

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



ADDENDUM

DIVISION MEETING OF THE MERCED ACADEMIC SENATE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2013

3:00-5:00 p.m.

Chancellor's Conference Room

232 Kolligian Library

ORDER OF BUSINESS

- I. ANNOUNCEMENTS** 20 min
- A. Division Chair Ignacio López-Calvo
 - B. Systemwide Academic Senate Chair William Jacob
 - C. Systemwide Academic Senate Vice Chair Mary Gilly
 - D. Chancellor Dorothy Leland
 - E. Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Thomas W. Peterson
- II. CONSENT CALENDAR**
- A. **Approval of the Draft Minutes of the April 4, 2013 Meeting** pp.5-16
 - B. Annual Committee Reports (2012-2013)
 - [Division Council](#) pp. 17-20
 - [Committee on Academic Personnel](#) pp. 21-28
 - [Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation](#) pp. 29-35
 - [Faculty Welfare](#) pp. 36-40
 - [Graduate and Research Council](#) pp. 41-57
 - [Committee on Rules and Elections](#) pp. 58-63
 - [Undergraduate Council](#) pp. 64-68
- III. DISCUSSION ITEMS** 10 min
- A. Update approved Graduate/Undergraduate policies within Senate Regulations-*Chair Leppert*
On October 29, 2013 UC Merced received WASC Interim Approval (final approval is anticipated by November 15, 2013) for Fast Track Review of new Doctoral degrees emerging from existing emphases within the Interim Individualized Graduate Program (IIGP). A single recommendation was made: "UCM is encouraged to continue with the process to formalize its standards through establishing Merced Division Academic Senate regulations for graduate programs."
- Division Regulations pp. 69-77

- IV. CONSULTATION WITH CHANCELLOR LELAND AND PROVOST/EVC PETERSON**
- A. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the University of California Merced and University of California, Office of the President **20 min**
pp.78-80
- B. Budget Request and Strategic Focusing **25 min**
- Process for faculty FTE and budget request
- Strategic Focusing Initiative
- [Project 2020](#)
- V. STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS** **30 min**
- Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation, Chair Anne Kelley (oral)
Committee on Academic Personnel, Vice Chair David Kelley (oral)
Committee on Committees, Chair Patricia LiWang (oral)
Committee on Research, Member David Noelle (oral)
Committee on Rules and Elections, Chair Rick Dale (oral)
Faculty Welfare, Diversity and Academic Freedom, Chair Rudy Ortiz (oral)
Graduate Council, Chair Valerie Leppert (oral)
Undergraduate Council, Chair Jay Sharping (oral)
- VI. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS**
- VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
- VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

Agenda items deemed non-controversial by the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Division, in consultation with the Divisional Council, may be placed on a Consent Calendar under Special Orders. Should the meeting not attain a quorum, the Consent Calendar would be taken as approved. (Quorum = the lesser of 40% or 50 members of the Division.) At the request of any Divisional member, any Consent Calendar item is extracted for consideration under “New Business” later in the agenda.

Rick Dale
Secretary/Parliamentarian

Glossary of Senate Acronyms

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

2013-2014 SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

DIVISION COUNCIL

Ignacio López-Calvo, Chair (SSHA), COUNCIL
Jian-Qiao Sun, Vice Chair (SOE)
Rick Dale, CRE Chair, Secretary/Parliamentarian (SSHA)
Jay Sharping, UGC Chair (SNS)
Patricia LiWang, CoC Chair (SNS)
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas, CAP Member (SSHA)
Valerie Leppert, GC Chair (SOE)
Anne Kelley, CAPRA Chair (SNS)
Rudy Ortiz, FWDAF Chair (SNS)
Ruth Mostern, COR Chair (SSHA)
Paul Maglio, At-Large (SOE) Assembly
Robin DeLugan, At-Large (SSHA) Assembly Alternate

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Raymond Gibbs, Chair (UC Santa Cruz)
David Kelley, Vice Chair (SNS), UCAP
Theofanis "Fanis" Tsoulouhas (SSHA)
Michelle Yeh (UC Davis)
Gary Jacobson (UC San Diego)
Richard Regosin (UC Irvine)
John Leslie Redpath (UC Irvine)
Rajiv Singh (UC Davis)

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Anne Kelley, Chair (SNS), UCPB
Mukesh Singhal, Vice Chair (SOE)
Jan Wallander (SSHA)
Marilyn Fogel (SNS)
Jian Qiao Sun, Senate Vice Chair, (SOE)

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Patricia LiWang, Chair (SNS), UCOC
Ashlie Martin, Vice Chair (SOE)
Ajay Gopinathan, (SNS)
Kara McCloskey (SOE)
Linda Cameron (SSHA)
Erik Menke, (SNS)
Kevin Mitchell (SNS)
Jinah Choi (SNS)

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Ruth Mostern, Chair (SSHA), UCORP & UCOLASC
Roummel Marcia, Vice Chair (SNS)
David Noelle (SSHA)
Jason Hein (SNS)
YangQuan Chen (SOE)
Ex-Officio: Samuel Traina, VC for Research

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS

Rick Dale, Chair (SSHA), UCRJ
Peter Vanderschraaf, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Paul Almeida (SSHA)

FACULTY WELFARE, DIVERSITY AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Rudy Ortiz, Chair (SNS), UCAAD
Linda Cameron, Vice Chair (SSHA), UCFW
Shawn Newsam (SOE)
Sean Malloy (SSHA), UCAF
Tanya Golash-Boza (SSHA)
Asmeret Asefaw Berhe (SNS)
Ex-Officio: David Ojcius, VP for Academic Personnel

JOINT UGC/GC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

Gregg Camfield, Chair (SSHA)
Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA)
Mike Dawson (SNS)
Jeff Gilger (SSHA)
Mukesh Singhal (SOE)
Ex-Officio: Laura Martin, ALO and UCM Accreditation Liaison Officer

PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Robert Hillman, Chair (UC Davis), UCPT
Jodie Holt (UC Riverside)
Tom Joo (UC Davis)

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

Jay Sharping, Chair (SNS), UCEP
Jack Vevea, Vice Chair (SSHA), BOARS
Virginia Adan-Lifante (SSHA), UCIE
Teamrat Ghezzehei (SNS)
Florin Rusu (SOE)
Kelvin Lwin (SOE)
Anne Zanzucchi (SSHA)
Elliott Campbell (SOE)
Carrie Menke (SNS)
Ex Officio: Jane Lawrence, VC Student Affairs
Elizabeth Whitt, VP and Dean of Undergraduate Education
Liaisons: Suzanne Sindi (SNS), UCOPE

GRADUATE COUNCIL

Valerie Leppert, Chair (SOE), CCGA
Kathleen Hull, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Erin Johnson (SNS)
Sayantani Ghosh (SNS)
Sachin Goyal (SOE)
Paul Almeida (SSHA)
Ex Officio: Chris Kello, Acting Dean of the Graduate Division

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. *Division Chair Peggy O'Day*

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

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

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

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

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

B. *Provost/EVC Peterson*

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

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

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

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

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

II. Consent Calendar

The November 8, 2012 minutes were approved as presented.

III. Discussion Items

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

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

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

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

Chair Dale then opened the floor for comments or concerns.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Standing Committee Reports

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

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

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

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

Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation- Chair Susan Amussen

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

Committee on Committees- Chair Ajay Gopinathan

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

Committee on Rules and Elections-Chair Rick Dale

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

Committee on Faculty Welfare – Chair Sean Malloy

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

Graduate and Research Council Chair Valerie Leppert

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

Undergraduate Council- Chair Cristian Ricci

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

V. Senate Awards

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

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

Chair O'Day went on to explain the significance of the Dr. Fred Spiess Award. Professor Spiess was the first chair of the UC Merced Task Force, which functioned as the campus Academic Senate. Professor Spiess was a renowned scholar in the Scripps Research Institute at UC San Diego, was a highly distinguished oceanographer, and also served as

the systemwide Senate Chair and Vice Chair. He valued the importance of the Academic Senate and dual leadership. He was sincerely committed to the success of this campus, and the UCM Senate presents this award in recognition of those who are outstanding in research, teaching and Senate service. The recipient of the award is Valerie Leppert who is one of our founding faculty members and our first faculty UCM member to receive tenure. She has served numerous times on GRC, on numerous other committees, and has committed herself to the success of UC Merced.

VI. Petitions of Students (NONE)

VII. Unfinished Business (NONE)

VIII. New Business (NONE)

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned.

Attest:

Peggy O'Day, Senate Chair

Division Council
Merced Division of the Academic Senate
Annual Report 2012-2013

The Division Council (DivCo) held a total of 16 regularly scheduled two-hour, in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw I.IV.3](#). In addition the Council held a preliminary meeting to establish goals for the year, as well as meeting with Vice Chancellor for Planning and Budget, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost for Faculty, and Vice Provost/Dean of Graduate Education Candidates.

2012-2013 Accomplishments

The unofficial theme of DivCo this year was improving communication with faculty. Issues and concerns falling under this theme include: Senate monthly newsletter, Senate Website, and faculty participation.

At the beginning of the 2012-2013 academic year, DivCo held a planning meeting and identified three issues that were priorities for the upcoming year:

- ***Campus Challenges:*** To have robust conversations about the challenges facing the campus.
- ***Academic Mission:*** To become a full partner with the Chancellor about how to direct the academic mission.
- ***Shared Governance:*** Promote shared governance at all levels of the campus.

2012-2013 List of Activities

The following summarizes the Division Council's activities and actions for 2012-2013. Please refer to the Division Council approved [minutes](#) and newsletters for details.

DivCo made recommendations to the Administration on the following items:

- Faculty Leadership Structure for SNS, SSHA and SOE- DivCo sent a memo to the School Deans and SNS Unit Leads requesting the completion of elections for Chair and Executive Committee members no later than September 1, 2012.
- Coordination of School/Senate Business-DivCo sent a memo to School Deans requesting a staff member who will be responsible for coordinating communications and activities between the Senate and Schools.
- Revised MAPP- DivCo provided Acting Executive Vice Chancellor and Vice Provost of Academic Personnel with comments on proposed revisions from Senate members and DivCo.
- UC Merced Joint Senate-Administration Library Working Group-DivCo worked with Library staff to create the working group charge and membership.
- Long-Range Enrollment Plan- DivCo conducted a poll of graduate groups for revised graduate student enrollment projections, and provided comments on the draft text emphasizing the need to balance growth in undergraduate, graduate, faculty, and staff populations.
- Long-Range Development Plan- DivCo supported the proposed amendments to create mixed use areas that would enable more flexibility in the construction of campus buildings.
- Joint Senate-Administration Salary Equity Study Committee-In conjunction with the Faculty Welfare committee, DivCO worked to establish committee charge and membership.

- Joint Senate-Administration Working Group, Academic Space Planning for Project 2020-DivCo worked with the Provost/EVC and Chancellor to develop the charge and membership for a joint Senate-Administration working group responsible for gathering and synthesizing information from academic units, graduate groups, and Schools on space needs and planning in advance of strategic academic planning in Fall 2013.
- Composite Benefit Rates—In its memo to the Chancellor and Provost/EVC, DivCo strongly opposed the recommendation from the UCOP Steering Committee on Composite Benefit Rates to charge faculty summer salaries from grants and contracts the same benefit rate as that for full academic year salaries.
- Role of School Executive Committees and Senate Rights and Responsibilities in Schools- DivCo sent a memo to SSHA Executive Committee pointing out the primary areas of Senate responsibility: Academic degree programs and curriculum, Academic Personnel, and advising the administration on Budget and Resource Allocation.

