE representative, reported the following: Professor Chen encouraged UGC to support the proposed changes and called attention to the importance of international research collaborations.

UGC applauds the plan to make available information that can be used to shape and refine faculty governance in international activities.

UGC unanimously voted in favor of the proposed revisions.

    B. **UC Policy on Copyright and Fair Use (Final Review)**

Final Review is intended to advise the results of the Systemwide Review and how language has been refined. This stage of consultation is intended to confirm that revisions to the proposed policy reflect comments received during the initial review and is not expected to lead to additional substantive changes to the proposed policy.

Link to Senate response during first round of review (June, 2014):
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/reports/BJ2Dorr_Copyright_FairUse_Policy.pdf
Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **April 20, 2015**.
UGC declines to comment on this item.

    C. **Draft Guidelines for Pilot Program to Accept Equity for Access to University Facilities or Services**

Under this proposal, UC would be able to accept equity from companies in return for access to facilities and services associated with incubators and accelerators around the UC system. Guidelines were developed by staff within the Office of Research and Graduate Studies, the Office of General Counsel, in consultation with representatives from the UC Berkeley and UC Davis programs that will be the first participants in the pilot.
Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **May 1, 2015**.
UGC declines to comment on this item.

    D. **Proposed Revisions to APM 210-1-d (Final Review)**

This revision was proposed by an Academic Council working group consisting of the Chairs of BOARS, UCAAD, UCAP, UCEP, and the UCSD Division, and endorsed unanimously by the Academic Council in February. This is a final review thus; substantive changes are not expected.
Comments are due to the Senate Chair by **May 13, 2015**.
UGC declines to comment on this item.

Absent: Linda-Anne Rebhun
Desiree McClain

<div align="center">

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
Notice of Meeting

Friday, May 1, 2015
10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
UC Office of the President Room

BOARS Website: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/

AGENDA

</div>

I. **Consent Calendar**
- ➤ BOARS draft minutes of March 6**,** 2015

II. **Announcements**
- o Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair

III. **Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**
- o Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair
- o Dan Hare, Academic Senate Vice Chair

Senate leaders discuss current issues before the Senate.

V. **Consultation with UCOP – Office of Admissions**
- o Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs
- o Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions
- o Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- o Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions

IV. **Executive Session**

VI. **Visit with Staff from Governor's Office and Department of Finance**
- o Lark Park, Senior Advisor to Governor Brown
- o Amy Costa, Advisor to the Director on Higher Education at the California Department of Finance
- o Christian Osmena, Education Budget Analyst at the California Department of Finance

VII. **Articulation and Evaluation Working Group Breakouts**

VIII. **Working Group Reports**

IX. **AP Capstone Curriculum**

X. **Review of ICAS Natural Sciences Competency Statement**

XI. **Next Generation Science Standards: continued discussion of potential proposed revision of the area "d" subject requirement**

❖ **This Agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.**

XII.   TOEFL Sub-Scores and Minimum Score

XIII.   Common Core math pathways – UC's perspective on accelerated pathways to calculus

XIV.   New Business

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
NOTICE OF MEETING
Monday, May 4, 2015, 10:00 a.m. – 3:15 p.m.

Item

I.   **Announcements**

II.   **Consent Calendar**

III.   **Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

IV.   **Consultation with the Office of the Governor**

V.   **Executive Session**

VI.   **Consultation with the Office of the President**

VII.   **Member Items/Campus Reports**

VIII. **Streamlining Transfers**

IX.   **Report on the Systemwide Natural Reserve System Field Course**

X.   **New Business**

Charge for the General Education Subcommittee of UGC

Revised Proposal (April 2015)

Membership:

The General Education Subcommittee of the Undergraduate Council (UGC) consists of no fewer than five and no greater than eight Senate faculty members, with a minimum of two who also serve on UGC. The Chair of the Subcommittee is appointed by the Committee on Committees to serve a one-year term beginning the first day of Fall semester. The Vice Chair of the Subcommittee will normally succeed to the position of Chair the following year. The Committee on Committees will appoint a new Vice Chair for each academic year. Each school should be represented.

The Senate faculty are voting members of the Subcommittee. Up to two non-voting members include non-senate teaching faculty representative(s) who have regular GE course assignments, ideally in a range of instructional formats.

Ex-officio members include the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education, the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the Coordinator of Institutional Assessment,   and a representative of a required GE course (*unless otherwise represented among the faculty committee members).

Charge:

Broadly conceived, the Subcommittee is responsible for strategic planning for general education, with an emphasis on sustainable curricula and integrated assessment planning in support of intended general education learning outcomes. In particular, the General Education Subcommittee is charged to:

- Provide recommendations to UGC on criteria for approving undergraduate general education courses;
- Oversee and coordinate activities relating to the assessment of general education, including the use of results to inform curricula, practices, and processes in support of intended student learning;
- Advise on staffing and resource needs associated with supporting general education   courses, programs, and related assessment; and
- Review and, as necessary, suggest changes in general education principles and policies, to UGC for final consideration and approval.

SECTION 3: WITHDRAWAL FROM THE UNIVERSITY (W)

Students who find that they will not attend the University for a semester in which they have enrolled may cancel their registration only if instruction for that semester has not yet begun. To do so, they must formally request a cancellation of their registration from the Registrar's Office. If instruction has already begun and students find it necessary to stop attending *all* classes, they must formally request withdrawal from the University. When a completed withdrawal form is approved by the Dean of the School with which the student is affiliated, a W notation will be assigned for each course in which the student has been enrolled. Students also will not be eligible to re-enroll until they have been reinstated. Students who withdraw during a term must file a Notice of Cancellation/Withdrawal, available from the Office of the Registrar's website at registrar.ucmerced.edu. Before considering a complete withdrawal, students are urged to consult with an academic advisor and the Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships, if appropriate, to consider the full implications of this action.

Please see the refund policies for specific details on refund rules. Students who fail to submit an approved petition for cancellation/withdrawal will receive F, NP or U grades, as appropriate, for all courses in which they are enrolled for that term.

Adding a Course

During the first week of instruction, students may add a course or courses if space is available. During the second and third weeks of instruction, a student may add courses only with the permission of the instructor. After the third week of instruction, students may add a course only with the permission of both the instructor and the dean of the School with which the student is affiliated. A fee will be assessed for adding a course after the third week.

- First week: Students may add if space available.
- Second and third weeks: Students may add only with instructor's approval.
- After third week: Students may add through petition only; fee assessed.

Use the **Add/Drop form** to obtain instructor permission to add the course if it is after the first week of instruction. If you are missing a prerequisite for a course you are trying to add, you must use the **Requisite Override Enrollment** form to request instructor permission to add the course. When complete, turn the form in at the Students First Center to be officially added to the course. View the **Add/Drop/Withdraw grid** provided every term to help students be aware of all course deadlines.

Dropping a Course

During the first three weeks of instruction, students may drop a course or courses without paying a fee and without further approval.

View the **Add/Drop form.** When completed, turn the form in at the Students First Center. View the **Add/Drop/Withdraw grid** provided every term to help students be aware of all course deadlines.

Withdrawing from a Course

After the third week of instruction and until the end of the 10th week of instruction, a student may withdraw from a course for emergency reasons or for good cause with the signed approval of the instructor of record and confirmed by the dean of the school with which the student is affiliated, provided:

1. The student is not on special probation,
2. Dropping the course would be to the educational benefit of the student; and
3. The student is not being investigated for academic dishonesty in that course.

Withdrawing between the fourth and 10th weeks will be approved only provided the student submits a withdrawal form including a written description of the special circumstances warranting this action; therefore, students should continue to attend the course until their withdraw request is approved.

Download Course Withdrawal form
View the Add/Drop/Withdraw grid provided every term to help students be aware of all course deadlines.

For students withdrawing after the third week of instruction, a fee will be assessed and a "W" notation will be assigned by the Office of the Registrar and appear on the student's permanent transcript. Courses in which a "W" has been entered on a student's record carry no grade points, are not calculated in the grade point average, and will not be considered as courses attempted in assessing the student's progress to degree. Nevertheless, it is a marker used to indicate that the student was enrolled in the class beyond the third week of instruction. It does not indicate whether the student was passing or failing.

Auditing a Course

With the consent of the instructor, registered students and interested individuals are permitted to audit classes. Arrangements are made directly with the faculty member under any rules the faculty member may establish, and those auditing ordinarily do not participate in exams or written papers. Priority for course resources such as classroom space and laboratory supplies is given to students who are fully enrolled in the course. Audited classes are not recorded on the student's class schedule or on academic transcripts.

Return to top.

Grade Appeals Policy

Introduction

All grades, except Incomplete, are considered final when assigned by an instructor at the end of the term. For the purposes of the grade appeal, a term refers to fall or spring semesters, or summer session.

An instructor may request a change of grade when a computational or procedural error has occurred in the original assignment of a grade. An instructor may not change a grade as a result of re-examination or the submission of additional work after the close of the term. No term grade except Incomplete may be revised by re-examination.

A student may initiate a grade appeal only in case of a clerical / procedural error or non-academic circumstances (described below). Students are encouraged to review their work with the instructor for an explanation of the grade assigned. A student may appeal a grade specifically on the grounds set forth in this policy, based on potential reporting errors or criteria not directly reflective of academic performance in this course.

Basis for Grade Changes

There are two valid bases for changing a grade through an appeal. The first is errors and corrections, wherein the appeal is to correct a mistake either in the computation or the reporting of a grade. The second is where it is established that non-academic criteria were applied to determine a grade which includes (a) discrimination based on ethnicity, political views, religion, age, gender, financial status or national origin; or (b) the application of arbitrary criteria in a manner not reflective of student performance in relation to course requirements.

Point of information: Other grade policies, outside of the grade appeal processes, address "good cause" considerations which may include illness, serious personal problems, an accident, a death in the immediate family, a large and necessary increase in working hours, or other situations deemed to be of equal gravity. Two grading policies may apply to "good cause" circumstances: an "Incomplete" or "Withdraw" grade. These processes are triggered during the term in which the course is taken and are not available subsequent to the grade being filed.

Initial Steps

The following are recommended preliminary steps that should be taken prior to filing a formal appeal to address grade concerns. These steps precede the formal appeal process, described in the next section.

