

**Undergraduate Council
Minutes of Meeting
September 11, 2013**

I. Meeting

Pursuant to call, the Undergraduate Council (UGC) met at 10:00 am on Wednesday, September 11, 2013 in SE370K, Chair Jay Sharping presiding.

II. Chair's Report

Chair Sharping welcomed new and returning members and guests, and provided an overview of UGC's duties; its corresponding systemwide committees; and the slate of systemwide representatives. Chair Sharping pointed out that UGC benefits from and values the open dialogue the Council has with the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs.

III. Consent Calendar

The agenda was approved as presented.

IV. Report from VCSA Lawrence

Enrollment data is not official until the 3rd week of census. As of Monday, September 9, data is as follows:

- 6180 students are enrolled
- 1660 new freshmen
- 104 new transfer students
- 80 new graduate students. The graduate division expected to have 100.
- The number of transfers has decreased but at the same time, the number of applications is increasing. This may be due to the newly implemented admissions requirement. At some point, it would be useful to get some feedback from the Schools regarding the academic caliber of their transfer students. We had one of the highest rates of transfer applications.
- Diana Ralls will attend a future meeting to talk about Financial Aid. The goal was to award 15 freshmen Regents' Scholarships and 22 were awarded. UGC sets up the criteria for the selection of the Regents.
- The new dorms are now open and they provide housing for over 500 students. 2100 students currently live on campus.
- UGC reviews the Catalog in the Spring of each academic year. The Catalog is now electronic and it is searchable. It also has a new function ("my catalog") which enables users to build their own e-Catalog and includes a mechanism for preserving outdated versions of the e-Catalog.
- The number of veteran students has increased. The campus now offers a few services for veterans.

- This Fall, a program for foster youth will be rolled out. There is a large foster community in Merced County. We are hoping to reach out more and provide them with adequate services.
- The Career Center has changed its name to Center for Career Services and Professional Advancement. The staff is taking a different approach to help students get prepared for graduate school, particularly with first-generation college students and staff is working on implementing strategies to help them succeed. The campus has been working with local department stores to collect clothes donations.
- Fall 2014 – The Office of Admissions, the BOARS representative, and the UGC Admissions subcommittee will collaborate and revisit our criteria to become more selective. We had 17000 applications this fall and estimate the number to be 18000 next fall. Director of Admissions will reach out to the Admissions subcommittee of UGC and the Senate to discuss Admissions standards and students’ academic quality.
- The VPDUE search was successfully completed.

V. Consultation with Campus Ombuds De Acker and Program Review Committee Chair Gregg Camfield

Academic Honesty Task Force

Report: The Academic Honesty policy has been in effect for several years. Students, faculty, and staff have expressed profound dissatisfaction with the way the current policy is implemented. If a faculty member finds that a student may be cheating, per procedures, an academic misconduct form is filled out by the faculty. Under the current policy, faculty can assign a failing grade to a student. If the form is filled out properly, the faculty member would send the form to the student to give him/her the opportunity to respond. From the students’ perspective, there is no opportunity to respond in a timely manner. Furthermore, the policy seems to be implemented differently in each School and doesn’t seem to follow due process. The new policy will have to have an institutional goal and should involve a preponderance of individuals working towards the same goal.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) clearly states that due process is as important for students as it is for faculty. The AAUP standards are, for the most part, the ones that guide UC procedures. Dishonesty undermines the mission of the University; it is a larger issue and therefore, should be taken out of the hands of the two people most involved (faculty and student) and placed in a more objective context. It is important that the revised policy distinguish the educational and judicial aspects of the process. Research done by the Senate office two years ago suggests that there are different models. Current research shows that academic dishonesty is on the rise and looking at the numbers from 2011-2013, we note a 40% rise in academic misconduct among seniors. VCSA will provide UGC with the data.

Students who committed academic misconduct in multiple classes are tracked in Judicial Affairs; however Judicial Affairs are a repository and can take no action. This is why the Director of Judicial Affairs is on the task force.

Following discussion, members agreed to expand the membership of the task force to include Senate faculty representatives from the three Schools and lecturers as follows:

- SNS Senate Representative: Carrie Menke (will represent UGC and SNS)
- SSHA Senate Representative: Gregg Camfield
- ENG Senate Representative: TBD (Member of the Graduate Council)
- Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education: Elizabeth Whitt
- Student Life and Judicial Affairs: Le Trice Curl, Director
- Disability Services: Holly Mayo, Director
- Bright Success Center: James Barnes, Associate Director
- Coordinator for Institutional Assessment: Laura Martin
- ASUCM Representative: Kirandeep Kaur
- GSA Representative: Mac Panah
- Campus Ombuds: De Acker
- Two Unit-18 Lecturers Representatives: TBD

The charge will not include language about quorum since no decisions will be made within its membership. The task force will make recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Action: Senate analyst will circulate revised membership for review and approval by the Council.