DivCo reviewed and responded to the following campus items:

- LES Bylaw 55 Unit Proposal-endorsed the proposal to establish a Life and Environmental Sciences (LES) Bylaw 55 Unit.
- Political Science and Sociology Bylaw 55 Unit Proposal- sent memo to Provost/EVC Peterson endorsing the proposals and recommending approval by the administration
- CCGA Proposals-sent memos to Provost/EVC Peterson endorsing the revised Interdisciplinary Humanities CCGA Proposal, new Political Sciences CCGA Proposal, and new Applied Math CCGA Proposal.
- Establishment of English and Spanish Undergraduate Majors-endorsed proposal to establish these two majors and recommended the School articulate an implementation plan and timeline for the discontinuance of the Literature and Cultures major.
- WASC Revised Handbook- forwarded standing committee and DivCo's comments expressing concerns and encouraging WASC to implement accreditation policies that do not place additional strain on already over-burdened faculty and staff.
- WASC Graduate Student Success Template-endorsed a set of materials related to evaluating student success at the graduate level.
- Learning Management Systems-forwarded memo endorsing IT's budget proposal for the replacement of UCMCROPS (SAKAI) with a new Learning Management System (CANVAS).
- Office of Assessment-forwarded memo endorsing a new Senior Administrative Analyst for the Office of Assessment.
- Joint Program Review Committee- forwarded memo to UGC and GRC Chairs establishing a Joint-Undergraduate-Graduate Program Review Committee.
- Revised UC Merced Assessment Principles-forwarded memo to SACAP Co- Chair's endorsing the assessment principles which will be useful as a set of values to guide the campus' philosophy and practices regarding assessment, and to communicate them to external audiences.

DivCo opined on the following systemwide items:

- Rebenching Report-forwarded standing committee and DivCo responses supporting the core principles of rebenching in the report and agreeing that student funding across the system should be equalized and transparent.
- Revisions of APM 700- forwarded standing committee and DivCo comments supporting revisions.

- APM Section 430, Visiting Scholars and Other Visitors- reviewed and had no additional comments.
- Open Access Policy-forwarded standing committee and DivCo's comments supporting the intention of the policy in making university-based research openly available to all, and in potentially affecting changes in commercial publishing.
- BOARS Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 478- forwarded committee comments with no objections but agreed that the changes will have little effect on students transferring into our science and engineering programs.
- Financial Aid Funding Policies-forwarded DivCo's memo favoring Option A, which would direct more aid to lower income students.
- APM 015-reviewed and had no additional comments.

DivCo proposed substantive revisions to the UCM Bylaws

- Graduate and Research Council (GRC) to be split into two new standing committees: Graduate Council and Committee on Research beginning Ay13-14
- Expanded the duties of the Faculty Welfare Committee and renamed as the Committee on Faculty Welfare Diversity and Academic Freedom.
- Changed the membership of CAPRA, removing Vice Chairs of GRC/UGC, and adding representatives from Schools.
- Expanded the membership of Division Council to include the chairs of the two split GRC committees (Graduate Council/Research), and included the chair of Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom.
- Added an additional member to the Undergraduate Council.

2012-2013 List of Guests

- Chancellor Dorothy Leland, September 27, 2012, November 1, 2012
- Laura Martin, Coordinator of Institutional Assessment, October 18, 2012
- Interim EVC Sam Traina, November 1, 2012
- Vice Chancellor for Administration Mary Miller, December 6, 2012
- Michael Truong, LMS Implementation Task Force, February 13, 2013
- Provost/EVC Peterson, January 30, 2013, April 26, 2013, May 8, 2013
- Systemwide Provost Aimee Dorr, March 18, 2013
- Lacey Kiriakou, Director of Federal Relations, Office of Government Relations, October 18, 2012

Senate Office

The Academic Senate office workload continues to increase with the ongoing responses to the campus requirements for Program Review as well as WASC requirements. With the maturing of the Division Council, the growth of the faculty, and the growing needs of Program Review, the Senate will be adding two new standing committees to its roster: the Committee on Research (COR) and the Joint Undergraduate/Graduate Program Review Committee (PRC).

The Senate office hired a new Executive Director Dejeuné Shelton and Senate Senior Analyst Simrin Takhar.

DivCo reviewed the AY12-13 Senate Office budget and reviewed and approved the Senate Office budget request for AY13-14

UCM Faculty

Peggy O'Day, Chair (SNS)
Ignacio López-Calvo, Vice Chair (SSHA)
Susan Amussen, CAPRA Chair (SSHA)
Cristián Ricci, UGC Chair (SSHA)
Valerie Leppert, GRC Chair (SOE)
Ajay Gopinathan, CoC Chair (SNS)
Dave Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (SNS)
Rick Dale, Parliamentarian & CRE Chair (SSHA)
Wolfgang Rogge, At-Large Member (SOE)
Paul Maglio, At-Large Member (SOE)

Senate Staff

Dejeuné Shelton, Executive Director
Fatima Paul, Assistant Director
Simrin Takhar, Senior Analyst
Mayra Chavez-Franco, Senate Analyst

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) is pleased to report on its activities for the Academic Year 2012-2013.

I. CAP Membership

This year the CAP membership included three members from UCM and seven external members. The UCM members were Jan Wallander, - Spring 2013 (Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts); David Kelley, CAP Vice Chair (Natural Sciences); and Jian-Qiao Sun, (Engineering). The external members were Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB, Computer Science); Hung Fan (UCI, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry); Raymond Gibbs, CAP Chair (UCSC, Psychology); Gary Jacobson (UCSD, Political Science); Richard Regosin (UCI, French and Italian); and Michelle Yeh (UCD, East Asian Languages).

We had three CAP Analysts assisting the committee this year, in succession, Mary Ann Coughlin, Mayra Chavez and Simrin Takhar.

II. CAP Review of Academic Personnel Cases

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

Policies and Procedures

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

The Merced Academic Personnel Policies & Procedures ([MAPP](#)) document is also a useful resource for faculty members, administrators and Academic Personnel Committee (APC) Chairs. As the MAPP is an evolving resource, CAP presented this Spring extensive suggestions for revisions of the document to the Academic Personnel Office (APO) and the Divisional Council (DivCo). These comments were aimed at better aligning the MAPP with the UC APM.

Review Process

CAP's review process begins when the committee receives files from APO, where they have been analyzed, vetted, and classified to facilitate further, efficient processing. The cases, as well as reviewer assignments, are distributed to the committee one week prior to CAP's meeting and ensuing discussion of the files. CAP typically reviews fewer cases in the Fall (two to five) and many more in the Spring (five to eleven). One lead reviewer and one or two secondary reviewers, depending upon the proposed personnel action, are assigned to report on each case;

however, all members are expected to read and become familiar with the files. Reviewer assignments are made according to members' areas of expertise. Reviewers serve not as advocates of their areas, but as representatives who act in the best long-term interests of the campus. Committee members who participate in a prior level of review for a file are recused from CAP's respective review of the file.

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

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

Throughout the UC system certain categories of academic personnel cases, for example, appointment at tenure or promotion to tenure, require an additional formal review of the dossier and supplemental materials by an *ad hoc* committee of experts. This *ad hoc* committee is appointed by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate and its report is included in the materials submitted to CAP; the identity of the committee members is known only to CAP and the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designate. At the older campuses, these *ad hoc* committees generally involve three experts, with an outside Chair and one internal member from the relevant unit. Due to the limited number of tenured faculty at UCM, CAP frequently serves "as its own *ad hoc*"; however, when there is inadequate expertise within CAP to review a particular case, an *ad hoc* committee of expert faculty from other UC campuses is appointed by the EVC/Provost.

Recommendations

Appendix A provides a simple numerical summary and analysis of the CAP caseload for the 2012-2013 academic year. CAP reviewed a total of 99 cases during the year, compared to 90 the year prior. The committee agreed with the School recommendations without modification on 91 (92%) of the reviewed cases (see Table 2). In addition, CAP agreed with the School recommendations but with a modification (e.g., a higher or lower step) for another 2 cases (2%). For 6 other cases (6%), CAP voted against the recommendation for a merit, promotion, or appointment, and for 1 case, an appeal of a recommendation made in 2011-2012, we returned the file to the central administration and asked for its own ruling per APM 220 84b.

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

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

III. General Comments Regarding the Submission of Personnel Cases

CAP offered substantive feedback to improve the academic personnel process via the MAPP document in Spring 2013. The revised MAPP contains most of our recommendations. For now, we highlight two issues that we will be the focus of improvement in the coming year.

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

Second, CAP continues to receive files in which Units/Schools have not properly enumerated the number and types of published materials that were specifically considered for the present review period. In some cases, the number of publications cited as relevant to a case will differ between the faculty member's statement, the Unit/School letter and the Dean's letter.

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

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

IV. Counsel to EVC/Provost

The CAP Chair briefly discusses each week's cases, after CAP has voted on its recommendation, with the CP/EVC and the VPAA. These discussions mostly focus on individual cases, but there were other general discussions regarding the preparation of academic personnel files, differences between the Academic Divisions in their recommendations, and CAP procedures. The topics of the more general administrative comments included the following: Recommendations for Increases in Off-Scale Salary Components, Bylaw Unit Voting Procedures, Accelerated Promotions, and Case Material Relevant to a Review. The substance of these administrative comments is detailed in Appendix B. Deans and APC are encouraged to review these as well.

V. Academic Personnel Meetings

Fall Meeting

As is becoming an annual tradition at the UCM campus, the EVC/Provost and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel (VPAP) requested CAP's presence at a fall academic personnel meeting. The meeting, held on Sept 13, 2012, was also attended by faculty and administrators. CAP was represented by Chair Raymond Gibbs and Vice Chair David Kelly, along with one internal member and two of the six other external members. The committee participated in three discussion sessions. The first morning session was held with Assistant Professors and Academic Personnel. This session began with a brief introduction to the academic personnel review process. A second , lunch, meeting was held involving CAP members and chairs of the Academic Senate Committees at UC Merced. This was followed by extensive discussion between the Assistant Professors and CAP. A second session, which was held over lunch and continued into the afternoon, was open to all faculty members, School APC Chairs, School personnel staff, the Deans, and Academic Personnel. This session was devoted to questions and answers on various facets of the academic personnel process at UCM. Brief minutes from both sessions are available in the APO.

Spring Meeting

Academic Personnel, CAP, the Deans, and the School APCs convened during the spring semester to discuss the academic review process, as well as academic personnel policies and procedures. This meeting was held on May 20, 2013. CAP was represented by Chair Ray Gibbs and Vice-Chair David Kelley. Discussion items focused on the preparation of the Case Analysis, external evaluation response rates, Bio-Bibliography elements, teaching criteria and relevant streams of evidence, consistency in recommendations for beginning steps, off-scale salary recommendations, the role of diversity in academic reviews, and the Merit Short Form.

VI. Academic Senate Review Items

The Divisional Council transmitted to CAP various campus and systemwide proposals and documents for review. This academic year included a significant amount of such review activity, which was added to the review of cases. The Committee returned formal opinions on some of these, APM 15, 241, 430, 600, 700 as well as Bylaw 55, the Faculty Relocation Policy, the Open Access Policy. We also, as mentioned above, gave extensive feedback on MAPP.