If a clerical or procedural error in the reporting of a grade by the instructor can be documented within the term following when the grade was filed, a student may contact the instructor and/or the by-law unit chair[1] in writing (an email message is sufficient), describing the error. Grade changes to correct

---

[1] A lead faculty contact may be a program director (e.g. the Merritt Writing Program)

clerical and procedural errors may be filed by the instructor (or equivalent proxy) and approved by the Office of the University Registrar. Such grade changes should ensure fairness and equity based on syllabus or other policies, especially for those students whose grades will be unaltered. No final grade (except an Incomplete) may be revised by reexamination or additional coursework.

Concerns about non-academic issues (discrimination or arbitrary treatment) should be discussed with the instructor, if possible; otherwise, students are encouraged to discuss these matters with the by-law unit chair and/or program's Dean[2] (with WRI and Core 1 considerations addressed to the Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education).

Appeal Process

If there are sufficient and appropriate grounds to appeal a grade, based on the above specified criteria and procedures, a student may consider the following process.

Appeal Petition
Whenever possible, students are encouraged to work directly with their instructor to discuss grades, course policies and expectations. If a student wishes to appeal a grade after speaking to the faculty member in charge of the course and the appropriate administrator, the grade appeal process commences with a written appeal petition.

An appeal petition includes a written summary (250 total words, see below) and is filed electronically with the program's Dean (who will communicate with the instructor and other appropriate administrators). The following is an outline of what a formal grade appeal petition should include:

• Contact Information: *Include name, university email address, student identification number, and phone number*
• Course information: *Include course number and title, instructor name*
• Background to appeal: *In 100 words, briefly describe attempts to resolve concerns with instructor. If the faculty program lead or Dean was contacted, note these details as well.*
• Brief description of appeal: *In 150 words, describe the grounds for the appeal itself. What are the primary criteria and considerations?*
• Appendix: *Include all related documentation*

Appeal Process
The program's Dean shall proceed to attempt to resolve the dispute independently. (If the program's Dean has a conflict of interest, *e.g.* is the instructor who filed the disputed grade, the program's School Executive Committee Chair will serve as designate on the case. In such a case, all reference to the program's "Dean" refers to this "designate.") After review of the appeal petition, the program's Dean may or may not approve further action.

If an appeal petition alleges discrimination or arbitrary treatment, an initial assessment of the grounds for the case will be considered by the program's Dean. If it is determined that this is potentially a

---

[2] A School dean of a given undergraduate or graduate academic program is the appropriate contact. The Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education is the contact for WRI or Core 1.

discrimination case[3], the petition will be reviewed as a Title VI and/or Title IX matter by the appropriate officer(s).

Written notification about findings will be shared with the student and instructor within four weeks of receipt of the formal petition. If the student or instructor requests a reconsideration of the appeal decision, they must respond within one week of this notification to the Provost (or designate). If there is no request for reconsideration from the student or instructor, the grade shall be sustained or altered in accordance with the findings.

A final appeal to the Provost may be based only on (1) a violation of due process in the grade appeal process or (2) new and substantial information. This final appeal is limited to a 100 word summary, with related evidence, and must be filed to the Provost's Office within one week of the findings. The Provost (or the Provost's designate) will decide if further process is warranted and if so, how this process will be structured. If further process is warranted, additional documentation or interviews supporting the appeal may be requested.

The final decision should occur within the term of the appeal. Decisions may include: 1) no change, 2) removal of course from transcript, or 3) grade correction. In cases where it is determined that nonacademic criteria were significant factors in establishing the grade, students may have the option of either receiving a P or S in the course or retroactively dropping the course without penalty.

If a grade appeal is related to the final term before graduation, submission of an appeal must be made within 30 days after the last day of a student's final term and considered within 30 days after receipt.

Timeline

The following timeline should be followed in all grade appeals. Failure to take actions within this timeline will significantly limit and potentially disqualify the grounds for an appeal.

The following timeframe begins in the term following the one in which the grade in question has been filed.

At the beginning of the term, the student will no later than

Weeks 1-3: Initiate communication with instructor and/or program faculty lead, seeking informal resolution of concerns

Weeks 4-5: Develop a formal appeal petition, if concerns are unresolved

By Week 6: Submit this petition and supporting evidence to the program's Dean for review

The goal of the appeal process is for findings to be shared with the student and instructor as soon as possible. The following are estimated times for reviewing the petition, exploring information, and summarizing findings.

---

[3] Discrimination refers to protected groups based on ethnicity, political views, religion, age, gender, financial status or national origin.

In the process that follows, the program's Dean will:

Weeks 7-9: Review the formal appeal. Findings and summaries are developed, with the potential for seeking further information or consultation.

Weeks 10-12: If possible, findings are shared. Please note that some cases are complex and require either further consultation or information gathering, with associated time added. The final decision should occur within the term of the appeal.

*Finding*s: When findings are released, the student and instructor have one week to respond via a brief summary (100 words) to the Provost (or Provost designate). This is the final step in the appeal process, and there may be no further petitions or appeals.

Informational Item: Please note that the timeline for appeals concerning the final term before graduation is abbreviated to 30 days.

Final Note

These procedures are designed solely to guide grade appeal processes. No punitive actions may be taken against the instructor solely on the basis of these procedures. Neither the filing of an appeal nor the final disposition of the case shall, under any circumstances, become part of the personnel files of the instructor. The use of nonacademic criteria, however, is a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and in some instances Title VI and/or Title IX policies, which may result in potential sanctions.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

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

April 16, 2015

To: Undergraduate Council
From: School of Engineering Curriculum Committee
Re: School of Engineering AY 2015-2016 IB/AP Chart in General Catalog copy

The School of Engineering Curriculum Committee has approved via email an update to the CSE entry on the IB/AP Chart included in the AY 2015-2016 General Catalog. Approval to include the updated entry in the upcoming AY 2015-2016 General Catalog is requested.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95344
(209) 228-7930; fax (209) 228-7955

Date: March 11, 2015

To: Undergraduate Council

From Kelvin Lwin
Undergraduate Chair Computer Science & Engineering

Re: Course credits for AP and IB CS

CSE 20 is designed for students with a limited background in computer science, enabling them to have enough instructional time to build solid fundamentals in computation using logic. The curriculum begins with the basic building blocks; printing lines of text and asking users for simple input. To manipulate input and output, they utilize placeholders called variables to store information and used in expressions for computing. They are then introduced to decision-making constructs with or without repetition, and simple data structures like arrays. These topics are covered in Computer Science A under "programming constructs", and students who do well have begun to build a solid foundation. We have found in the past students who excel are not challenged, and feel that they are wasting time in our intro courses.

CSE 21 introduces methods or function calls for encapsulating behavior into easy to reuse groups. Then object-oriented programming is introduced that allows for modeling the real world using "objects" with easy mapping onto logical constructs. This course is noticeably harder than CSE 20, and only students with the proper foundation excel. This maps directly with more advanced topics in the Computer Science A exam, and we have found students with high scores to be proficient in these topics.

CSE 20 and 21 are taught using the Java programming language. Computer Science A and International Baccalaureate Computer Science also use Java. While the underlying concepts matter more than the language itself, it does foster compatibility. We propose that, based on the scores of these exams, course credit is given in our CSE courses. Note: the Computer Science AB test was discontinued in 2009.

        AP CS 3: CSE 20
        AP CS 4/5: CSE 20 and CSE 21
        IB CS 5: CSE 20
        IB CS 6/7: CSE 20 and CSE 21

Precedence for splitting the credit based on the score is set in the UC Merced catalog, for example with AP English. For giving course credit in UC system and splitting it according to the same scores at UC Santa Cruz: http://registrar.ucsc.edu/catalog/undergrad-acad/AP-IBH-table.pdf

Cc: SOE Curriculum Committee Chair
        Registrar

Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) Examinations

The University awards credit for successful completion of the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) and the International Baccalaureate Higher Level Examinations (IB). Students must have official test score reports sent directly from the testing service to UC Merced to receive credit. Students will meet with advising staff during New Student Orientation to discuss which courses or requirements they may have satisfied based on transfer credit for scores in these examinations.

Potential Duplication of Credit for AP and IB Exams

Credit will be granted for either the AP or IB examinations in any one subject area. College courses taken prior to or after enrolling at the university may duplicate the content of AP or IB examinations. The following chart provides guidelines used for awarding units (elective credit) and exemptions for degree requirements. Students who choose to take a course at UC Merced from which they are otherwise exempt will receive credit for the UCM course but not the units for the exam.

Credit for AP Exams

UC Merced grants elective credit for all College Board AP examinations on which a student scores 3 or higher. Some examinations passed with scores of 3 or higher may award exemptions for degree requirements. The number of elective units awarded for each examination can be viewed on the chart in this section.

Placement into level 2 language courses at UC Merced will be granted for Advanced Placement (AP) exams with score 2: Chinese, French, Japanese, and Spanish Language. Unit credit will not be awarded.

AP SUBJECT CREDIT	UNITS	COURSE EXEMPTIONS AND GENERAL EDUCATION
AP Studio Art: Drawing*	5.3	Score 4 or 5 on Drawing exempts one (1) course in ARTS.
AP Studio Art: 2-D Design*	5.3	Score 4 or 5 on 2-D Design exempts one (1) course in ARTS.
AP Studio Art: 3-D Design*	5.3	Score 4 or 5 on 3-D Design exempts one (1) course in ARTS.
		*Unit credit limit for all AP Studio Art exams: 5.3.
AP Art History	5.3	Score 4 or 5 exempts one (1) course in GASP.
AP Biology	5.3	Score 4 or 5 exempts BIO 001 and BIO 001L.
AP Chemistry	5.3	Score 3 or above exempts Chemistry Placement Exam. Score 4 or 5 exempts CHEM 002.
AP Computer Science: Comp Science A2^	1.3	Score 3 exempts CSE 20. Score 4 or 5 exempts CSE 20 and CSE 21.No course exemption.
AP Computer Science: Comp Science AB^	2.7	No course exemption.