Program Review

The program review policy has now been used for 3 cycles of program review and we are discovering some weaknesses and thus, some aspects of the policy need to be streamlined. Now is the time to revisit it and make necessary changes. We originally envisioned it as a way to help faculty plan intelligently between cycles and as a venue to enable them to ponder on what will need to be done for at least 5 years. We need good linkage with the administration to balance all the programs' resource needs. Nonetheless, program reviews are taken very seriously and consistently in the resource allocation process. There needs to be a reciprocal linkage between program review and institutional priorities. We could approach this by talking to groups that have undergone program review to see what their experience was with regards to the administration's responses to their resource requests. Secondly, we want to talk about whether there should be some consultation between the program and the administration before the review begins to see if there are specific questions that the program should address with the review team and to make sure that those questions are aligned with institutional goals. As an institution, we will need to investigate institutional directions. If we are going to ask the Administration to help us guide questions, this changes our understanding of program review and aligns us with UC Berkeley's policy. This cannot and should not be implemented quickly and requires some form of dialogue between the relevant parties.

Points to consider before and during the revision of the program review policy:

- Ensure that consultation takes place between program, Dean and Provost before the review begins.
- Role of SACAP in the process.
- Are we asking for the right data sets?
- Are we asking for too much data?
- Revise the policy to connect undergraduate and graduate reviews?
- The linkage between the programs and the administration is essential to ensure resources are aligned with needs of the programs.
- Collect feedback from faculty in programs that have undergone review.

VI. Slate of Subcommittees

Most of UGC's work is done through its subcommittees. Members approved the following slate of subcommittees:

- **General Education (GenEd)** –Current members are Anne Zanzucchi (SSHA), Kelvin Lwin (ENG) and the VPDUE serves as ex-officio, non-voting.

Anne Zanzucchi provided an overview of the committee's work: When the committee convened this summer, the goal was to revisit Core 100 because it has been suspended. GenEd members recognized that GenEd is a distributed model and since Core 100 is cumulative; the questions that arose included: what is in the distributed model that adds up to Core 100 and what would an integrative course like Core 100 look like if we better understood the distributed model? Members also discussed the sustainability of Core 1. Just like Core 100, Core 1 should not be taken for granted and could face similar sustainability issues. With regard to the distributed model, this summer the Office of Undergraduate Education funded a temporary staff worker to go through all the syllabi that are in the CRF system. Staff reviewed all the syllabi that had a box checked for GenEd and it proved difficult to identify why those courses satisfy GenEd. The committee also learned that the GenEd guiding principles are not self-evident; they are meant to be institutionally broad so it was not clear how an individual instructor might declare a course GenEd component so it might be interesting for UGC to consider the following: 1) the CRF system could include fields for GenEd; 2) engage in discussions and provide guidance to faculty when a course is declared as meeting one or more guiding principles. For example, if a course meets a communication requirement, does it mean communication in the classroom or does it mean that students have potentially achieved some expectations? This activity is not exclusively internal to the GenEd committee. Members of the GenEd committee have engaged in discussions with the School Curriculum Committees and Bylaw 55 units and shared the graduate senior survey data for their majors and findings about what students have learned about GenEd.

The GenEd model has been course or instructor-specific. Once we have the institutional portrait, we will have a better sense of what the students are expected to do and learn.

The committee noted that its membership needs SNS representation and two additional faculty members (external to UGC).

A discussion ensued about the assessment process and structure of General Education with regard to assessment and the need to identify who will be the Faculty Assessment Organizer. This will be discussed further in consultation with the VPDUE, PRC Chair and the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment.

Action: Send request to CoC asking for additional members – one of those members should be from SNS. The subcommittee's charge will be revised and discussed at the next UGC meeting.

Admissions/Financial Aid:

Teamrat Ghezzehei (SNS)

Florin Rusu (ENG)

Jack Vevea (SSHA)

Policies/Courses:

Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA)

Elliott Campbell (ENG)

Carrie Menke (SNS)

Action: Senate analyst will distribute slate and post on the Senate website.

VII. Academic Calendar

It was noted that the October 1, 2013 and March 3, 2014 are firm dates and cannot be altered once approved by UGC.

Action: The calendar was unanimously approved as presented and will be sent to the Schools and the Registrar by the Senate analyst.

VIII. SACAP Charge

The Provost has proposed a revision to the charge and membership of SACAP. All standing committees were asked to provide their comments by Monday, September 30.

Comments:

- Maintaining continuity on SACAP -. Faculty rotate off each academic year but the administrative representation remained unchanged.
- There is a slight imbalance between the faculty and administration representation (6 vs. 7) which means the faculty vote could be a tie and the administration could not. This could potentially disenfranchise the faculty. UGC recommends the addition of one faculty representative, preferably a Faculty Assessment Organizer.

- The language regarding quorum in the footnote poses a question. The charge should make a statement rather than pose a question. UGC recommends the following language:

“An affirmative vote would require the support of at least 50% of Academic Senate Representatives and, separately, 50% of the Administration representatives”

A concern was raised about the nature of the data that will be shared among constituents (please see bullet 4). Is the charge referring to institutional data or assessment reports generated by programs? This data could be a program, institution, course data. This may have a lot of implications depending on what the data is. VCSA Lawrence noted that there has been a lot of discussion about publishing assessment results and clarified that the charge is referring to institutional data.

Action: Senate analyst will draft a memo on behalf of the UGC chair before transmittal to the Senate Chair.

IX. Program Review Policy

Action: Senate analyst will revise policy and send it to the Chair for review. The policy will need to be revised in consultation with the GC and PRC.

X. Conflict of Interest

Action: UGC will adopt the UCR model. A draft will be circulated for review and approval before transmittal to the Senate Chair.

XI. Course Buy-out Policy

Action: Members were asked to send comments to the Senate analyst.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00noon.

Attest: Jay Sharping, Chair