VII. Acknowledgments

CAP would like to acknowledge its excellent working relationship with David Ojcius in his role as Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The committee would also like to acknowledge APO, the Deans, the APC Chairs, and the AP staff in each school for their dedication to excellence in the personnel review process at UC Merced, and especially the three superb Senate Analysts assigned to CAP this past year.

Respectfully,

Raymond W. Gibbs, Jr., Chair (UCSC)
David F. Kelley, Vice Chair (UCM)
Ruzena Bajcsy (UCB)
Hung Fan (UCI)
Gary Jacobson (UCSD)
Richard Regosin (UCI)
Jian-Qiao Sun (UCM)
Jan Wallander, Spring 2013 (UCM)
Michelle Yeh (UCD)

APPENDIX A

**2012-2013 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
TABLES 1A-1D FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ACTION TYPE**

	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
TOTAL PERSONNEL CASES	85	5	8*	0	98

*Includes one split vote and one “no action”

TABLE 1A APPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant Professor (1 Acting)	19	0	0	0	19
Associate Professor	5	0	1	0	6
Professor	2	1	0	0	3
Lecturer Series (LPSOE)	2	0	0	0	2
Chairs	0	0	0	0	0
Total	28	1	1	0	30
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					93
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					97

TABLE 1B PROMOTIONS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Associate Professor	10	0	2	0	12
Professor	1	0	0	0	1
Professor VI	0	0	0	0	0
Above Scale	0	0	0	0	0
Total	11	0	2	0	13
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					85
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					85

TABLE 1C MERIT INCREASE	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
LPSOE/SOE	1	0	0	0	1
Assistant	20	2	0	0	22
Associate Professor (2 Adjunct)	13	2	1	0	16
Professor	6*	0	2**	0	8
Total	44	0	3	0	47
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					94
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					94

*Includes one 5-year mandatory review (without merit increase)

**Includes one “No Action.”

TABLE 1D REAPPOINTMENTS	CAP Recommendation				TOTAL
	Agreed	Modification	Disagreed	Pending	
Assistant	3	0	2	0	5
Associate	1	0	0	0	1
Professor	0	0	0	0	0
Total	4	0	2	0	6
% CAP Agreed with Proposal					67
% CAP Agreed or Modified Proposal					67

**TABLE 2
FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON SCHOOL PROPOSALS
2012-2013**

School	Number Proposed	CAP Recommendation					% CAP agreed w/unit without modification	% CAP agreed w/unit or modified up or down
		Agree	Modify-Up	Modify-Down	Disagree	Pending		
Engineering (MCA)	24 (3)	20	1	1	2	0	83	92
Natural Sciences (MCA)	40 (2)	35	0	2	3	0	88	93
Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts (MCA)	34 (1)	30	0	1	3	2	88	94
TOTALS (MCA)	98 (6)	85	1	4	8	0	87	92

*Includes two split votes.

**Includes one "No Action."

**TABLE 3
CASES REVIEWED BY CAP 2005-2013**

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

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

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION (CAPRA)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2012-2013

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Academic Planning (CAPRA) held a total of 14 regularly scheduled in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.IV.1](#).

The 2012-2013 academic year was a transition year in terms of a new budget and planning process. CAPRA was at the center of this process and worked closely with the Provost and Schools to help guide the campus through a new way of thinking about the budget. While CAPRA conducted normal Senate business, much of the academic year was focused on the transitional process of obtaining FTE allocations from the Schools and the subsequent consultation with the Provost.

Framework for FTE Requests

At the beginning of the academic year, CAPRA discussed considerations for establishing a new framework for making faculty FTE requests. In the past FTE requests were mainly driven by undergraduate teaching needs, which is not generally characteristic of a major research university and especially not characteristic of a university striving to obtain that status. CAPRA strongly supported giving graduate and research groups the opportunity to submit FTE requests. The committee also felt that the request process may be more effective and successful if the Schools and campus first look at where they expect to be in 2020 and use that as a guiding principle.

The process for the 2012-2013 year represented a "way station" to a more robust and connected planning process. Next year, we expect CAPRA and the administration will be asking Schools to present a strategic plan that outlines what they expect to look like when we reach 10,000/10% graduate students in 2020, including their space needs and "brand" research and graduate programs. In 2012-2013, though, there were two major changes to the FTE request process:

1. Rather than a total number of FTEs, the Chancellor allocated a maximum dollar amount for FTEs (including start up) across all Schools.

2. CAPRA responded to the Chancellor's focus on developing the graduate and research mission of the university by asking that FTE requests, as are part of the Dean's overall budget requests, to represent the priorities of the twelve existing graduate programs. The requests were submitted through the lead Dean for the program.

While CAPRA did not request full strategic plans this year, the committee did ask the Schools to provide 1) a brief overview of how each graduate group sees its trajectory, and how they see themselves connecting to research in other parts of the campus; 2) a brief overview of the metrics that may be useful in assessing the success of the program, and 3) a 2 year FTE request. Academic units, ORUs, and CRUs were also permitted to submit a hiring request under the auspices of one or more graduate groups.

At the end of the year, CAPRA, in consultation with the Provost, came to the following conclusions about the new FTE allocation process:

The campus did not wholly succeed in evaluating plans and goals. While graduate groups all wrote plans, neither the School Executive Committees (ECs) nor the Deans assessed them. Instead, they assessed individual positions. A key piece to strategic planning of any kind is to separate the evaluation and assessment of plans from the assignment of particular FTEs. A focus on the plans, without the positions, would have allowed CAPRA to help develop a campus, rather than a School, academic plan

Unresolved issues/lessons learned from the 2012-2013 transitional process:

- Replacement faculty FTEs. In SNS, they were ranked along with new positions, as if in competition; the SSHA position identified as a replacement position by the EC was not ranked by the Dean. CAPRA looks forward to a future coherent process to handle these FTEs.
- LPSOE positions. The campus needs some consensus on the positions. In SNS, the Dean did not recommend an SOE position that would serve the campus' largest and most impacted major. The SSHA Dean recommended one of four requested SOEs, but gave no reason for not including others. CAPRA points to these unanswered questions: What are our criteria for SOEs? How do we rank

them? Should they be listed in with ladder faculty positions? If separately (as seems logical), what are the criteria?

- Start-up. While CAPRA was asked to think about the question of FTE requests without associating it with budget, clearly each Schools' requests have been shaped by historical allocations, which have in turn been shaped by financial considerations. Next year, it would be helpful if the budget included an item for start-up so it is not treated as a new budget item each year. The campus will need start-up funds from somewhere (not necessarily identified) for the foreseeable future. CAPRA looks forward to a process that includes answers to such dilemmas as the total cost of hiring faculty is and what kind of support is needed.

CAPRA Criteria:

In terms of the CAPRA criteria, and the School process, CAPRA made the following observations:

- There was a lack of consultation and dialogue between the School ECs and the Deans on the Dean's final recommendations, at least in two of the Schools. Next year's CAPRA should ensure that the ECs have the opportunity to endorse or comment on the Deans proposals.
- There was a lack of cross-school collaboration partly due to the timeline and partly due to the state of mind in the Schools. There seemed to be no carrots for collaboration.
- Similarly, there is inconsistent thinking about "interdisciplinary" proposals. Thus a position which asks for a particular non-disciplinary slant on a subject may be judged as interdisciplinary, while two connected positions that would speak to each other are seen as disciplinary. This is a particular issue for the graduate groups that incorporate multiple disciplines: they are attentive to both the need to disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary coherence.
- The School ECs and Deans did not comment on the trajectories for growth that were put forth by the graduate groups. The focus was entirely on the positions.
- Neither School ECs nor Deans provided significant guidance in assessing the claims made by groups in the FTE requests.
- While the Deans of SNS and SSHA both explained why each *position* was

chosen, their larger framework for making decisions was less clear. The lack of clear consultation with the School ECs hampered the articulation of an overarching school vision.

CAPRA also opined on the following issues:

State Budget

Proposition 30 on the November 2012 ballot successfully passed and will provide the UC with an additional \$125.7M in enrollment support.

Urban Land Institute

The Urban Land Institute (ULI) was hired to assist the campus in finding solutions for physical expansion behind the original campus footprint. ULI visited campus in September 2012 and took an in-depth look at capital development and funding options. A final report from ULI was released in spring 2013 via Chancellor Leland, detailing the measures that must be undertaken to achieve Project 2020/10,000. The Chancellor has indicated her intention to carry out the ULI report recommendations by soliciting public private partnerships for building a cluster of academic and non-academic buildings. It is vital that the faculty be fully engaged in identifying the key space needs associated with academic program growth for undergraduate instruction, graduate training, and research at 2020/10,000 students/10% graduate students.

Academic Planning and Space

In March 2013, CAPRA proposed that DivCo recommend to the Chancellor that a Senate-Administration Committee of 6-8 people (3-4 faculty, 3-4 administration) be formed to gather information and determine the kinds of academic space needed to serve anticipated growth of academic programs. The committee would identify and synthesize the kinds of teaching and research space we will need at 2-3 times our current faculty size, double the number of undergraduate students, and triple the number of graduate students. In particular, the committee would identify the amount of specific types of space (e.g., wet research labs, core research facilities, teaching labs of various kinds, studios, performance space, graduate student space) aligned with academic program growth. Although program growth cannot be completely defined at this point, especially for new programs, the contours of the growth of existing and

incipient graduate and undergraduate programs over the next seven years can be generally planned and aligned with space requirements.

The committee should continue to be engaged as appropriate as discussions move forward. The committee would need support from either the office of the Provost or the VCPB.

The Provost also expressed his wish to meet with each School Dean to review faculty hiring plans in conjunction with available space. CAPRA thought this would assist in its review of budget/resource/FTE requests.

Development

CAPRA conveyed its concern to the Provost that the campus lacks a transparent vision and mission for increasing development revenue. The committee agreed that a stronger and more strategic effort should be made to attract donor funds and that the faculty should be included in the process. A new Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Affairs was hired to coordinate this effort. At the Provost's request, CAPRA discussed the development issue with the Chancellor and emphasized the need for donors to interact with faculty members who can best communicate academic and research activities in light of shared interests and goals.

Systemwide Review Items

- Proposed revision of financial aid formula. The committee was particularly cognizant of the interests of students as it considered the three options presented by the systemwide UC. CAPRA acknowledged the strengths and drawbacks of each proposal, but in the end, the committee decided that "Option A" (fund self-help at the midpoint of the current benchmark manageable range) is the best of the three. It combines a predictable level of aid and manageable debt expectations.
- Open Access policy. CAPRA carefully reviewed the proposed Open Access Policy. The policy would expand open access to research publications by University of California faculty by changing the default relationship between faculty authors and scholarly publishers to one in which authors grant the University a non-exclusive license to the work. CAPRA agreed that it carried no

significant direct resource implications, though it may have implications for grants.

- **Rebenching project.** CAPRA discussed the systemwide reports on the rebenching project and enrollment management. While UC Merced will not participate in the rebenching implementation, it will eventually be folded into the system. In response to the reports and with consideration for UC Merced's future, the committee's comments fell into three broad categories; (1) the systemwide rebenching model; (2) Merced's integration into the process; and (3) campus-level considerations. The committee noted the following: Rebenching should not be implemented without a predefined enrollment management plan. The two prominent risks of failing to do so are (1) that some campuses may attempt to significantly increase in-state enrollment numbers and (2) that some campuses may push for increased out-of-state enrollment numbers. Both of these scenarios would have a negative impact on the University's historic mission of ensuring quality, access, and affordability in its education.