		^Unit credit limit for both AP Computer Science exams: 2.7.
AP Economics: Macroeconomics	5.3	Score 4 or 5 on both Macroeconomics and Microeconomics exempts ECON 001.
AP Economics: Microeconomics	5.3	Score 4 or 5 on both Macroeconomics and Microeconomics exempts ECON 001.
AP English: Language/Composition€	5.3	Score 4 or 5 Lang/Comp exempts WRI 010. Score 3 or above exempts WRI 001 and Entry Level Writing Requirement.
AP English: Literature/Composition€	5.3	Score 4 or 5 Lit/Comp exempts one ENG course (10-49) for the ENG major or ENG minor. Score 3 or above exempts WRI 001 and Entry Level Writing Requirement.
		€Unit credit limit for both AP English exams: 5.3.
AP Environmental Sciences	2.7	Score of 4 or 5 exempts ESS 001.
AP Government and Politics: United States	2.7	Score 4 or 5 exempts POLI 001.
AP Government and Politics: Comparative	2.7	Score 4 or 5 exempts POLI 003.
AP History: European History	5.3	Score 4 or 5 exempts two of the following courses: HIST 030A, HIST 030B, or HIST 031.
AP History: US History	5.3	Score 4 or 5 exempts HIST 016 and HIST 017.
AP History: World History	5.3	Score 4 or 5 exempts HIST 010 and HIST 011.
AP Human Geography	2.7	No course exemption.
AP Language Other Than English: Chinese Language and Culture	5.3	Score 5 on AP Chinese Language and Culture exempts CHN 004. Score 3 or higher fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
AP Language Other Than English: French Language and Culture	5.3	Score 5 on AP French Language and Culture exempts FRE 004. Score 3 or higher fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
AP Language Other Than English: German Language and Culture	5.3	Score 3 or higher on AP German Language and Culture fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
AP Language Other Than English: Italian Language and Culture	5.3	Score 3 or higher on AP Italian Language and Culture fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
AP Language Other Than English: Japanese Language and Culture	5.3	Score 5 on AP Japanese Language and Culture exempts JPN 004. Score 3 or higher fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in

		History or English.
AP Language Other Than English: Spanish Language and Culture	5.3	Score 5 on AP Spanish Language and Culture exempts SPAN 004 or SPAN 011. Score 3 fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
AP Language Other Than English: Spanish Literature and Culture	5.3	Score 4 or 5 on AP Spanish Literature and Culture exempts SPAN 004 or SPAN 011. Also exempts SPAN 050 and SPAN 051. Score 3 fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
AP Latin	2.7	No course exemption.
AP Mathematics: Calculus AB[#]	2.7	Score 3 or higher on Calculus AB exempts Math Placement Exam and SSHA's Quantitative Reasoning Requirement. Score 4 or 5 exempts MATH 011 or MATH 021.
AP Mathematics: Calculus BC[#]	5.3	Score 3 or higher on Calculus BC exempts Math Placement Exam, SSHA's Quantitative Reasoning Requirement, and MATH 011 or MATH 021. Score 4 or 5 on Calculus BC exempts MATH 011 and MATH 012 OR MATH 021 and MATH 022.
AP Mathematics: Calculus BC Subscore AB[#]	2.7	Score 3 or higher on Calculus BC Subscore AB exempts Math Placement Exam, SSHA's Quantitative Reasoning Requirement, and MATH 011 or MATH 021.
		[#]Unit credit limit for all three AP Mathematics exams: 5.3.
AP Music Theory	5.3	No course exemption.
AP Physics: Physics B[+]	5.3	No course exemption.
AP Physics: Physics C: Mechanics[+]	2.7	Score 5 exempts PHYS 008 or PHYS 018.
AP Physics: Physics C: Electricity and Magnetism[+]	2.7	No course exemption.
		[+]Unit credit limit for all three AP Physics exams: 5.3
AP Psychology	2.7	Score 4 or 5 exempts PSY 001 [[/permalink]].
AP Statistics	2.7	Score 4 exempts MATH 018 or SSHA's Quantitative Reasoning Requirement (PSY 010). Score 5 exempts ECON 010 or POLI 010.

Credit for IB Exams

UC Merced grants 5.3 semester units of elective credit for International Baccalaureate Individual Certificate subject Higher-Level exams with grades of 5, 6, or 7. All exams must be at the Higher Level (HL) for unit credit. Unit credit is also granted for Higher Level category B exams in languages other than English. The International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) awards either a diploma or a certificate for individual IB exams. Students completing the IB diploma with a score of 30 or above will receive a total of 20 semester units of credit toward their UC Merced undergraduate degree.

Course exemptions already designated for UC Merced can be viewed on the chart in this section. Additional exams for which UC Merced will award elective units include: Afrikaans, Arabic, Art History, Dance, Danish, Dutch, English: Literature (formerly English A1), Environmental Systems, Film, Finnish, Further Mathematics, Greek (Modern), Hebrew, Hindi, Indonesian, Malay, Norwegian, Persian, Philosophy, Physics 1, Physics 2, Pilipino, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serb-Croat, Siswati, Slovene, Spanish Language and Culture, Spanish Literature and Culture, Swahili, Swedish, Turkish, Urdu and Welsh.

IBH SUBJECT CREDIT	UNITS	COURSE EXEMPTIONS AND GENERAL EDUCATION
IBH Visual Arts	5.3	One (1) course in ARTS.
IBH Biology	5.3	No course exemption.
IBH Chemistry	5.3	No course exemption.
IBH Computer Science	5.3	Score 5 exempts CSE 20. Score 6 or 7 exempts CSE 20 and CSE 21. No course exemption.
IBH Economics	5.3	Score 6 or 7 exempts ECON 001.
IBH Language A: Literature (English) or IBH Language A: Language and Literature (English)	5.3	Score 5 or above satisfies WRI 001 and Entry Level Writing Requirement. Score 6 or 7 exempts WRI 010.
IBH History	5.3	Score 6 or 7 exempts one (1) lower division history sequence.
IBH Geography	5.3	No course exemption.
IBH Language A2 or B: Chinese	5.3	Score 6 or 7 on IBH Chinese exempts CHN 004. Score 5 or higher fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
IBH Language A2 or B: French	5.3	Score 6 or 7 on IBH French exempts FRE 004. Score 5 or higher fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
IBH Language A2 or B: German	5.3	Score 5 or higher on IBH German fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
IBH Language A2 or B: Italian	5.3	IBH Italian: Course exemptions to be determined.
IBH Language A2 or B: Japanese	5.3	Score 6 or 7 on IBH Japanese exempts JPN 004.

		Score 5 or higher fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
IBH Language A2 or B: Portuguese	5.3	IBH Portuguese: Course exemptions to be determined.
IBH Language A2 or B: Spanish	5.3	Score 6 or 7 on IBH Spanish exempts SPAN 004 and fulfills Spanish language requirement for those majoring in Spanish. Score 5 or higher on IBH Spanish fulfills the foreign language requirement for those majoring in History or English.
IBH Classical Languages: Latin	5.3	No course exemption.
IBH Classical Languages: Classical Greek	5.3	No course exemption.
IBH Mathematics	5.3	Score 5 exempts MATH 011. Score 6 or higher exempts MATH 021.
IBH Music	5.3	Score 6 or 7 exempts one (1) GE course in ARTS.
IBH Physics	5.3	Course exemption to be determined.
IBH Psychology	5.3	Score 6 or 7 exempts PSY 001.
IBH Social and Cultural Anthropology	5.3	Score 6 or 7 exempts ANTH 001.
IBH Theater Arts	5.3	Score 5 or above exempts one (1) GE course in ARTS.

Return to: Top of Page

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343

April 20, 2015

Jian-Qiao Sun
Chair, UC Merced Division of the Academic Senate
UC Merced

RE: UC Merced's Review under the WSCUC Standards

Dear Chair Sun:

As you know, this semester UC Merced initiated its efforts to re-affirm accreditation by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC, formerly "WASC"). This process, which involves several stages[1], will conclude with an Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 and, in June 2018, the WSCUC Commission decision to re-affirm accreditation for a period of 6, 8 or 10 years. The Chancellor and Provost expect UC Merced to earn a 10-year re-affirmation period, continuing our record of strong accreditation reviews.

The first step in the Institutional Review Process for re-affirmation is to complete, as an institution, the *Review under the WSCUC Standards*. Through this first step, UC Merced will

1. Undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards, the commitments, standards, and criteria UC Merced must be in substantial compliance with for accreditation to re-affirmed.
2. Identify strengths and areas of good practice.
3. Identify areas that may need attention.
4. Generate a required document for our accreditation review; the *Review under the WSCUC Standards* is the basis for the second essay of the institutional self-study report, and the conclusions and supporting evidence are carefully validated by the external review team.

The WSCUC Steering Committee has completed a draft of the *Review under the WSCUC Standards* on behalf of the campus, and is now seeking feedback on this draft.

Toward that end, I write to invite the Academic Senate to review the document, with a particular focus on Standards 2, 3, and 4, and return comments to me (with a cc to Laura Martin) by Thursday

---

[1] The stages of the Institutional Review Process (IRP) for re-affirmation, and the campus' timeline for this work, are available on the Re-affirmation page of UC Merced's accreditation website, accreditation.ucmerced.edu.

May 21st. If this is not possible, please respond with an alternative submission date as soon as possible.

When reviewing the document, the faculty of the Senate should consider the extent to which they agree with

1. The Steering Committee's *Self-Review Rating* (column 3) and rating of *Importance to Address* (column 4) for each Criteria for Review (CFR). WSCUC's scoring rubric is provided in the box in the upper left hand portion of p. 2 of the document.
2. The responses to the Synthesis/Reflections questions for each of the four standards.

If there is disagreement with a self-rating score, **these differences can be noted in the document using the PDF sticky note or highlight function. Alternative scores, together with a brief explanation for the conclusion, including hyperlinks and/or references to evidence in support of the conclusions, are welcome.**

Similarly, the PDF sticky note and/or highlight function can be used to comment on and/or modify responses to the Synthesis/Reflection questions.[2]

To increase the efficiency of the work, we recommend dividing the work of reviewing each Standard among individuals or teams of individuals.

Laura Martin, the campus' Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), and I are happy to meet with the Senate to review this process and/or answer questions. Please note that the first page of the worksheet includes a helpful overview, including

- the purpose of the worksheet , *Purpose of Worksheet*
- the relationship of the WSCUC Standards, Criteria for Review (CFR), and Guidelines, T*he WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines*
- guidance for completing the worksheet, *Using this Worksheet*

Finally, please know that, in addition to the Senate, a broad array of institutional stakeholders have been invited to review and comment on this draft, including but not limited to the School Executive Committees, campus administrative leadership, and student leadership.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, thank you very much for your assistance in completing this significant first stage in our re-affirmation of accreditation effort. We look forward to your feedback.