In the course of its discussion of rebenching and enrollment management, CAPRA agreed that in addition to the campus' discussion on a systemwide enrollment management plan, a similar discussion is warranted at the local level. Merced needs to be strategic in how it plans to reach its 2020 goals, and enrollment management is a critical variable in this regard.

Campus Review Items

- **Life and Environmental Sciences (LES) Bylaw 55 Unit proposal.** CAPRA informed the Senate chair that the proposal contained no significant resource implications.
- **Proposal for a Ph.D. Program in Political Science.** CAPRA focused primarily on the resource implications of the proposal. The committee's greatest concern was that the proposal did not show how the program can be offered with current resources. The proposal also assumes that Political Science will receive "one or two" FTEs each year; however, we cannot predict their success in the planning process. As the Chancellor pays increasing attention to strategic planning, the parameters driving FTE allocations will change. CAPRA would like to see a realistic course rotation (incorporating leaves as well as undergraduate and

graduate teaching responsibilities), in order to show that the program is feasible with current resources.

- Draft 2013 WASC Handbook of Accreditation. CAPRA is particularly concerned with the cost implications of this process, and the challenge of establishing appropriate benchmarks. While the accreditation process itself may be simpler, the cost in both time and money of the assessment processes that WASC is mandating will be a significant burden on the campus.

Respectfully submitted:

CAPRA members

Susan Amussen, Chair (SSHA) – UCPB representative

Matt Meyer, Vice Chair (SNS)

Marcelo Kallmann, (SoE)

Ignacio López-Calvo, Senate Vice Chair (SSHA)

Ruth Mostern, (SSHA)

Teamrat Ghezzehei, (SNS) – Fall term

Jay Sharping (SNS) – Spring term

Ex officio, non-voting members:

Peggy O'Day, Senate Chair (SNS)

Student Representatives:

Jason Baumsteiger, Graduate Student Representative

David Ascencio, Undergraduate Student Representative

Staff:

Fatima Paul

Mary Ann Coughlin

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (FW)
ANNUAL REPORT
AY 2012-2013

To the Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare held a total of 6 regularly scheduled in-person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate Bylaw II.III.5.

The Faculty Welfare committee worked on the following issues:

Ombuds

On behalf of the Faculty Welfare committee, Chair Malloy met with the new campus Ombuds – and former Assistant Dean of the School of Natural Sciences – De Acker. In her role as serving faculty, students and staff, she will provide impartial and confidential counseling as a first step in resolving conflicts and grievances.

Report of the Faculty Diversity Working Group

During the last academic year, a report from the Systemwide Faculty Diversity Working Group was circulated through the UC Divisions for review and comment. Professor Cristian Ricci, UCM's UCAAD representative, presented the report at the first Faculty Welfare meeting of fall 2012 and led the discussion on what could be implemented at the campus level to increase and support diversity. The campus-level recommendations from the report were: crediting contributions to diversity, one-time half or whole-step increase for extraordinary contributions to diversity, establishing a central diversity office, and cluster hiring. Additional recommendations discussed among the Faculty Welfare committee were financial rewards for school and unit efforts, more focused recruiting efforts, workshops for chairs, deans, faculty, and staff, surveys to assess progress, and the Presidential Postdoctoral program.

Professor Ricci suggested the Academic Senate create a standing committee for diversity but was informed that the campus at this time does not have the resources to establish and staff an additional committee.

Ultimately, the Faculty Welfare committee decided on the following revisions to the list of campus-level initiatives: 1) note the high success rate of Presidential Post-Doctoral (PPD) fellows in obtaining faculty positions at UC campuses and in achieving tenure; 2) reference the relatively large percentage of Merced faculty who were PPD fellows, and 3) highlight the highly competitive nature of the fellowship.

Campus Faculty Salary Equity Study

In September 2012, UC President Yudof requested the Divisions to address the issue of faculty salary equity. In response, the Faculty Welfare committee selected faculty members Vice Chair Anna Song and Professor Rudy Ortiz to serve on the steering committee to formulate a joint Academic Senate-Administration Plan on a UC Merced faculty salary equity study. UC Merced's plan was completed in December 2012 and transmitted in January 2013 by UC Merced Provost Peterson to systemwide Provost Dorr.

Learning Assessment and Faculty Welfare & Campus Assessment Principles

The intention of institutional assessment was to ensure success with the WASC accreditation, as the agency has a number of standards regarding learning assessments and outcomes. However, learning assessment has steadily increased its presence in faculty workload and as such, the Faculty Welfare committee identified the following concerns: increased, uncompensated workload on faculty; the erosion of faculty's control over and the management of curriculum, and the need for a substantial amount of resources with significant opportunity costs in this limited budget environment.

Campus Visit, Professor Emerita Martha West

In August 2012, Martha West, a professor of law at UC Davis, visited UC Merced. Professor West has served the UC Merced and UC Davis faculty by advising on grievances before they are formally filed with P&T. She will continue to serve as an additional resource for UCM faculty.

UC Online Education

The Faculty Welfare committee sought answers to the following questions: What is the existing copyright language for standard courses taught in a classroom? Should an online degree be a UC degree? How would online courses be factored into faculty personnel reviews?

Systemwide Review Items

- Proposed Revision of APM 430 – Visiting Scholars. The Faculty Welfare committee was concerned with the general lack of prescribed faculty oversight in the process, especially since the minimum criteria for becoming a Visiting Scholar were relatively slim. The committee sought clarification on APM 430-4 language “under supervision of UC faculty” and ensuring a faculty role in vetting visiting scholar appointments. Chair Malloy drafted a memo of the committee’s concerns to the Senate Chair.
- Proposed Revision of APM 700 – Leaves of Absence. The Faculty Welfare committee acknowledged the rationale behind the proposed revisions to APM 700, though the committee felt additional clarification was needed with respect to the definition of “academic duty” and to the process for determining qualifying absences. Chair Malloy sent a memo expressing the committee’s concerns to the Senate Chair.
- APM 668 – Negotiated Salary Program. APM 668 proposed to establish a Negotiated Salary Program (NSP) that would bring a modified version of the Health Sciences Compensation Program (HSCP) to the general campuses. The Faculty Welfare committee drafted a response to the program that included several concerns. First, the NSP represents a further retreat from the salary scales and the principles of peer review and faculty governance. Also, despite the claim in the draft APM that the NSP will “offer consistent benefits and privileges to general campus faculty,” it appears that this program will in fact privilege a particular type of contribution to the university mission. Moreover, there are several unresolved questions with respect to the implementation of the NSP. Finally, the explanatory material suggested the UC’s goal should be to “encourage an entrepreneurial spirit” amongst the faculty; while the UC should certainly not discourage entrepreneurship among the faculty within the existing guidelines for such activities, to promote it as a key university mission raises troubling question with respect to academic freedom.
- Proposed Open Access Policy. The Faculty Welfare committee supported the policy’s objective, as well as its opt-out option. The committee had a few general concerns with the proposal: What is meant by the notion of commercial use and reuse? Could an end user modify published work? In general, what are the terms of the license? The committee further noted that the policy imposes additional

work on participating faculty members. In addition, more clarity is needed on enforcement mechanisms. Chair Malloy sent a memo expressing the committee's concerns to the Senate Chair.

Campus Review Items

- Search Committee for VPF. The Faculty Welfare committee was invited to nominate a committee member to serve on the search committee for the Vice Provost for Faculty which will be a full-time position to replace the current Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
- MAPP. The Faculty Welfare committee expressed concern regarding language in the revised MAPP pertaining to unit-level voting procedures. Specifically, the implications of the required "physical presence" were unclear.
- Integrating evidence of faculty engagement in assessment process. The Senate Administration Council on Assessment and Planning (SACAP) was concerned that UC Merced's commitment to assessment as a means for improving student learning will not endure if faculty engagement with assessment is not addressed in the faculty personnel process. SACAP therefore identified two possible lines of evidence that could be included in faculty files and (as appropriate) addressed by case writers, the faculty discussion, or the Dean. These are 1) thank you letters issued by the School, and signed by the Dean, indicating the faculty member's contributions to their program's annual assessment activities and 2) teaching statements that address their use of formal or informal assessment practices to refine teaching activities, curriculum design, pedagogy, or other aspects of instruction or the instructional environment.
- Proposal for a B.A. in English. Undergraduate Council asked the Faculty Welfare committee to review and comment on the proposal.
- Proposal for a B.A. in Spanish. Undergraduate Council asked the Faculty Welfare committee to review and comment on the proposal.

Respectfully submitted:

Faculty Welfare members

Sean Malloy, Chair (SSHA) – UCFW Representative

Anna Song, Vice Chair (SSHA)

Asmeret Asefaw Berhe, (SNS)

Lilian Davila, (SoE)

Marcos Garcia-Ojeda, (SNS)

Shawn Newsam, (SoE)

Ex officio, non-voting members:

Peggy O'Day, Senate Chair

Ignacio López-Calvo, Senate Vice Chair

Guest:

Rudy Ortiz, (SNS)

Staff:

Fatima Paul

Mary Ann Coughlin

**GRADUATE AND RESEARCH COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013**

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the academic year 2012-2013, the Graduate and Research Council (GRC) met 17 times in person and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UCM Senate Bylaw II.IV.3.B. The issues that GRC considered and acted on this year are described as follows:

Administrative Structure

- The Graduate and Research Council operated with three standing subcommittees that met via email throughout the year:
 - Awards Subcommittee reviewed guidelines, applications and provided recommendations on awardees to the Graduate Division and DivCo.
 - Membership: Chair Ruth Mostern (SSHA), Roummel Marcia (SNS), and Valerie Leppert (SOE)
 - CRF Subcommittee reviewed all graduate course request forms and provided a recommendation to the council as a whole.
 - Membership: Chair Erin Johnson (SNS), Stefano Carpin (SOE), and David Noelle (SSHA)
 - Policy Subcommittee provided the initial review and recommendations on all graduate policies and systemwide policies.
 - Memberships: Chair Sayantani Ghosh (SNS) and Jason Hein (SNS)
- In addition, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed for the Senate Research Awards and Office of Research Tier Rankings.
- GRC expanded the meeting material distribution list to include Graduate Program Chairs, School Graduate Program Coordinators, and the Coordinator of Institutional Assessment in order to provide an opportunity for feedback.

Annual Review of Policies and Procedures

- GRC sent the call for the annual review of graduate group policies and procedures, instituted last year, in order to ensure continuing compliance with campus and system wide policies. GRC noted to Graduate Groups that particular attention would be paid to the following points:
 - Graduate Group Policies and Procedures in regard to transfer of credit should adhere to the requirements in the Graduate Advisor's Handbook (GAH). Noting that PhD students may not transfer credit taken towards a graduate degree at another institution but may petition for a waiver of coursework based on that work, using the process outlined in the GAH.
 - Possible outcomes of critical exams include pass, fail and partial pass

CCGA Proposals

- **GRC Lead Reviewers and Process**

Given the complexity of the UCM CCGA proposal review process, GRC defined the steps and developed a timeline for review so that programs had a chance of CCGA review this Academic Year. GRC identified the following members as the GRC lead reviewers:

- Political Science: Valerie Leppert (SOE)
- Interdisciplinary Humanities: Stefano Carpin (SOE)
- Applied Mathematics: Jason Hein (SNS)

- **Internal Reviewers and Process**

Chair Leppert developed a timeline, process and pre-review rubric for CCGA Proposals which formed the UC Merced Internal Reviewers Packet. In order to streamline the review process a letter was drafted for all UCM Internal Reviewers that provided detailed instructions for review of CCGA Proposals.

- **Reviewed CCGA Proposals**

- **Applied Mathematics CCGA Proposal:** Applied Mathematics submitted their CCGA proposal to GRC on 12/1. GRC completed their preliminary review on 1/25. In accordance with UC Merced Policy, CAPRA and the Acting Dean of the Graduate Division were asked to review and provide feedback. GRC also extended the review to consultation with CRE, UGC, and ALO Martin. In general, reviews were positive, but concerns were voiced around the compliance of academic requirements with UC Merced and University of California policies and the assessment plan. GRC requested a teaching rotation for undergraduate and graduate courses, further details explaining the rationale for the two Masters plans proposed, and a simplified program assessment plan. A revised proposal was submitted on 2/15 and forwarded to the three non-GRC UCM Internal Reviewers identified. On March 14, comments from the UCM Internal Reviewers were received. GRC reviewed the UCM Internal Reviewer comments and requested additional revisions that addressed the synergy of the proposed program with other programs on April 4. At its meeting of April 30, 2013, GRC unanimously approved the revised Graduate Group proposal submitted by the Applied Mathematics faculty at UC Merced. The final Applied Mathematics CCGA Proposal was transmitted by the Chancellor to the CCGA and UCOP on May 15 for review.
- **Interdisciplinary Humanities CCGA Proposal:** Interdisciplinary Humanities resubmitted their CCGA proposal to GRC on 11/3. CAPRA, Graduate Dean Kello, CRE, UGC, ALO Martin, and the EVC were asked to opine. Before final approval, GRC also conducted a comprehensive review of the revised proposal to verify that reviewer recommendations resulting from review of the initial proposal had been adequately addressed. GRC determined that all recommendations had been

adequately addressed and no further revisions would be required on 1/30. On February 28, Chancellor Leland transmitted the final Interdisciplinary Humanities CCGA Proposal to CCGA and UCOP for review.

- **Political Science CCGA Proposal:** Political Science submitted their CCGA proposal to GRC on 10/20. CAPRA, Graduate Dean Kello, CRE, UGC, ALO Martin, and the EVC were asked to opine. In general, reviews were positive, but concerns were voiced around the adequacy of resources, compliance of academic requirements with UC Merced and University of California policies, and the assessment plan. GRC discussed the results of the pre-review and agreed that further revisions were needed before soliciting outside reviews. The revised proposal was further reviewed by two non-GRC UCM Reviewers that were asked to provide feedback based on a review rubric. The UCM Reviewers raised minor points that the Political Science faculty were asked to address before submission of the proposal for administrative review, resulting in some minor revisions. At its meeting of January 29, 2013, GRC unanimously approved the revised Graduate Group proposal submitted by the Political Science faculty at UC Merced.

Committee for the Review of PLO Reports

- ALO Martin asked GRC for feedback on what type supportive feedback can be provided to graduate programs regarding their program assessment practices as reported in PLO Reports. While reviewing the template and rubric, the committee recommended implementing a sampling process for the review of PLO reports in which 1-2 PLOs are reviewed every year by graduate groups in an effort to reduce workload associated with the process. The committee also felt that the review of PLO reports points to the overall need for the campus to prevent duplicating work for faculty and staff when creating new requirements, and instead integrate PLO assessment to the extent possible into the seven-year academic program review.

CRU, MRU, and ORU Budget Proposal Tier Rankings

- Chancellor Leland and Vice Chancellor of Research Traina asked GRC to review the five budget proposals submitted through the Office of Research for a Centralized Research Unit, two Organized Research Units, a Multi-campus Research Unit, and a Research Institute. Chair Leppert recused herself from the discussion and ranking due to her position as Director of the IMF, with Vice-Chair Mostern presiding instead. Members were asked to rank the proposals into 3 tiers with 1 being the highest priority for the campus, and provide a short justification for their rankings. The committee discussed the individual member rankings and as a result of the discussion the finalized rankings are presented below.
 - Tier 1: Imaging and Microscopy Facility (IMF)
 - Tier 2: ReCCess , SNRI, HSRI
 - Tier 3: Advanced Solar Technologies Institute (UC Solar)

Faculty Research Grants

- Provost/EVC Peterson and Budget Director Jefferds have confirmed that 130K is available for faculty grants this year. GRC discussed a timeline for review of faculty research grant applications. GRC set the submission deadline to April 30, 2013 to allow the award subcommittee two weeks for review, and notification of award recipients by May 14, 2013. Members agreed to assign two reviewers to each proposal with one reviewer from the same school to provide a better level of expertise. Each reviewer was asked to provide a rating on a scale of 1-5 for merit and need. The ratings were tallied, averaged and ranked. A total of 35 proposals were received totaling \$217,651.93 in funding requests. GRC discussed proposal rankings and options for funding proposals. Members chose to fund all proposals ranked 3.75 and above.

Graduate Course Request

- **Approved CRFs**
GRC reviewed and approved 52 courses.
- **CRF Policy and Form**
The course request policy was reviewed and revised by the GRC Chair, Analyst, Registrar and ALO. GRC had no objections to the proposed changes.
- **Graduate Online CRF System**
The approval of graduate courses is a significant workload of the GRC Analyst as all graduate courses are approved by an email-based system. Chair Leppert worked with Graduate Dean Kello, UGC Chair and SOE Assistant Dean German Gavilan to begin the discussion of creating an online-system for approval of CRFs. GRC requested and received a proposal and cost estimate from SOE Assistant Dean German Gavilan. It was agreed that the graduate CRF approval system would be integrated with the Undergraduate Management System so a unified UGC/GRC CRF Workflow was created. Dean Kello spoke with Provost/EVC Peterson about the CRF on-line system and funding was made available.
- **Reoccurring Submission Deadline Calendar**
On August 22, GRC voted to adopt a reoccurring CRF and CCGA submission deadline calendar. GRC officially communicated this to graduate groups on August 23.

Graduate Group Websites

- In preparing for review of the Social and Cognitive Sciences emphasis under the IIGP program, and for submission of Political Science's CCGA proposal, GRC found a potential issue with SCS websites being in compliance with CCGA and WASC requirements. GRC discussed this issue at its October 9th meeting, and requested that ALO Martin screen the content of SCS websites. Because university website content is under the authority of the administration, GRC requested that Graduate Division determine and correct problems with compliance for all graduate studies websites. GRC

recommended that the Graduate Division work with the Office of Communications and the School Deans, to identify and implement mechanisms for addressing these immediate concerns, and for supporting the ongoing maintenance and monitoring of graduate group websites.

Graduate Program Review

- Program Review Policy and Procedures

GRC made several edits to the Program Review Policy and Procedures to: allow flexibility for the review of tracks within a graduate emphasis area, clarify the role of GRC, and align for consistency with UGC Program Review Policy and experiences of the Undergraduate Program Review Committees. GRC was then asked the Senate Chair to make additional revisions to allow the establishment of a joint Undergraduate-Graduate Program Review Committee.

- Revised Graduate Program Review Cycle

Chemistry and Chemical Biology was approved as a stand-alone graduate program by CCGA. GRC revised the Graduate Program Review Cycle to reflect the program's new review cycle.

- Social and Cognitive Sciences Program Review

Until mid-AY2012-2013, there were five different graduate group "tracks" under the Social and Cognitive Sciences (SCS) emphasis under the IIGP umbrella: Public Health, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology. SCS Graduate Group Chair Trounstine requested a deferral from review in AY2011-2012. GRC reviewed the request and responded that the program would undergo an abbreviated Program Review in AY2012-2013. In the absence of a policy for abbreviated program reviews, GRC in AY2012-2013 discussed the form and merit for requiring SCS to undergo Program Review with such a complicated dynamic. Members suggested that SCS should be reviewed as a whole or conduct separate reviews of each field based on the year students were first admitted into the program. GRC agreed to request information prior to reviewing the SCS, asking them to identify their membership, graduate students, provide a list of their last approved bylaws and policies, elect their executive committee and graduate group chair as per their by-laws, and revise their by-laws and degree requirements so that they are consistent with senate policy and the Graduate Advisors Handbook. This process was completed towards the end of AY2012-2013, and resulted in Anthropology removing itself from the SCS Emphasis and SCS renaming itself to the Social Sciences Emphasis under the IIGP umbrella. The Political Science CCGA proposal was approved in the interim, which will leave just Economics, Public Health, and Sociology as tracks under the SS Emphasis beginning in Fall 2013, once WASC approval is obtained for the Political Science graduate degree program. Review of the SS Emphasis will take place in AY2013-2014.

Graduate Recruitment Promotion Plans

- GRC was asked to provide feedback on the Graduate Recruitment Promotion Plans and felt that the campus would benefit more from the use of marketing funds to improve the graduate application system.

Graduate Student Issues

- Members reviewed the report from GSA regarding reoccurring graduate student issues and distributed the report to School Program Coordinators and Lead Deans.

Hellman Family Faculty Fund

- The last two years the Hellman Family Faculty Fund has awarded grants that are intended to support the research activities of promising Assistant Professors in their second or third years of their pre-tenure period. GRC was given the task to advise the EVC/Provost regarding the call, recommending the amount of each award, and reviewing faculty proposals. GRC discussed the UC Merced-Hellman Foundation Agreement and the 2012 Hellman Fellowship Call. Members agreed that the Hellman Committee should not be primarily GRC representatives and the Provost's Office should be responsible for finding the membership for the committee, as per agreement between the Provost's Office and DivCo in previous years. A member also recommended that the Provost's Office develop and provide clear review guidelines to the Hellman Committee so that the review of applications is not conducted on an ad-hoc basis.

Joint Senate-Administration Library Working Group

- DivCo asked GRC to revise the draft charge for a joint Senate and Administration Library Working Group in consultation with other senate committees. GRC discussed the proposed charge and membership of the Senate-Administration Library Group. The committee sent a memo to the GRC representative of the Senate-Administration Library Working Group with a charge detailing what the committee would like the representative to accomplish. Of particular concern to GRC was the resolution of: current perceived shortfall in physical library resources, apparent lack of established process for faculty consultation on acquisition of new resources, lack of campus consultation of prioritization of use of library space, and faculty consultation with the management of research data in satisfaction of federal grant requirements.

Model for Graduate Program Funding

- **AY 2012-2013**
In September, Acting Dean Kello provided an update on the model for graduate program funding. GRC was informed that the committee would no longer be receiving \$500,000 from the "Opportunity Fund Pool" previously distributed by the EVC/Provost. Graduate Programs are to be funded by USAP money as a result of new funding streams. The AY2012-13 funding model gave Schools money for fee remission and asked Schools to decide the use of USAP funds internally. Members' raised their overarching

concerns of how staff needs, recruiting needs and NRT needs to help support graduate students would be met by the combined pots of funding available to the campus. GRC discussed the concern that Schools were not aware that funding provided by the Graduate Division included graduate student funding for the summer. Dean Kello agreed to follow-up with the confusion in the School of Engineering regarding graduate group funding provided at the beginning of the year.