Sincerely,
Nate Monroe
Associate Professor, and Chair, WSCUC Steering Committee

---

[2] We chose not to offer Word documents as we have found the tables quite difficult to work with and somewhat unstable in their formatting.

Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements

Purpose of the Worksheet

This worksheet is designed to assist planning groups preparing for a WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) review to undertake a preliminary, systematic institutional self-analysis under the WSCUC Standards by identifying strengths and areas of good practice as well as areas that may need attention. Institutions will also use this worksheet to identify, and insert references to, key supporting documentation to support its judgments. Teams will follow these references to verify the completeness of the information. After being used to stimulate discussion and to help focus the review, the completed worksheet will then be submitted with the self-study for evaluation as evidence for Component 2 of the Institutional Report at the time of the Offsite Review, with follow up as needed at the time of the Accreditation Visit. The submission of this worksheet with the institution's self study helps to validate that the institution has been reviewed under all Standards and relevant Criteria for Review.

The WSCUC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines

The WSCUC Standards guide institutions in self-review, provide a framework for institutional submissions, and serve as the basis for judgments by evaluation teams and the Commission. Each Standard is set forth in broad holistic terms that are applicable to all institutions. Under each of the four Standards are two or more major categories that make the application of the Standard more specific. Under each of these categories are Criteria for Review (CFRs), which identify and define specific applications of the Standard. Guidelines, provided for some but not all CFRs, identify typical or common forms or methods for demonstrating performance related to the CFR; institutions, however, may provide alternative demonstrations of compliance. This worksheet contains all the CFRs and Guidelines from the 2013 *Handbook of Accreditation*. An "X" in the cell indicates a cross-reference to other CFRs that touch on related issues.

Using this Worksheet

The worksheet is used during the early stages of planning for the Institutional Report and may be revisited later when preparing for further reviews. For each CFR, institutions are asked to give themselves a rating indicating how well they are doing, to identify the importance of addressing the CFR as an aspect of the review, and to provide comments as appropriate, about their self-assessment. Key areas may thereby be identified where more evidence is needed or more development required. Institutions may have members of the planning group complete the worksheet individually with responses reviewed by the group as a whole. Or an institution may divide the worksheet by Standards with different groups completing each standard. Use these or other approaches to complete the worksheet.

Once the institution has completed this self-review process, priorities that are identified using this form should be integrated with the institution's context, goals, and planning in the development of its report. Summary questions are provided in the worksheet as a means of assisting institutions in determining areas of greatest concern or areas of good practice to be addressed or highlighted in institutional reports. Please include the summary sheets with the submission of this worksheet.

Compliance with Federal Requirements

In addition to the Review, there are four checklists that team members will complete during the Accreditation Visit and attach to their team report in order to ensure that the institution is in compliance with the federal requirements cited in the checklists. The institution is expected to provide the links to the needed information in anticipation of the team's review at the time of the visit.

033114

Review under WSCUC Standards

Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.	Institutional Information

Self-Review Rating   **Importance to address at this time**
1= We do this well; area of strength for us   A:U= High priority – Urgent
2= Aspects of this need our attention   A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth.
3= This item needs significant development   B= Medium priority
0= Does not apply   C= Lower priority
                0= Does not apply
	Institution: University of California, Merced
	
	Type of Review:
	     ⑧ Comprehensive for Reaffirmation
	
	Date of Submission: ____/_____/_____
	                      Mo Day Year
	
	Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The institution defines its purposes and establishes educational objectives aligned with those purposes. The institution has a clear and explicit sense of its essential values and character, its distinctive elements, its place in both the higher education community and society, and its contribution to the public good. It functions with integrity, transparency, and autonomy.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Institutional Purposes						
1.1 The institution's formally approved statements of purpose are appropriate for an institution of higher education and clearly define its essential values and character and ways in which it contributes to the public good.	The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes. The institution's purposes fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines.	2	C	Though functional, the mission could benefit from revision. A recurrent theme is that the mission statement is overly long and slightly outdated. Recently, CAPRRA noted that the mission is not a relevant reference document. Rated as a lower priority in light of more urgent and important priorities. Steering Committee noted that UCM might consider updating its mission after the self-study is complete, permitting revisions to be informed by the outcomes of the self-study process.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: *Introduction.* • Mission • Principles of Community	

033114

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
1.2 Educational objectives are widely recognized throughout the institution, are consistent with stated purposes, and are demonstrably achieved. The institution regularly generates, evaluates, and makes public data about student achievement, including measures of retention and graduation, and evidence of student learning outcomes. X 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.2		2	B/A:OA	• To what extent are educational objectives widely recognized? How do we know? • How are educational objectives shared/communicated within the institution (students, faculty, staff) as the institution grows? • As an institution, need to consider how we will make public "evidence of student learning outcomes", beyond those reported in the UC Merced Profile and in keeping with our campus principles of assessment. • IRDS makes data on student achievement including retention and grad available, but it is difficult to get there from any of main landing pages. Propose adding assessment/student success link on campus homepage under "About."	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 5: *Student Success*. Public disclosure links verified by Annual Report.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Integrity and Transparency						
1.3 The institution publicly states its commitment to academic freedom for faculty, staff, and students, and acts accordingly. This commitment affirms that those in the academy are free to share their convictions and responsible conclusions with their colleagues and students in their teaching and writing. X 3.2, 3.10	The institution has published or has readily available policies on academic freedom. For those institutions that strive to instill specific beliefs and world views, policies clearly state how these views are implemented and ensure that these conditions are consistent with generally recognized principles of academic freedom. Due-process procedures are disseminated, demonstrating that faculty and students are protected in their quest for truth.	1	C	• Commitment is publicly stated in system-wide APM (APM – 010). Hard to know how easy it is to locate from campus. • What about for staff who work with academics? Do they need/receive orientation on academic freedom? Is there existing policy for non-academic staff regard academic freedom?	• Academic Freedom Statement in system-wide Academic Personnel Manual (APM-010) • Academic freedom for Unit 18 lecturers is provided in Article 2 of MOU with UC. • Principles of Community	

1.4 Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices. X 2.2a, 3.1	The institution has demonstrated institutional commitment to the principles enunciated in the WSCUC Diversity Policy.	1	A:OA	• Campus has a clear commitment to diversity as stated in our mission, but needs to continue to focus on diversity as a campus, including in all its definitions, across all areas. • Would campus benefit from a strategic plan for diversity?	Evaluated during comprehensive review.
1.5 Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy. X 3.6 – 3.10	The institution does not experience interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by governmental, religious, corporate, or other external bodies that have a relationship to the institution.	1	C	The University is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." Consistent with this, the UC Merced operates with appropriate autonomy.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.
1.6 The institution truthfully represents its academic goals, programs, services, and costs to students and to the larger public. The institution demonstrates that its academic programs can be completed in a timely fashion. The institution treats students fairly and equitably through established policies and procedures addressing student conduct, grievances, human subjects in research, disability, and financial matters, including refunds and financial aid. X 2.12	The institution has published or has readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. The institution does not have a history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period. The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts. The institution's policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated and provides opportunity for appeal as needed.	1	C	Truthful information about academic goals, programs, services and costs to students is available to students and the larger public on campus websites including those of the Registrar, Student Affairs, Disability Services, Office of Student Life, Student Conduct (Student Judicial Affairs), and Financial Aid.	Evaluated during comprehensive review. Truthful representation and complaint policies evaluated during comprehensive review

033114

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
1.7 The institution exhibits integrity and transparency in its operations, as demonstrated by the adoption and implementation of appropriate policies and procedures, sound business practices, timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances, and regular evaluation of its performance in these areas. The institution's finances are regularly audited by qualified independent auditors. X 3.4, 3.6. 3.7		1	C	UC Merced has a high level of integrity and transparency in its operations as evidenced by commitment to an appropriately resourced Office of Campus Culture & Compliance (OC3) placed within the Chancellor's Office for the highest degree of independence when evaluating campus operations. OC3 is organized to ensure coordinated independent evaluation of business processes through the Internal Audit function as well as through compliance monitoring within the Ethics & Compliance Program. Coordination of campus-wide policies and procedures has been consolidated under OC3 to enhance access to and development of local procedures. Timely and fair responses to complaints and grievances have received robust attention at UC Merced. Coordination of complaints across all functional areas at UC Merced is being carried out by OC3, with emphasis on promoting efficiencies, improving accountability, and tracking complaints and outcomes through disposition so we are better able to understand and improve culture in real time.	Audits submitted with Annual Report.	

033114

1.8 The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.		1	C	UC Merced carefully attends to accreditation requirements, including those related to substantive change, with the support of the ALO and Substantive Change Coordinator. UC Merced continues to develop practices (e.g. ALO ex-officio on Graduate Council) to ensure that we abide by these expectations. When questions arise we work with WSCUC staff to gather answers and understand the implications for the campus.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 1: *Introduction*. Commitments to integrity with respect to WSCUC policies are demonstrated in prior interactions with WSCUC.

033114

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard One
1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard? • Our mission is outdated and could benefit from revision. The Steering Committee suggested that revisions might be an outcome of the self-study process associated with re-affirmation of accreditation. • We meet these expectations but our documentation needs to be more accessible to stakeholders. For instance, the academic freedom policy and student success data.
2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard? • The campus does a good job of collecting data that illustrates we meet to this Standard (and CFR), in fact and in spirit.
3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard? • We need to better job of making crucial information—such as, the eight guiding principles, academic freedom, commitment to diversity, and student outcomes—easily accessible to internal and external stakeholders.