- **AY 2013-2014**

Graduate Program funding policies and streams for graduate students have changed every year. Dean Kello was asked to provide an update on his efforts to stabilize funding policies and streams for graduate students. As a result, GRC sent the Graduate Student Funding Stability Memo to Dean Kello on 2/22 that asked for funding model for review. Graduate Dean Kello asked GRC to opine on the draft internal funding model for graduate student research and teaching. Graduate Dean Kello provided an overview of the funding model to the committee that proposes to preserve the intentions of the original graduate division support model with one exception: TA support and fellowship support are treated separately. GRC raised concerns regarding long term funding availability, lack of incentives for faculty to support graduate students with grants, and transparency of the funding model. The suggestion was made to use weighing factors from the National Research Council to develop quantitative measurements that have some factors by disciplines that could be helpful in establishing the graduate program funding levels. Questions were raised about the NRT models which seem to be working but are not finalized with the budget office. GRC then discussed the issues with TA assignments. The current problems include: timing issues with students funded by grants at the last minute, how the TA slots are assigned to courses, low numbers of students supported by grants, and transparency of TA assignments.

Online Graduate Application System

- Last year, the Graduate Division asked for money to improve/repair the online graduate application system in the Budget Call. The request was denied; however, the Graduate Division hired a programmer to fix the immediate problems with the in-house application system and hired temporary staff to help improve the routing of applications. The Graduate Division will evaluate how the internal system works before heading towards a market system used by other institutions. At the start of the next academic year, GRC will ask for feedback from the Graduate Groups in order to assess the in-house graduate application system. GRC will review comments and provide a formal recommendation to the Graduate Dean.

Position Description: Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education

- A draft position description based on UCLA's recent search from among internal candidates was sent to search committee members on 10/29. GRC reviewed the draft position description and were concerned with the strategies for dissemination of the

position advertisement to ensure a highly qualified pool of national applicants. Chair Leppert conveyed GRC concerns to the search committee and as a result, the same search firm used for the SNS Dean and EVC searches was hired.

Requests from the Graduate Division

- First Year Fellowship

- **Guidelines:** GRC reviewed the draft 2013-2014 First Year Fellowship Guidelines and provided recommendations for revisions to the evaluation process. GRC recommended against asking graduate group chairs to write full letters of support of behalf of each fellowship candidate, for extending the deadline for graduate group nominations to avoid excluding students, and for changing the eligibility requirements for the two first year grants. The committee also requested that the Graduate Division track fellowships declinations so that fellowships can be offered to additional students. The Graduate Division requested clarification and approval on two changes to the 2013-2014 Fellowship Calls. One of the revisions made to fellowship guidelines was establishing a GPA requirement that would serve as a joint measure for review. Members were supportive of allowing more applicants by lowering the GPA requirement that would allow for exceptions to be made by each graduate program. As each graduate group puts a different weight on GPA, GRC agreed to respect each discipline and request one memo that would explain the overall graduate group ranking system used.
- **Review and Rankings:** A total of 25 applications were received for the continuing student fellowships. GRC provided the top five ranked nominees for the Miguel Velez Fellowship, Presidential Dissertation Year Fellowship, Fletcher Jones Fellowship, and Faculty Mentorship Program.

- Catalog: Graduate Studies Section

Assistant Graduate Dean Callale Concon briefed GRC on the history behind the review of the Catalog- Graduate Studies Section. Members agreed that GRC's role should only be reviewing the catalog copy for senate policy compliance and not compiling the revised graduate group sections. Moving forward, the Graduate Division will be sending the call for Catalog revisions to the graduate groups and compile them with track-changes (or equivalent) for GRC's review. GRC discussed the revision made and had no objections. The major revisions were three graduate group name changes and removal of the faculty membership. Members discussed the need for all graduate groups under the IIGP umbrella to mention that they are an emphasis and agreed to request additional revisions from the relevant graduate groups.

- Continuing Student Fellowship

- **Guidelines:** GRC was asked by the Graduate Division to provide feedback on draft 2013-2014 Continuing Student Fellowship Guidelines. The committee felt that the turnaround time for GRC and Graduate Group rankings was too short and made

revisions to the proposed timeline. GRC also suggested adding the number of fellowships that will be awarded in the calls.

- **Review and Rankings:** GRC was asked by the Graduate Division to provide a rank list of nominees for the Chancellor Graduate Fellowship and Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship. The committee sent the top six ranked applicants to the Graduate Division on 2/27. GRC was asked to provide additional rankings to the Graduate Division. The Awards subcommittee evaluated the remaining graduate group nominees and proposed a final extended ranking. GRC endorsed the subcommittee rankings on 4/30.

- **Critical Examination Outcomes**

Sister campuses do not offer the conditional pass but offer a “partial pass” outcome for examinations. On October 9, GRC was asked to address the issues concerning the overall campus policy on critical examination outcomes. GRC reviewed the subcommittee comments on the proposed language for critical examination outcomes. GRC agreed on renaming the outcomes to pass, fail, and partial pass in place of pass, fail, and retake. GRC agreed with the recommendation but had additional concerns on when a partial pass would be applicable. Members felt that a partial pass could only be applied if an examination had multiple components and each one of the components could be clearly separated, allowing for a retake of the specific failed portion.

- **Graduate Advisors Handbook**

On April 16, GRC reviewed the proposed revisions to the Graduate Advisors Handbook that addressed the issues concerning the overall campus policy on critical examination outcomes. GRC members discussed the discrepancy and other proposed revisions. GRC approved the suggested revisions and sent a formal request to the Graduate Division for revisions to the Graduate Advisors Handbook.

- **Graduate Student Services: Graduate Writing Instruction**

A graduate student writing tutor was hired by Graduate Student Services and the extent of consultation with Graduate Division and faculty is unclear. GRC agreed that tutoring for graduate students would be helpful if clear service guidelines are set between the tutor and graduate group programs. GRC recommended requiring each student who seeks the services of the tutor to sign a disclosure agreement so that the tutor is not held accountable.

- **Outstanding Graduate Student Teaching Award**

Graduate Division received a total of nine applications and three awards were given to Graduate Students in each of the three schools. GRC reviewed and approved the Award Subcommittee awardee recommendations.

Requests from Graduate Emphasis Areas/Groups

- **Campus Recharge Committee**
GRC discussed the problems with the lack of school and faculty representation on the previous recharge committee. Members were concerned with a requirement currently under discussion to require faculty approval of all instrumentation use. In the past, the recharge committee has been focused on non-research facilities and VCR Traina is proposing a new composition for a joint Senate-Administration subcommittee. Members discussed the VCR memo to Senate Chair (3/13) and supported the formation of the committee.

- **Expenditure Reports for Previous GRC Allocations**
GRC previously collected expenditure reports on GRC funds distributed to graduate groups, to consider in allocating new funding. The committee discussed the benefits of continuing to collect expenditure reports even if no funding would be allocated directly by committee. GRC agreed to not continue collecting expenditure reports.

- **Joint Senate Administration Advisory Committee on Research Safety**
Provost/EVC Peterson delegated the authority to Vice Chancellor of Research Traina to create a Joint Senate Administration Advisory Committee on Research Safety. GRC reviewed the proposed charge and had recommendations on the committee composition. Members suggested that the committee membership should include: laboratory staff, an Assistant Dean and a member from the Senate Committee on Research.

- **Laboratory Safety Management and UCLA Settlement**
Chair Leppert received a request from faculty for GRC to become involved in the new policies that will be implemented for safety management as a result of the UCLA settlement. Members agreed that GRC should be involved in the discussion and would benefit from a discussion with the new EHS Director Ott. GRC invited EHS Director Ott to discuss faculty consultation in research laboratory safety management and how the UCLA Lab Safety Settlement requirements would be met. Members agreed to send a formal request to Vice Chancellor of Research Traina to establish a joint working group for lab safety policy at UC Merced.

- **MEAM Name Change Proposal**
GRC unanimously approved a proposed name change to the Mechanical Engineering and Applied Mechanics (MEAM) Graduate Group Emphasis under the IIGP to that of Mechanical Engineering (ME) Graduate Group Emphasis under the IIGP. The name change was due to the group wishing to remove the redundancy in the old name, and did not result in any changes in faculty or student membership, by-laws, or policies & procedures.

- **PHYS-CHEM Name Change Proposal**

The IGP Physics and Chemistry Graduate Group Emphasis submitted a proposal to change the group name to IGP Physics Graduate Group Emphasis. This is a result of Chemistry and Chemical Biology (CCB) becoming an approved stand-alone graduate program and the name no longer reflecting the current membership of the graduate group. GRC reviewed the memo from the Physics Graduate Group Chair regarding the request and had no objections to the name change. GRC agreed to request an updated copy of their Bylaws, faculty membership, updated graduate student list, and their revised Policies and Procedures.

- **Physics Revised Bylaws**

GRC approved the name change of Physics with the provision that their Bylaws and Policies & Procedures would be reviewed before the end of the academic year. GRC briefly discussed the concern raised by CRE regarding the removal of a faculty member from the graduate group. Members had no additional concerns and agreed to request the revised Policies and Procedures from Physics.

- **Political Science CRFs**

Social and Cognitive Science (SCS) Graduate Group submitted CRFs indicating that approval was by vote of the Political Science faculty, which is not recognized in GRC's most recent copy of SCS group by-laws as having authority over the SCS curriculum. GRC requested a submission of a memo from the SCS Chair to GRC, indicating the CRFs have been approved by vote of the Social and Cognitive Sciences faculty, or the SCS EPC or EC in order to move forward with final approval.

- **Re-allocation of Funds Request**

In spring 2012, GRC allocated Research/Travel and Shared Equipment Awards to Faculty. A faculty member has submitted a request to GRC for re-allocation of funds within the 2012 Award. Members had no objections to grant the request for re-allocation of funds.

- **Review of Graduate Group Policies and Procedures**

GRC sent out the call for Graduate Group Policies and Procedures to ensure that changes in policies are consistent with systemwide and campus policies.

- **Revised Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) Policies and Bylaws**

EECS submitted two versions of their revised EECS Policies and Bylaws. The first version contained some problems regarding the transfer of credit policy for PhD students as the Graduate Advisors Handbook only allows courses for PhD students to be waived, not transferred, from non-UC institutions. The second version approved by GRC addressed rights of affiliate faculty and waiver of coursework requirement for Ph.D. students transferring from another institution or coming in with a M.S. GRC had no objections and approved the revised EECS Policies and Procedures.

- **SCS Name Change Proposal**

At its meeting of November 20, GRC unanimously approved a proposed name change to the Social and Cognitive Sciences (SCS) Graduate Group Emphasis under the IIGP to that of Social Sciences Graduate Group Emphasis under the IIGP. This name change reflected the current membership of the Graduate Group Emphasis, as Cognitive Sciences established their own CCGA-approved graduate program.

- **Social Sciences Revised Bylaws**

As part of the information requested in advance of Program Review, GRC requested a new set of bylaws for review. The new document is expected to become binding for students enrolling in 2013-2014. GRC reviewed the suggestions received from CRE regarding the need to define the role of the faculty advisor. Members had no additional concerns and agreed to approve the revised Social Sciences Bylaws.

Request to Renew the Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP)

- The Graduate and Research Council (GRC) unanimously voted to renew the Interim Individual Graduate Program (IIGP). The IIGP was put in place to incubate disciplinary and interdisciplinary graduate programs at UC Merced. Given the support that the IIGP has provided in successfully growing the graduate programs at UC Merced, GRC requested an extension of the IIGP for AY 2013-2014 to CCGA that was granted on 6/5.

Review Requests from DivCo

- **Academic Honesty Task Force**

Last year, DivCo charged a task force with revisions to the academic honesty policy this year. A GRC representative was requested and GRC send a request to all Graduate Groups for a volunteer. Professor Evan Heit volunteered and GRC forwarded the official appointment recommendation to CoC.

- **Draft 2013 WASC Accreditation Handbook**

The Policy Subcommittee reviewed the draft 2013 WASC Accreditation Handbook and the concern was raised regarding the approach that WASC has taken with graduate education. GRC reviewed the subcommittee comments and forwarded final comments to DivCo regarding the meaning, quality, and integrity of the doctorate degree. Members recommended that doctoral degrees should be defined instead by two simple standards that form the real basis by which students preparing to graduate with a PhD are judged – originality of work presented in fulfillment of degree requirements, and demonstration that the student has attained peer status with other PhDs in the field who have graduated from peer institutions. GRC noted that while the effort to change and streamline the development and maintenance of ‘assessment infrastructure’ is notable and in the right direction, in general, the level of bureaucratic book-keeping proposed in the 2013 WASC Handbook may not necessarily be helpful and may shift needed resources and time away from faculty.

- **Draft Long Range Enrollment Plan**
GRC was asked to review the draft 2013 Long Range Enrollment Plan (LREP) that would determine the development of graduate programs and research capabilities. GRC felt that submitting two scenarios to UCOP for consideration would be helpful as it was unclear how enrollment projections would impact future funding.

- **Draft- UC Merced Principles of Assessment**
GRC reviewed the draft principles drafted by the Campus Working Group on Assessment and while the intent of the document was understood the committee felt it would be helpful to know the context in which the principles would be used, how they would be applied, and implications of their adoption and broader dissemination, in order to better evaluate their suitability. GRC recommended (1) adding language to address the specific base on which assessment could be done using direct and indirect lines of evidence, and (2) adding a principle that addresses assessment of the evolution of individual success and creative thought as graduate students become more advanced in their education.

- **English and Spanish Undergraduate Majors**
UGC extended the consultation process and invited GRC to comment on the proposals to establish a B.A. in English and a B.A. in Spanish. Members had no comments on the proposals.

- **Establishment of a Joint Graduate-Undergraduate Program Review Committee**
Senate Chair O'Day sent a memo to UGC and GRC requesting both committees to jointly revise the current graduate and undergraduate program review policies to form an joint PRC subcommittee of both GRC and UGC, without the stipulation that PRC members also serve as members of UGC or GRC. GRC discussed the joint committee membership, policies, and responsibilities. The suggestion was made to look at the entire academic program review process with administration during the strategic planning process.

- **Graduate-level WASC Substantive Change Review & Program Assessment**
Chris Kello, Acting Dean of the Graduate Division and Laura Martin, Coordinator for Institutional Assessment asked for recommendations on how to most effectively leverage a new half-time position dedicated to supporting the development and implementation of graduate level program assessment, including related support for CCGA and WASC Substantive Change proposal development. GRC reviewed the request and agreed that some degree of coordination was needed for graduate assessment and defining the role for this position should not result in removing the burden of support for graduate program assessment, and CCGA and WASC substantive change proposals, from the assessment staff in the schools.

- **Life and Environmental Sciences Bylaw 55 Unit Proposal**
Following the establishment of four bylaw units in the School of Natural Sciences the remaining faculty submitted a proposal to establish the Life and Environmental Sciences (LES) Bylaw 55 unit. GRC discussed the potential issue that may arise since the membership of the Bylaw 55 Unit is non-continuous with the membership of the graduate and undergraduate programs associated with it. GRC submitted a memo to DivCo regarding the membership issue that would present challenges and recommended that the Bylaw 55 Unit be mindful of the needs of the graduate and undergraduate programs in future planning. GRC also noted that the LES Bylaw 55 Unit proposal points to the overall challenge of the structuring of interdisciplinary programs on campus when non-continuous with a Bylaw 55 Unit.

- **Long-Range Development Plan**
The Chancellor and Provost proposed amendments to the 2009 campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for presentation to and approval by the UC Board of Regents in May. GRC had a preliminary discussion on the proposed amendments and noted that no indication was made of additional parking and the use of the public-private partnership funds to pay for parking garages which cannot be done with state funds.

- **Political Science and Sociology Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals**
In general, members had no objections to establishing the Political Science and Sociology Bylaw 55 Units. However, GRC noted that the Bylaw 55 Unit proposals point to the overall need for the campus to consider the creation of discipline-based Bylaw 55 Units, their infrastructure requirements and impact on faculty and staff workload, and how they support the interdisciplinary mission of campus.

- **Proposed 2013 Summer Session Calendar**
GRC has reviewed the proposed 2013 Summer Session Calendar. In general, members had no objections to the proposed calendar. However, GRC would like to note the overall need for the campus to consider the impact of the proposed change on graduate student support (TA funding).

- **Reorganization of Senate Committee Structure and Membership**
GRC was asked to provide feedback on the possible reorganization of the Senate standing committee structure. Members strongly agreed with the proposed GRC committee split that may streamline committee workload. A memo was sent to DivCo with feedback and a proposed division of committee duties for consideration.

- **Revised MAPP**
In response to the request by DivCo, GRC reviewed the newly revised MAPP and had no objections.

- **SACAP Charge and Composition**

GRC reviewed SACAP's charge and composition, and agrees that its present structure and charge should be reviewed and revised as necessary in order to better contextualize it within overall senate and administration assessment and program review efforts currently underway at UC Merced.

- **WASC Graduate Student Success Indicators**

GRC review the WASC draft set of templates for documenting and evaluating student success at the graduate level and forwarded its comments to DivCo. GRC has several major concerns regarding (1) the lack of adequate staff support for additional assessment needs, (2) the feasibility and benefit of aggregating the data by degree type as proposed by WASC, and (3) WASC has not provided any information on how the data would be evaluated, what type of data would be acceptable, or the implications after the data is submitted.

Senate Awards

- An ad-hoc subcommittee reviewed and selected nominees for three distinguished faculty awards:
 - Senate Distinguished Graduate Teaching/Mentorship Award- One nomination was received.
 - Senate Award for Distinguished Early Career Research- Six nominations were received.
 - Senate Award for Distinction in Research: two nominations were received.

Systemwide Business

- **Systemwide Items Reviewed by GRC**

- **New APM-430, Visiting Scholars:** GRC reviewed the proposed new [APM-430](#) that accommodates students and academics visiting the University of California and had no objections or additional comments.
- **Open Access Policy:** GRC reviewed the proposed [Open Access Policy](#) developed by University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). In general, the committee was supportive of the intention behind the proposed policy but believed that faculty buy-in would be difficult to achieve. GRC also felt that the proposed policy did not address the potential resource cost and staff time to implement, the impact on faculty time should be minimized, and the public access and mechanism for retrieval of deposited open-access articles must be very transparent.
- **Rebenching and Enrollment Management Principles:** GRC reviewed the [Rebenching Budget Committee Report](#) and [Enrollment Management Principles in the Context of Rebenching](#). GRC suggested getting clarity as to whether a new memorandum would be developed and how long it would last to help define when the rebenching criteria would be relevant for the campus. The committee raised

their concern of the scaling factor for funding different kinds of students as it seems to penalize campuses without a medical program and seems to go counter to the core tenant that the quality of instruction is the same across the different campuses. GRC also found that mechanism for determining how the off-the-top allocation is made is not clearly defined and can be seen as further means of favoring schools with medical and professional programs.

- **Revised APM Section 241, Faculty Administrators (Positions Less than 100%):** GRC was asked to opine on the proposed revisions to [APM Section 241](#) and declined to comment. The proposed revisions bring APM 241 into conformance with Regents Policy 2307 in its specification of how systemwide Multi-campus Research Unit (MRU) directors are chosen
 - **Revised APM Section IV, Salary Administration (APM 600 Series):** GRC was asked to opine on the proposed revisions to [APM Section IV](#) and declined to comment. The proposed revisions are updating outdated delegations of authority, technical corrections, congruent formatting with overall APM, and replaces payroll system with UC Path initiative component to build a systemwide Shared Service Center.
 - **Revisions to APM-700, Leaves of Absence/General:** GRC reviewed the proposed systemwide revisions to [APM-700](#) and had no objections to the proposed revision that address the need for a presumptive resignation policy.
 - **Systemwide EH&S Policies:** On January 24, 2013, the campus Human Resources emailed a notification of formal review of proposed systemwide EH&S Polices. No consultation was made with Senate in drafting the proposed policies: [Lab Safety Training Policy](#), [Minors in Labs Policy](#) and [Personal Protective Equipment Policy](#). Due to the short turn around request, Chair Leppert drafted memos in response to the policies proposed for committee feedback. Another memo was drafted asking for senate consultation for proposed laboratory research policies.
- **Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA)**
GRC Chair Valerie Leppert reports on CCGA activities included the following:
- CCGA decision to allow program submitting a CCGA proposal to solicit two external reviews that may replace two CCGA solicited reviews.
 - Draft 2013 WASC Accreditation Handbook
 - Review of Self-Supported Graduate Program Policies
 - Issues for student tuition with Self-Supported Graduate Programs
 - Review of the Political Science CCGA Proposal
 - Review of the Interdisciplinary Humanities CCGA Proposal
 - Review of the Applied Mathematics CCGA Proposal
- **University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)**
GRC Vice Chair Ruth Mostern reports on UCOLASC activities included the following:
- Open Access Policy
 - UC Press

- Composite Benefit Rates- UCOP has proposed changes to the benefit rates for health and retirement that will impact faculty summer salaries.

- **University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP)**

GRC Representative Michael Cleary reports on UCORP activities included the following:

- Composite Benefit Rates- UCORP discussed the Composite Benefit Rates proposed for faculty summer salaries between 12 to 34%. UCORP wants examples on how this will affect UCM grants. Different rates have been proposed for post-doctoral scholars and each campus will have to negotiate the rates for charging sabbaticals.
- Open Access Policy- UCORP remains concerned regarding the copyright issue and indirect cost on libraries resulting from having to offset any cost for subscriptions.
- Portfolio Review Group will be composed of faculty and administration, and will be responsible for reviewing multi-campus research initiatives to rank and determine the systemwide funding priorities.
- UC investment in research and how it impacts the systemwide mission in teaching and education.
- Lab Safety Management and new policies to be implemented as a result of the UCLA Settlement.

GRC also benefited from consultation and reports throughout the year from the Vice Chancellor for Research Traina and the Provost/EVC Peterson.