033114

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

The institution achieves its purposes and attains its educational objectives at the institutional and program level through the core functions of teaching and learning, scholarship and creative activity, and support for student learning and success. The institution demonstrates that these core functions are performed effectively by evaluating valid and reliable evidence of learning and by supporting the success of every student.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Teaching and Learning						
2.1 The institution's educational programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, rigor, and nomenclature for the degree level awarded, regardless of mode of delivery. They are staffed by sufficient numbers of faculty qualified for the type and level of curriculum offered. X 3.1	The content, length, and standards of the institution's academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review.	1.5 - UG 1.5 - Grad	A:OA	Content, length, and standards of academic programs, graduate and undergraduate conform to recognized disciplinary and professional standards. Programs are also subject to rigorous peer review, both at the time they are proposed and once every seven years via program review. Faculty: student ratios at the institutional level are in keeping with our UC peers, although ratios vary across programs. Faculty are appropriately qualified for the curriculum as vetted through faculty hiring and peer review processes and, in some cases as appropriate, administrative review. Additional faculty are needed as programs continue to grow. We are engaged in integrative planning as an institution in support of the goal of 10,000 students by 2020.	Evaluated during comprehensive review, documented in "Credit Hour and Program Length Checklist"	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.2 All degrees—undergraduate and graduate—awarded by the institution are clearly defined in terms of entry-level requirements and levels of student achievement necessary for graduation that represent more than simply an accumulation of courses or credits. The institution has both a coherent philosophy, expressive of its mission, which guides the meaning of its degrees and processes that ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees. X 3.1 – 3.3, 4.3, 4.4		2 - UG 1- Grad	A:U - UG C - Grad	At the undergraduate level, entry level requirements are clearly defined and set at the system-level. Within the major and standalone minors, PLOs and associated rubrics define levels of student achievement that represent more than an accumulation of courses or credits. As an institution, we are in the process of clarifying and fully defining the meaning of the baccalaureate degree as part of our re-examination of General Education. At the graduate level, degrees are clearly defined in terms of entry level requirements as articulated in program-level policies and procedures, and the Graduate Advisor Handbook. Capstone experiences are required for masters (thesis or comprehensive exam) and PhD (dissertation); expectations associated with degree completion (PLOs, rubrics) define levels of student achievement necessary for graduation and represent more than an accumulation of courses or credits. There is a coherent philosophy that guides the meaning of graduate degrees, including learning outcomes for the Masters and PhD, and processes to ensure the quality and integrity.	Program descriptions in Catalog. • UCM Catalog See also program websites: • School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts • School of Natural Sciences • School of Engineering Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality*.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.2a Baccalaureate programs engage students in an integrated course of study of sufficient breadth and depth to prepare them for work, citizenship, and life-long learning. These programs ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking. In addition, baccalaureate programs actively foster creativity, innovation, an appreciation for diversity, ethical and civic responsibility, civic engagement, and the ability to work with others. Baccalaureate programs also ensure breadth for all students in cultural and aesthetic, social and political, and scientific and technical knowledge expected of educated persons. Undergraduate degrees include significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major). X 3.1 – 3.3	The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level, together with significant in-depth study in a given area of knowledge (typically described in terms of a program or major).	3 – UG	A:U	The score of three reflects the status of GE; we are in the process of revising General Education to address the description outlined in the guideline. A process is in place to attend to student development and assessment of the core competencies for all majors through the program learning outcomes.	Description of General Education program with reference to Core Competencies. Also evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality.*	
2.2b The institution's graduate programs establish clearly stated objectives differentiated from and more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of admissions, curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes. Graduate programs foster students' active engagement with the literature of the field and create a culture that promotes the importance of scholarship and/or professional practice. Ordinarily, a baccalaureate degree is required for admission to a graduate program. X 3.1 – 3.3	Institutions offering graduate-level programs employ, at least, one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered and have a preponderance of the faculty holding the relevant terminal degree in the discipline. Institutions demonstrate that there is a sufficient number of faculty members to exert collective responsibility for the development and evaluation of the curricula, academic policies, and teaching and mentoring of students.	1 -Grad	B	See CFR 2.2. We clearly meet all aspects of this CFR, including as described in the guideline. We demonstrate this to WSCUC with every substantive review for new graduate programs. Initially, there were a number of conjoined undergraduate/graduate courses; with growth of faculty this has decreased to an appropriate number.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs* and Component 4: *Educational Quality.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.3 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are clearly stated at the course, program, and, as appropriate, institutional level. These outcomes and Standards are reflected in academic programs, policies, and curricula, and are aligned with advisement, library, and information and technology resources, and the wider learning environment. X 3.5	The institution is responsible for ensuring that out-of-class learning experiences, such as clinical work, service learning, and internships which receive credit, are adequately resourced, well developed, and subject to appropriate oversight.	1 – UG 1 -Grad (with respect to the CFR, 3 with regard to the guideline, if we choose to accept the guideline)	A:OA (with respect to the CFR); B with respect to the guideline.	As described in the CFR, this is an area strength for us. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow. Regarding the guideline: there are questions about resourcing for co-curricular experiences like internships or service learning that address the needs of our students specifically, e.g. financial needs, or the factors related to local context.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs.*	
2.4 The institution's student learning outcomes and standards of performance are developed by faculty and widely shared among faculty, students, staff, and (where appropriate) external stakeholders. The institution's faculty take collective responsibility for establishing appropriate standards of performance and demonstrating through assessment the achievement of these standards. X 4.3 – 4.4	Student learning outcomes are reflected in course syllabi.	1 – UG 2 – Grad	A:OA	By Regental authority, policy and practice, faculty are responsible for curriculum, including student learning outcomes, standards of performance, and for demonstrating through assessment student achievement of these standards. Student learning outcomes are required for approval of new courses, and appear in the syllabi of nearly all courses. At the graduate level, shared expectations for learning as reflected in systematic assessment of program outcomes that advances a shared set of standards among faculty is still evolving. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.5 The institution's academic programs actively involve students in learning, take into account students' prior knowledge of the subject matter, challenge students to meet high standards of performance, offer opportunities for them to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned, and provide them with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. X 4.4		2 - UG 1 - Grad	A:U – UG A:OA - Grad	Rated as a 2 for the undergraduate level, because we need to address these expectations for General Education. There is also some thought that expectations for student performance, and support to help students meet those expectations, may not be uniformly high across all undergraduate programs. Some programs and courses may benefit from development in this area.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
2.6 The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated learning outcomes and established standards of performance. The institution ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards that faculty use to evaluate student work. X 4.3 – 4.4	The institution has an assessment infrastructure adequate to assess student learning at program and institution levels.	1.5 – UG 1.5 -Grad	A:OA	UCM has a strong academic assessment infrastructure, growing understanding of practice and use of results to inform teaching and curriculum. Student achievement of academic standards is also considered during program review. Assessment of student learning in GE is in development. At the graduate level, we need continue to attend to assessment as programs grow and new programs are added.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
2.7 All programs offered by the institution are subject to systematic program review. The program review process includes, but is not limited to, analyses of student achievement of the program's learning outcomes; retention and graduation rates; and, where appropriate, results of licensing examination and placement, and evidence from external constituencies such as employers and professional organizations. X 4.1, 4.6		1 – UG 1 -Grad	A:OA	All academic and co-curricular programs are subject to program review on a seven year cycle. By policy, reviews consider student learning outcomes, retention and graduation rates. The process is overseen and coordinated by the Periodic Oversight Review Committee, which is working to strengthen periodic review as a means for advancing program and institutional goals.	• Academic program review policies: Undergraduate, Graduate • Academic program review schedules: Undergraduate, Graduate • Student Affairs Program Review policy and schedule [Description of Program Review process and calendar for academic and co-curricular units.] Also addressed during review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* Component 5: *Student Success,* and Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	

Scholarship and Creative Activity						
2.8 The institution clearly defines expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity for its students and all categories of faculty. The institution actively values and promotes scholarship, creative activity, and curricular and instructional innovation, and their dissemination appropriate to the institution's purposes and character. X 3.2	Where appropriate, the institution includes in its policies for faculty promotion and tenure the recognition of scholarship related to teaching, learning, assessment, and co-curricular learning.	2 - UG 1 - Grad 1 - Faculty	A:OA	The extent to which expectations for research, scholarship and creative activity is defined for undergraduates varies with major as described in program learning outcomes and degree overview. The institution is working to clarify this aspect of the meaning of the baccalaureate degree. These requirements are available to all faculty, Senate and non-Senate as codified in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM 210) and MOU, respectively. Instructional and curricular innovation is encouraged. Faculty are encouraged to apply for graduate training grants from funding agencies, and this activity is recognized in personnel reviews. The "A" rating recognizes the need to acculturate new faculty as we continue to grow. [Note: Recommendation by Review Team for Initial Accreditation (p.30): "In the tenure and promotion process, consider research on teaching as a standard, acknowledging the firm foundation of assessment. View this as a form of scholarship."]	Policies related to faculty and student research. • Senate Faculty: APM 210 • Non-Senate, lecturing faculty: MOU	

| 2.9 The institution recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service.
X 3.2 | | | 2 – UG
2 - Grad | A:OA | Appropriate linkages are recognized in system-wide policy governing appointment and promotion for Senate faculty: "Superior intellectual attainment, as evidenced both in teaching and in research or other creative achievement, is an indispensable qualification for appointment or promotion to tenure positions." (APM-210). Some non-Senate faculty also engage in scholarship on teaching, pedagogy, and assessment. However, interpretation and recognition of these expectations varies across by-law units. The campus also continues to work on recognizing assessment as part of teaching (at course and program levels). Toward this end, the Graduate Division, the Office of Institutional Assessment and the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence offer a learning community "Assessment as Pedagogy and Planning" for faculty and graduate students. Interest in the learning community increases with each offering suggesting a growing recognition of the importance of assessment/culture of assessment. The campus is also working on mechanisms for assessing mentoring in interdisciplinary context, especially across schools. | Policies related to faculty evaluation, promotion, and tenure.

• Senate Faculty: APM 210
• Non-Senate, lecturing faculty: MOU | |

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Student Learning and Success						
2.10 The institution demonstrates that students make timely progress toward the completion of their degrees and that an acceptable proportion of students complete their degrees in a timely fashion, given the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs it offers. The institution collects and analyzes student data, disaggregated by appropriate demographic categories and areas of study. It tracks achievement, satisfaction, and the extent to which the campus climate supports student success. The institution regularly identifies the characteristics of its students; assesses their preparation, needs, and experiences; and uses these data to improve student achievement.	The institution disaggregates data according to racial, ethnic, gender, age, economic status, disability, and other categories, as appropriate. The institution benchmarks its retention and graduation rates against its own aspirations as well as the rates of peer institutions.	• 2 - UG (TTD, and degree completion) • 1.5 – Grad • 1 -both (for data collection and disaggregation, etc.)	A:U - UG A:OA – Grad and both	UCM's data collection efforts are sound in relation to the expectations described in this CFR. At the undergraduate level, we are actively seeking to understand barriers to completing a degree in four years in order to improve the fraction of students completing in a timely fashion. These efforts could benefit from greater coordination campus-wide. On finer scales than described in this CFR, we need to improve data gathering and use in support of student success. At the graduate level, TTD and degree completion rates are commensurate with national norms, but we strive to continue to improve. We are in the process of further systematizing data collection at the graduate level.	Included in Annual Report. Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
2.11 Consistent with its purposes, the institution offers co-curricular programs that are aligned with its academic goals, integrated with academic programs, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. The institution assesses the effectiveness of its co-curricular programs and uses the results for improvement. X 4.3 – 4.5		UG: • 2 (for alignment and support for all students' personal and professional development), • 3 (for integration), • 2 (for assessment and use of results) Grad: • 2 (for alignment and support for all students' personal and professional development), • 2 (for integration), • 2 (for assessment and use of results)	A:U – UG A:OA - Grad	At undergraduate level, co-curricular programs are designed to support all students' personal and professional development, and are aligned with academic goals. They are not, however, integrated with academic programs. At the graduate level, Student Affairs and Graduate Division are offering programs that are aligned with academic goals, and designed to support all students' personal and professional development. At both levels, co-curricular assessment is happening but not consistently.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

2.12 The institution ensures that all students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely, useful, and complete information and advising about relevant academic requirements. X 1.6	Recruiting materials and advertising truthfully portray the institution. Students have ready access to accurate, current, and complete information about admissions, degree requirements, course offerings, and educational costs.	2 - UG 2 - Grad	A:U	UG advising is an area to strengthen, particularly with respect to ensuring *all* students understand the requirements of their academic programs and receive timely and useful information. For instance, data suggest that a significant fraction of students struggle with degree planning. At the graduate level, annual student reviews are critical to ensuring students understand and receive timely advice about degree requirements; we are working to strengthen this aspect of graduate education.	Evaluated during comprehensive review; documented in "Marketing and Recruitment Review" Checklist.
2.13 The institution provides academic and other student support services such as tutoring, services for students with disabilities, financial aid counseling, career counseling and placement, residential life, athletics, and other services and programs as appropriate, which meet the needs of the specific types of students that the institution serves and the programs it offers. X 3.1		2 - UG 2 - Grad	B	UCM provides all listed services for undergraduates. We are unclear about the extent to which services are systematically assessed to ensure they meet the needs of UC Merced's students. Relevant services also exist at the graduate level, but we have additional needs, including residential life for international students in particular, and mental health services oriented for graduate students. Assessment is happening but not consistently at both levels.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.
2.14 Institutions that serve transfer students provide clear, accurate, and timely information, ensure equitable treatment under academic policies, provide such students access to student services, and ensure that they are not unduly disadvantaged by the transfer process. X 1.6	Formal policies or articulation agreements are developed with feeder institutions that minimize the loss of credits through transfer credits.	3 (UG) 0 (Grad)	A:U	At undergraduate level, it is not clear what is working and what is not working. Transfer success is a system-wide priority.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 5: *Student Success.* Also documented in "Transfer Credit Policy Checklist".

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

Undergraduate Level:
- Clarifying the meaning of the baccalaureate degree, including as a means for contextualizing the contributions of the major, GE, and the co-curriculum. (CFR 2.2)
- Addressing all aspects of GE including its contribution to the undergraduate degree, the learning outcomes of General education, its contributions to student development of the Core Competencies, its design to cultivate intended learning outcomes, and our mechanisms for sustainably assessing student achievement of intended outcomes. (CFR 2.2a, 2.5, 2.6)
- Undergraduate advising (CFR 2.12)

Graduate
- Assessment of graduate academic programs is evolving and needs continued development to ensure meaningful, valid and reliable results on which to take action. (CFR 2.4, 2.6)
- More consistent implementation of annual reviews of student progress. (CFR 2.12)

Undergraduate and Graduate
- More systematic collection of data to assess the extent to which our services meet the needs of our students, including intended learning outcomes, and using the results for improvement. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

With respect to Standard 2 CRF's, the evaluations above were made on the basis of available and informative evidence. This includes data/information on academic program outcomes assessment and student success metrics (at least at undergraduate level), demographics etc.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

- Graduate assessment: At the graduate level, we are still building systematic review processes and data sets as programs move to standalone status. We are working toward program-level dashboards.
- Undergraduate: strengthening our ability to further disaggregate data to explain and examine patterns in IRDS data.
- Undergraduate and Graduate, Academic and Co-Curricular: We are working to improve our ability to easily track assessment activity and aggregate results at levels above the program/unit to inform planning and decision making. Data exist but need to be readily available to a broader array of constituents and would benefit with being coupled to other metrics (e.g. student success) to provide a holistic picture of student learning, student success, and support for these core institutional functions.

Review under WSCUC Standards

Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.	Institutional Information

Self-Review Rating **Importance to address at this time**
 1= We do this well; area of strength for us   A:U= High priority – Urgent
 2= Aspects of this need our attention   A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed in light of 2020-related growth.
 3= This item needs significant development   B= Medium priority
 0= Does not apply   C= Lower priority
   0= Does not apply
	Institution: University of California, Merced
	
	 Type of Review:
	  ⑧ Comprehensive for Reaffirmation
	
	 Date of Submission: ____/_____/_____
	   Mo Day Year
	
	 Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability *The institution sustains its operations and supports the achievement of its educational objectives through investments in human, physical, fiscal, technological, and information resources and through an appropriate and effective set of organizational and decision-making structures. These key resources and organizational structures promote the achievement of institutional purposes and educational objectives and create a high-quality environment for learning.*

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Faculty and Staff						
3.1 The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification, and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered. X 2.1, 2.2b	The institution has a faculty staffing plan that ensures that all faculty roles and responsibilities are fulfilled and includes a sufficient number of full-time faculty members with appropriate backgrounds by discipline and degree level.	1	A:OA	The institution engages in fair hiring practices to ensure diversity in staff and faculty recruitment efforts. Diversity efforts are based on Affirmative Action Goals per the institutions Affirmative Action Plan. While we are confident in the fulfillment of this core deliverable, it remains a continuous high priority to maintain adherence to and delivery of a consistently high standard.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
3.2 Faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, workload, incentives, and evaluation practices are aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation is consistent with best practices in performance appraisal, including multisource feedback and appropriate peer review. Faculty evaluation processes are systematic and are used to improve teaching and learning. X 1.7, 4.3, 4.4		2	A:OA	The institution has established policies to ensure recruitment and hiring of faculty and staff are aligned with the mission. HR's Strategic Plan recognizes the long-range smart growth plans as detailed in the UCM's Workforce Planning exercise so that all hiring, training and development is integrated around a smart growth model to leverage people, skills and technology in the most efficient, effective and self-fulfilling way possible with continued focused dialogue anchored in the University's mission. Once on-boarded, the staff are evaluated annually with emphasize on essential functions, goals, achievements, core competencies, and professional development needs. Performance management training for supervisors is offered annually. Enhancement to our staff performance appraisal system, coupled with mandatory training and a reemphasis on overall employee training and development is a key component of the new HR Strategic Plan. Significant changes to streamline the appraisal process are underway. Institution offers cash and non-cash awards to recognize exceptional performance and innovation.	Faculty Handbooks Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and Merced Academic Personnel Policies and Procedures (MAPP) UC Policy PPSM 20 Recruitment PPSM 23 - Performance Management Policy, Performance Management Guidelines, Performance Appraisals, Employee & Supervisor Resources, Halogen. STAR & Innovation Awards	

| 3.3 The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes. X 2.1, 2.2b, 4.4 | The institution engages full-time, non-tenure-track, adjunct, and part-time faculty members in such processes as assessment, program review, and faculty development. | 2 | A:OA | Faculty development in support of teaching, learning and assessment of student learning outcomes is provided in several ways: through programming and resources provided by the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence (CRTE),) in the Office of Undergraduate Education and the Academic Personnel Office, and in small part by the Office of Institutional Assessment. Faculty work on program assessment is supported by assessment specialists, one per school and one at the graduate level. CRTE resources are available to all faculty, lecturing and Senate. They are also available to staff and complement professional development opportunities in assessment offered by the Division of Student Affairs.

At an institutional level, the Periodic Review Oversight Committee (PROC) is charged with advisory and oversight responsibilities for academic and administrative assessment, annual and periodic. This includes recommending appropriate resourcing in support of assessment, and facilitating processes by which assessment practices act to align resources with academic mission, campus strategic plans, and resources.

A score of "2" is given for several reasons: (1) in part because the CRTE is undergoing periodic review in spring 2015, including an examination of "sufficient support". (2) It also reflects the need to better integrate engagement in assessment (as teaching at course and program levels) into the tenure and promotion process. (3) Also, while lecturing faculty are involved in program review, their involvement in annual program assessment varies across programs. (4) Under PROC's guidance, we are still developing assessment processes that facilitate alignment of educational and administrative activities and resourcing with campus goals. The "A" score reflects the need to continue to attend to these needs this as the campus faculty numbers grow rapidly over the next five years in keeping with 2020 planning. | Policies, budgets, or other indicators of faculty development programs.

- Center for Research on Teaching Excellence Faculty Development Services

- Non-Senate Faculty access to Instructional Support in MOU

- Assessment specialist services for faculty and staff

- PPSM 50 Professional Development Policy for Staff Members

- Professional Development Programs for Staff Members

- Lynda.com Access for staff and faculty | |

Fiscal, Physical, and Information Resources

| 3.4 The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long-term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives.
X 1.1, 1.2, 2.10, 4.6, 4.7 | The institution has functioned without an operational deficit for at least three years. If the institution has an accumulated deficit, it should provide a detailed explanation and a realistic plan for eliminating it. | 2 | A:OA | UC Merced's budget is based on estimated revenue expected to be received which is reviewed and adjusted to actuals throughout the year. Enrollment management is done in coordination with the University of California system as a whole and is reconciled against the long range plan for UC Merced. A tone at the top has been established and communicated campus-wide regarding current and future budget alignment with our Academic Strategic Plans, workforce planning initiatives, and our long range 2020 Project, which is a long-term strategic plan to grow the campus over the next 5 years. A long range financial plan has been developed to forecast the financial impact of the aforementioned plans. The financial plan outlines the targets that must be met for the campus to achieve financial sustainability.

The diversification of revenue sources has been the most difficult in that the campus is in growth mode and many of the sources are not eligible to be used for capital use. Revenues received totaled $224.8 million from a variety of sources from student tuition and fees, which accounted for 23% of total revenues, State Educational Appropriations from the State of California (47% of total revenue), auxiliary enterprises (10%), Grants and contracts (8% of total revenue), and other sources. State Educational Appropriations requires advance approval from the State of California before it can be used for capital purposes but the amount eligible is capped. As a result, a majority of the amounts are not eligible for capital use. Likewise, grants and contracts are typically not eligible for capital use. Additionally, over the last three years, the Campus has shown positive increases in the net position of the campus (i.e. no operational deficits).

While individual campuses within the University of California do not issue stand-alone financial statements, the University of California System-wide maintains a net position (i.e. equity) of $11.3 billion with a cash and investment portfolio totaling $21.6 billion. Based on the | Audits submitted with Annual Report.

Also evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: *Sustainability*. | |

				official records of the UC, UC Merced share of total cash and investments totaled $171 million with a positive net position balance of $56 million as of June 2014. The UC, on a consolidated basis, received an unqualified opinion for the fiscal year then ended June 30, 2014 from its independent accounting firm KPMG.		

3.5 The institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope, quality, currency, and kind at physical sites and online, as appropriate, to support its academic offerings and the research and scholarship of its faculty, staff, and students. These information resources, services, and facilities are consistent with the institution's educational objectives and are aligned with student learning outcomes. X 1.2, 2.1, 2.2	The institution provides training and support for faculty members who use technology in instruction. Institutions offering graduate programs have sufficient fiscal, physical, information, and technology resources and structures to sustain these programs and to create and maintain a graduate-level academic culture.	3	A:U	UCM lacks sufficient or dedicated staffing and staff skill availability to support faculty in online course development, classroom use of technology and the use of a research cyberinfrastructure. As well, the content production and data delivery infrastructure is dated and lacks robustness, performance reliability, and standards-based installation and lifecycle. However, a new cloud-based LMS was launched in Jan 2015 that provides a solid foundation for the delivery of online course content. For spring semester 2015, approximately 376 faculty have activated an LMS course account as all grade submissions occur via this tool. At present five faculty are designing online courses per the UCOP ITLI funding and are using resources from other UC campus' for course and content development. Funding is in place to launch a multiyear upgrade of the campus network beginning April 2015. The IT Strategic Workforce Plan includes a request for a Director of Academic and Emerging Technology (Phase 1, launched in February 2015), along with a request for 10 staff lines to support content and course development and classroom technology support (Phase 2). The following 2 Goals are specified in the IT Strategic plan and scheduled to launch with the conclusion of Phase 1 of the IT workforce plan and the hiring of a Director of Academic and Emerging Technology: (2.1.5) Build and execute a classroom technology roadmap and (3.1.) Define vision for technology for teaching and learning. A Cyberinfrastructure external review occurred in March 2015 and we are waiting for final recommendations. Two proposals were submitted on 22 March, 2015 to NSF Solicitation 14-521 CC*DNI (Campus Infrastructure - Data, Networking, and Innovation) for funding to support faculty research computing needs.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Organization Structures and Decision-Making Processes						
3.6 The institution's leadership, at all levels, is characterized by integrity, high performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability.		1	C	The institution has assembled a leadership team that is committed to high performance goals and aspirations as evidenced by the launch of the Academic Focusing Initiative, workforce planning and the 2020 Project.	Evaluated during comprehensive review.	
3.7 The institution's organizational structures and decision-making processes are clear and consistent with its purposes, support effective decision making, and place priority on sustaining institutional capacity and educational effectiveness.	The institution establishes clear roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority.	2	A:OA	The institution has well defined organizational structures to facilitate shared governance as evidenced by the establishment of the Periodic Annual Review Committee (PROC). PROC is a committee, co-chaired by the Provost and the Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, includes faculty and administrative representation. It was established to consolidate Academic and Administrative Reviews to reaffirm the shared governance concept. Under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services, the university's administration has undertaken a comprehensive workforce planning process to ensure the organizational structure facilitates efficient service and effective decision support structures. One area of potential improvement concerns the duties and responsibilities of Bylaw Unit chairs. Currently, unit chairs have responsibility for many duties outlined in APM 245, but the final authority for decision-making in those areas rests with the school deans. Over the next several years, the university could evolve to better align responsibility with authority for functions that reside respectively with the deans and unit chairs.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 7: *Sustainability*.	
3.8 The institution has a full-time chief executive officer and a chief financial officer whose primary or full-time responsibilities are to the institution. In addition, the institution has a sufficient number of other qualified administrators to provide effective educational leadership and management.		1	C	The institution has assembled a solid leadership team who display the ability to provide effective educational leadership and management. The Chancellor serves as the full-time chief executive officer and Vice Chancellor of Planning and Budget serves as the chief financial officer. Both are accountable to the campus and serve as part of the Senior Management Group of the University of California.	Position Descriptions for CEO, CFO.	

3.9 The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer. X 1.5 – 1.7	The governing body comprises members with the diverse qualifications required to govern an institution of higher learning. It regularly engages in Self-review and training to enhance its effectiveness.	1	0	The University is governed by The Regents, which under Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The article states that "the university shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs." There is an annual review of the CEO by conducted by the President.	University of California Board of Regents, membership and biographies. Board of Regents Standing Committees and Membership Bylaws of the Board of Regents Academic Senate Policy on Review of Chancellors
3.10 The institution's faculty exercises effective academic leadership and acts consistently to ensure that both academic quality and the institution's educational purposes and character are sustained. X 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 4.3, 4.4	The institution clearly defines the governance roles, rights, and responsibilities of all categories of full- and part-time faculty.	1	C	The institution has established governance structures through the Standing Orders of the Regents that outline the responsibilities clearly. In addition, the structures are also outlined in the Bylaws of the UCM Academic Senate.	Faculty governing body charges, bylaws and authority: Standing Orders of the Regents of the UC Bylaws of the UC Academic Senate UC Merced Academic Senate

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

   - While UC Merced has outlined clear roles and responsibilities for its administration and administrative structures, there is a need to further define the academic administrative structure. UCM has strategically decided to establish a multi-disciplinary structure; however, there is need to have some clear lines of responsibility in the context of the traditional departmental structure while still preserving the unique nature and synergistic benefits of a multi-disciplinary organization.
   - The institution has deployed several strategic initiatives for mapping out the future of UCM through its Strategic Academic Focusing Initiative, the Workforce Planning initiative and the 2020 Project (Physical Planning initiative). The development of the Campus Financial plan consolidates the work of the aforementioned plans into a financial viability and sustainability plan.
   - Given that UC Merced prides itself on being the first university of the 21st century, the need for additional support of IT infrastructure and workforce plan was highlighted as critical area for improvement. UCM lacks sufficient/dedicated staff with the skills to support faculty in online course development, classroom use of technology and the use of a research cyberinfrastructure. As well, the content production and data delivery infrastructure is dated and lacks robustness, performance reliability, and standards-based installation and lifecycle. While funding is in place to launch a multiyear upgrade of the campus network beginning April 2015, there is still a need to address the workforce needs for IT.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

   An area of strength, showcased in this process, is that the institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. Through its hiring practices, and commitment to excellence in teaching, the institution employs a diverse faculty and staff and it provides for continued professional development. Also the institution has launched a several long range planning initiatives to ensure that the campus is able to deliver its mission of teaching and research through excellence in academia, workforce and physical resources. While these plans are still in development, the institution plans to integrate the plans for a comprehensive deployment in the near future.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

   One area that is both a high priority for the institution, and needs significant development, is the provision and access to information and technology resources. This important focus area is linked to our institutional needs to enhance the institution's ability to utilize data gathered to improve programmatic success. As mentioned in the review Standards 2, and 4, the UC Merced generally has effective data gathering processes; however, data resides in a significant number of data systems, which makes the process of enabling cross-referenced data analytics challenging. Therefore, the consolidation of data systems to enable effective development of the institution's data warehousing capabilities are also important.

Review under WSCUC Standards

Provide the institution's consensus rating for columns 3 and 4; add comments as appropriate in column 5. For un-shaded cells in Column 6, delete text and provide links or references to evidence in support of findings. Column 7 is for staff and teams to verify documentation and for teams to comments on evidence.	Institutional Information

Self-Review Rating   **Importance to address at this time**
 1= We do this well; area of strength for us   A:U= High priority – Urgent
 2= Aspects of this need our attention   A:OA = High priority – Ongoing attention needed
                                                                           in light of 2020-related growth.
 3= This item needs significant development   B= Medium priority
 0= Does not apply   C= Lower priority
                                                                          0= Does not apply
	Institution: University of California, Merced
	
	 Type of Review:
	          ⑧ Comprehensive for Reaffirmation
	
	 Date of Submission: ____/_____/_____
	                                          Mo Day Year
	
	 Institutional Contact: Laura Martin, ALO

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

The institution engages in sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection about how effectively it is accomplishing its purposes and achieving its educational objectives. The institution considers the changing environment of higher education in envisioning its future. These activities inform both institutional planning and systematic evaluations of educational effectiveness. The results of institutional inquiry, research, and data collection are used to establish priorities, to plan, and to improve quality and effectiveness.

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
Quality Assurance Processes						
4.1 The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results. X 2.7, 2.10		2	A:OA	UC Merced employs a set of quality assurance process. Examples include new curriculum approval process, new program approval process, periodic program review, teaching evaluation by students, etc. However, the dissemination of information is limited. Additionally, how to meet the academic services and curriculum development needs to reflect our students or our growth, is an area for improvement.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.2 The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision-making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated. X 1.2, 2.10		2	B	In 2014, Institutional Research and Decision Support underwent periodic review with a focus on the development of a collaborative service. There is a sense that data are generated, but data need to be made available to all faculty and staff in a timely manner, and clear pathways to acquire data need to be developed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance.*	
Institutional Learning and Improvement						
4.3 Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment—in support of academic and co-curricular objectives—is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes. X 2.2 – 2.6	The institution has clear, well-established policies and practices—for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting information—that create a culture of evidence and improvement.	2	A:U	Improvements as a result of inquiry, evidence and evaluation are not readily implemented, as more focus is placed on research, it takes precedent over assessment of teaching. Better evidence of co-curricular effectiveness needs to be developed beyond satisfaction and participation data.	Evaluated during comprehensive review through Component 3: *Degree Programs,* Component 4: *Educational Quality,* Component 6: *Quality Assurance*, and Component 7: *Sustainability.*	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.4 The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology. X 2.2 – 2.6	Periodic analysis of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and effectiveness of grading policies and practices.	1	A:OA	UCM has a strong, faculty-owned, academic assessment infrastructure, growing understanding of practice and use of results to inform teaching and curriculum. The teaching evaluation performed by students is a good process for faculty to sustain or improve their teaching quality. Curriculum committees, Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council together play good roles in keeping our courses in high quality. Evaluation of programs is achieved through two processes: (1) student evaluations, in which student feedback provides a basis for change in the classroom regarding improvements in curriculum and pedagogy; (2) coupled annual program learning outcomes assessment and program review processes that focus on student learning results in support of program improvement.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	
4.5 Appropriate stakeholders, including alumni, employers, practitioners, students, and others designated by the institution, are regularly involved in the assessment and alignment of educational programs. X 2.6, 2.7		2	A:OA	The School of Engineering has appointed Board of Advisors comprised of professionals that provide guidance to the educational programs. UCM's alumni population is now sufficiently large and advanced to contribute to advisory boards and they should be added as a means of connecting UCM"s growing campus community to external stakeholders. Plans to develop other advisory boards are underway. Both graduate and undergraduate students have voiced concern that their request for courses and program topics go unheard.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	

Criteria for Review (1)	Guidelines (2)	Self-Review Rating (3)	Importance to Address (4)	Comments (5)	Evidence (Un-shaded only) (6)	Team/Staff Verification (7)
4.6 The institution periodically engages its multiple constituencies, including the governing board, faculty, staff, and others, in institutional reflection and planning processes that are based on the examination of data and evidence. These processes assess the institution's strategic position, articulate priorities, examine the alignment of its purposes, core functions, and resources, and define the future direction of the institution. X 1.1, 1.3		2	B	Continued growth of the university requires the institution to continually reconsider its direction, which requires input from faculty, staff, and administrators. While the rapid growth and pace of decision making often limits the frequency of engaging all these constituencies, improvement in campus-wide engagement in planning is needed.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	
4.7. Within the context of its mission and structural and financial realities, the institution considers changes that are currently taking place and are anticipated to take place within the institution and higher education environment as part of its planning, new program development, and resource allocation.		2	A:OA	This process needs to occur throughout the continued rapid growth of the university. For example, the recent curtailment of undergraduate admissions was a smart response given the space and financial restrictions given the current growth rate.	Evaluated during comprehensive review in Component 6: *Quality Assurance* and Component 7: *Sustainability*.	

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. After completing this analysis, what are the two or three most important issues that emerged from the self-review of this Standard?

   - Effectively using the data collected to inform decisions, from course improvements, to program updates, to campus planning.
   - Engaging the multiple constituency groups to both provide valuable data points on the institution and to help inform strategic planning.
   - Rapid growth and development of the campus requires thoughtful, data informed planning to best direct new programs and growth of current efforts.

2. Looking overall at the quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems to support the review process, what are institutional **strengths** under this Standard?

   - The structures are in place to engage various constituency groups.
   - The tools exist and data are collected on all levels of the campus experience.
   - The processes to perform annual assessment review and periodic program review are in place and help ensure on-going quality review of academic programs, student services, and administrative operations.

3. Looking again at the overall quality and effectiveness of the institution's data gathering and systems, what are **areas to be addressed or improved** under this Standard?

   - The paths to access institutional data points are not apparent.
   - The lack of transparency on data informed decision-making generates skepticism that such activity occurs.
   - The engagement of campus constituents in planning needs to be broadened and deepened.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION
GRADUATE COUNCIL (GC)
KATHLEEN HULL, CHAIR

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

GRADUATE COURSE APPROVAL AND CRF PROCESS

Requests for new graduate courses and course modifications are transmitted using the existing Course Request Form (CRF) in Excel spreadsheet format. Transition to a web-based format is foreseen in the near future.

Notes: Throughout this document, the term "Graduate Program" refers to either a CCGA approved Interdepartmental/Departmental Program or to a Graduate Emphasis under UC Merced's Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP). A checklist for CRF submission appears at the bottom of this document to aid in preparing the CRF packet.

Procedure for CRF submission for graduate courses:

1. All CRFs must be approved by a vote of the faculty of the submitting graduate program or by a committee to which that authority has been delegated. Documentation of approval by the graduate program, usually in the form of a cover letter from the group chair, must accompany submission of the CRF. Beginning in Spring 2013, all CRFs should also be accompanied by documentation of review by the relevant graduate assessment coordinator, usually in the form of a cover letter, providing his/her evaluation of WSCUC requirements when syllabi are initially developed or revised for CRF submission. All CRFs must also be signed by the faculty member proposing the course or course change, and by the lead dean for the submitting graduate program. Draft catalog copy should also be provided. It is the responsibility of the graduate program faculty to review course content, programmatic contribution, overlap with other courses, and resource implications within the context of the relevant graduate program(s). Program faculty should also determine if the addition of the course might necessitate WSCUC Substantive Change Review of the program. The campus Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) will assist faculty in determining if a Substantive Change Proposal to WSCUC is necessary. Program faculty should also confirm that the syllabus addresses WSCUC requirements.

2. New courses should be indicated as such on the CRF, include a preliminary new course number and should have attached a syllabus providing the course goals/objectives, course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, contact information, class policies, academic integrity policy, disability services information, a brief course schedule and the number and types readings/assignments/assessments, the number of units earned, and assessment/grading policy. As per WSCUC requirements, the syllabus should explicitly explain the connections between course learning outcomes and program learning outcomes so that a course's contribution to the student's overall education is clear. GC approved CLO and PLO Guidelines for the development of course learning outcomes, including for courses/units like independent research, are available through the Senate Website. The course schedule required by Graduate Council should be sufficient to justify the number of units for the course. Resources for formulating a syllabus with required information are available through the Center for Research on Teaching Excellence at http://crte.ucmerced.edu.

3. Modifications to an existing course should be indicated as such on the CRF. The explanation box should explain briefly the reason for the proposed change and should have an accompanying syllabus with all required information. A clean copy of the syllabus and an edited copy (using track changes or the equivalent) should be provided.

4. Cross-listed courses are graduate courses that have different prefixes, names, and/or course numbers; but are intended to be offered as the same course with the same meeting time, and with the same requirements and units. Cross-listed courses must have identical course descriptions and prerequisites. Each course that is cross-listed with another course must have its own CRF that indicates the corresponding cross-listed course. If cross-listed courses originate within different schools each graduate program and lead dean of each school must approve the CRF. In addition, the relevant graduate assessment coordinator must review the CRF and provide documentation.

5. Conjoined courses are graduate courses that share one or more elements (e.g. lecture, lab, fieldwork) with an undergraduate course. If a graduate course is to be conjoined, details must be provided about what parts of the course will be shared and how the requirements of Senate Regulation 762 will be met. Each course that is conjoined with another course must have its own CRF that indicates the corresponding conjoined course. The undergraduate version of the course must be reviewed and approved by UGC. The Undergraduate Council (UGC) CRF Procedures and Approval Policy are available through the Academic Senate.

6. Distance or blended courses are graduate courses that are hybrid or distance education elements (e.g. web-based, audio conferencing, satellite). Distance or blended course CRFs must be submitted by a completed Supplemental Questionnaire.

7. Completed CRFs should be submitted by the graduate program to the Registrar's Office (to RegistrarSecure@ucmerced.edu). Upon receipt of the CRF, the Registrar will check the form for completeness, dean's signature, graduate program approval, and review documentation from the school assessment coordinator, check for consistency between cross-listed courses if relevant, and verify the preliminary course number if a new course. Forms submitted without required authorizations and incomplete forms will be returned to the originating graduate program.

8. Completed CRFs will be transmitted to GC for review. The following criteria will be used by GC in its review:
   - Are the standards and prerequisites of the proposed course consistent with those of related courses taught at UCM and similar courses taught at other UC campuses?
   - Is the instructional format justified (e.g. lecture, lab)? Is the unit value for the course consistent with the credit hour policy (each unit should correspond to three hours of student effort per week) as indicated by the course schedule and number/types of readings/assignments/assessments?
   - Does the course appear to fit within the graduate group's subject area?
   - Has the assessment coordinator confirmed that the syllabus contains information required by WSCUC?
   - Does the subject matter of the course substantially overlap with that of another course? If so, does the CRF or course outline explain why the new course is needed?
   - If the course is to be conjoined with an undergraduate course, are the subject matter and proposed format consistent with the credit hour, which requires that graduate and undergraduate courses "must have clearly differentiated and unique performance criteria, requirements, and goals." Do conjoined courses have sufficient overlap in course structure to facilitate concurrent instruction of both advanced undergraduates and graduate students? Are performance criteria, requirements, and goals of the undergraduate and graduate versions of the course clear and distinct?

- If the course is a distance or blended course have the supplemental questions been clearly defined and answered.

9. If GC requires further information or indicates that modification of the CRF is needed, the senate analyst on behalf of GC will notify the graduate program of the request. It is the responsibility of the graduate program and/or submitting instructor to provide the requested information or modification to GC in a timely fashion via the senate analyst.

10. Once a course is approved by GC, the CRF in its final form will be transmitted to the Registrar. The Registrar will notify the originating graduate program of approval, usually in the form of an email notification, and the course will be entered into the catalog.

Checklist for graduate CRF submission:
- ✓ Completed CRF form, signed by submitting instructor and school dean
- ✓ A syllabus with all required information (clean copy and "track changes or the equivalent" copy for revised CRFs are requested)
- ✓ Draft catalog copy
- ✓ Graduate program cover letter, documenting CRF vote and compliance with SR 762 (conjoined courses only)
- ✓ Graduate assessment coordinator cover letter, documenting review
- ✓ For cross-listed courses - accompanying CRF, syllabus, catalog copy, and documentation for all courses to be cross-listed with submitted CRF
- ✓ For conjoined courses - simultaneous submission of undergraduate CRF to UGC
- ✓ For distance or blended courses- supplemental questionnaire

Rev. April 2015