Respectfully submitted,

Valerie Leppert, Chair (ENG), CCGA Representative

Ruth Mostern, Vice Chair (SSHA)

Erin Johnson (NS)

Roummel Marcia (NS)

Sayantani Ghosh(NS)

Stefano Carpin (ENG)

David Noelle (SSHA)

Jason Hein (NS)

Ex-Officio

Peggy O'Day, Divisional Council Chair (NS)

Ignacio López-Calvo, Divisional Council Vice Chair (SSHA)

Chris Kello, Acting Dean of the Graduate Division (SSHA)

Student Representative

Kristynn Sullivan (SSHA)

Senate Staff

Mayra Chavez, Senate Analyst

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ELECTIONS
ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013

TO THE MERCED DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

In academic year 2012-2013, the CRE conducted business via teleconference, e-mail and in person meetings.

GENERAL PROCEDURES

The Committee on Rules and Elections (CRE) issues formal Legislative Rulings to resolve disputes or clear up ambiguities regarding Senate authority, procedures, or jurisdiction. Legislative Rulings are binding unless modified by subsequent legislation or action from the Board of Regents. CRE also prepares and reports to the Division, or to any of its Faculties, such changes and additions to their Bylaws and Regulations as it deems advisable; formally supervises all changes and additions to the Bylaws and Regulations proposed by other committees or by individuals; edits and publishes the Manual of the Merced Division at such intervals as it deems expedient; and determines whether a person meets the conditions for membership in the Division.

FORMAL LEGISLATIVE RULINGS ISSUED

CRE made no formal legislative rulings in AY 2012-2013.

UC MERCED BYLAW REVISIONS

CRE presented at the Meeting of the Division on April 4, 2013 substantial edits to the UCM Bylaws and the edits were approved through an electronic ballot in May 21, 2013. The following substantive changes were made:

- **Bylaws I.IV.2.D, I.IV.2.E, II.II.4.F, II.II.4.G, II.III. 7 and II.IV.3:** Graduate and Research Council (GRC) split into two new standing committees: Graduate Council and Committee on Research. The current workload of GRC is substantially greater than for most other Senate standing committees, which is a deterrent to faculty service and leads to a lack of committee focus on specific issues and topics.
- **Bylaws I.IV.2. M, II.II.4.B, and II.III.5:** Expanding duties of Faculty Welfare into Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom. The scope of duties of the Faculty Welfare committee in our bylaws is restricted to welfare issues such as salary, benefits, retirement, and conditions of employment. We currently have no standing committees that explicitly handle Senate issues related to diversity or academic freedom.
- **Bylaws II.IV.1.A:** Changing membership of CAPRA, removing Vice Chairs of GRC/UGC, and adding representatives from Schools. Our current practice of assigning CAPRA membership to the Vice Chairs of Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council has not been as effective as hoped, primarily because of the workload demand within those committees. Furthermore, Division Council recognizes a need for stronger ties and better communication with School Senate Committees and Deans related to planning and resource allocation.

- **Bylaws I.IV.A.4, I.IV.A.5, I.IV.A.6:** Expanding membership of Division Council to include the chairs of the two split GRC committees (Graduate Council / Research), and include the chair of Faculty Welfare, Diversity, and Academic Freedom. Given the importance of both graduate studies and research to the success of our campus, we feel that Chairs of each of these committees should be included in the voting membership of Division Council. In addition, the importance of faculty welfare, diversity, and academic freedom on our campus likewise calls for Chair membership on Division Council.
- **Bylaws II.IV.2.A:** Adding an additional member to the Undergraduate Council. While there is an overall agreement to split UGC, further discussion is needed whether a split is feasible for implementation. An additional member would help ease some burden from committee's high workload and allow concerns for splitting the committee to be addressed.

CRE sent the substantive change revisions to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) for approval. UCRJ approved the bylaw revisions on July 23, 2013.

SCHOOL BYLAW REVISIONS

School of Engineering (SOE) Bylaws

CRE corresponded over email regarding the proposed revisions to the SOE Bylaws and no substantive concerns were raised. CRE had some minor suggestions summarized below.

- In the event that a Vice Chair does not want to be chair upon the second year, there should be some agreement in place regarding election of a new Chair in the election description of ENG3.1 (it is included in ENG4.1.1). This suggestion is just aesthetics.
- In ENG4.1.1, this phrase is not entirely clear: "and up to the larger of the number of undergraduate programs and seven (7) voting members of the Faculty". If CRF noted that it is not clear how the undergraduate program representation will be determined.
- ENG4.3 seems unnecessary (it is within their power by default to form ad hoc committees).
- ENG7.3, in the spirit of senate deliberation secret ballots may be necessary under circumstances of personnel issues. However, traditionally, all other matters are typically discussed by members of schools as a deliberative body. In a deliberative body, it is customary that no voting member be denied the right to summon a roll call. CRE felt that it would be fine if the SOE faculty chose to maintain this as it is, but secret ballots are not part of the parliamentary tradition of a deliberative body.

School of Natural Sciences (SNS) Bylaws

CRE was asked to review the revision to the SNS Bylaws for compliance. CRE identified recommendations and forwarded them to the SNS Chair for consideration. Below is a list of the recommendations.

- ***Role of Administration Representatives:*** Clarify the role of administrative representatives on committees (5.a.i.e, 5.b.i). As a matter of process, systemwide bylaws have ex officio members as non-voting.

- ***Delegation of Authority:*** It is acceptable for the curriculum committee to approve such issues listed under 5.b.iii. Currently it indicates that *recommendations* of approval are made, but at the school level, it is acceptable for the executive committee to delegate the final school-level approval of relevant measures to the curriculum committee.
- ***Instructors in Residence:*** As the voting rights of Instructors in Residence with less than two years of service are governed by the Regents Standing Order 105.A, CRE discussed whether it was necessary to mention it in the bylaws. CRE felt that these voting rights only needed to be included to help maintain compliance in issues of membership and voting only.

REVIEW REQUEST ITEMS FROM DIVCO

Campus

- ***Applied Mathematics CCGA Proposal:*** CRE corresponded over email and paid special attention to the proposed Graduate Group Bylaws. No issues were raised by the committee.
- ***Draft 2013 WASC Handbook of Accreditation:*** CRE chose not to opine as the handbook did not require an interpretation, legislative ruling, advise or change to the UCM Bylaws and Regulations.
- ***English and Spanish B.A. Proposals:*** As requested by DivCo, CRE discussed the proposals for new English and Spanish majors. The committee members did not perceive any issues with regard to rules, and recommended moving forward with these proposals.
- ***Interdisciplinary Humanities CCGA Proposal:*** CRE corresponded over email and paid special attention to the proposed Graduate Group Bylaws. No issues were raised by the committee.
- ***Life and Environmental Sciences (LES) Bylaw 55 Unit:*** The committee identified no major issues, and supported moving forward with the proposal. One comment was raised regarding personnel procedures included in the LES Bylaws. According to APM 245, chairs are responsible for final recommendation on personnel cases since it's the chair's obligations (after consultation with relevant faculty). CRE suggested that the transmittal letter procedure may be supplemented with this detail because, in the proposal, it is implied that the letter goes directly from the faculty vote to the Dean, though the explicit recommendation by the chair is specified in APM 245.
- ***Political Science and Sociology Bylaw 55 Unit Proposals:*** CRE reviewed the two new Bylaw 55 Unit proposals in the School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts. The committee identified no major issues and recommended moving forward with these new units.
- ***Political Science CCGA Proposal:*** CRE corresponded over email and paid special attention to the proposed Graduate Group Bylaws. No issues were raised by the committee.
- ***School Executive Committees:*** At the DivCo August 30 meeting, CRE was charged with assisting the Schools with the election of their new Chairs and Executive Committees for the 2012-2013 academic year. The School of Engineering and School of Social Sciences,

Humanities and Arts elected their School Executive Committees by early Fall 2013. CRE worked with former Faculty Chair of the School of Natural Sciences to help facilitate the election of the School Executive Committee.

- ***School Executive Committees Advisory Document:*** Chair O'Day drafted a Shared Governance advisory document for Deans and School Executive Committees. CRE suggested that explicit language should be added for any committees that have final sign-off for the School (e.g. courses and curriculum). The committee also felt that the Executive Committee should opine on where the new FTE go and should not opine on Academic Personnel matters.
- ***Systemwide Review Items- Rebenching and Enrollment Management, Revisions to APM 700 and New APM Section 430:*** CRE chose not to opine on the review of the proposed revisions to APM-700 and new APPM Section 430, as the proposed revisions and policy do not require an interpretation, legislative ruling, advice or changes to the UCM Bylaws and Regulations.

OTHER BUSINESS

- ***Conflict of Interest Policy:*** CRE has considered a number of potential COI issues this semester, and the committee corresponded over email about the nature of Senate activities and what circumstances should prompt a COI concern. These issues were resolved, but CRE felt they presented an opportunity to clarify Senate COI, and set the groundwork for a policy of some kind. After CRE discussions, and consultations with committees on other campuses, CRE recommended to DivCo adopting an "open model" for establishing a COI policy. DivCo discussed the "open model" and endorsed testing model in AY 2013-2014.
- ***FTE Allocation Process-*** CRE determined that Senate participates in FTE Allocation Process but does not own it (noting in the APM or the Bylaws say how positions are allocated) and bylaw 55 units are the only Senate agencies authorized to actually vote on an appointment, therefore Bylaw 55 Unit buy-in is required or nothing useful will happen.

REQUESTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

- ***Social and Cognitive Sciences (SCS) Graduate Group Membership Procedure:*** CRE was asked by GRC to opine on the opt-in procedure used by SCS to update their graduate group membership. Previously, SCS had by consent added faculty in certain disciplines as they were hired into SSHA and only two remaining members seem to have joined according to the SCS approved Bylaws. CRE felt that this was not a serious issue to consider for compliance as the message was broadcast widely.
- ***Social Sciences Graduate Group Bylaws:*** CRE reviewed the revised graduate group bylaws and found that as much as the group would like to bind the Dean and Chancellor in the appointment of their Graduate Group Chair the faculty could only advise. CRE felt that it would helpful to include language that determines the role of faculty advisors.

- **Physics Graduate Group Bylaws:** CRE reviewed the revised graduate group bylaws and cautioned the wording used for removing a faculty member from a graduate group.
- **UGC CRF Subcommittee Conflict of Interest:** CRE was asked to opine on a potential Conflict of Interest (COI) issue in UGC. A UGC faculty member is a CRF Subcommittee member and a SSHA Curriculum Committee member, courses in the faculty members group have reached UGC for action and the committee asked if it warranted raising a COI issue. CRE concluded that as a deliberative body, UGC should only be concerned about COI issues if there are substantial personal benefits confounded in such deliberation. This may be an issue if someone's *own* class is seeking approval (in such a case the person may recuse themselves from *that specific motion only*). However, generally speaking, a COI is not an issue if it concerns the group a person belongs to; if anything, their role is to represent such groups within a deliberative body.

ELECTIONS

- **Academic Senate Election:** The call for nominations for four positions on the Committee on Committees and one At-large member of the Divisional Council was distributed to the Senate membership on February 14, 2013. All positions for both committees were for two-year terms. Nominating petitions required five signatures including the signature of the candidate showing willingness to serve and were due to the Senate office on February 28. CRE extended the nomination period to allow nominations to be returned to the Senate Office on March 18. An electronic election ballot was created on UCM CROPS and sent to all Senate members on April 3. The last day of the election was April 10. The ballot included four nominees for CoC and two nominees for the DivCo At-Large vacancy. The electorate was asked to submit write-in candidates for both committees. The four CoC candidates were voted into office.
- **New Online Voting System:** CRE worked with the Cognitive & Information Sciences Unit, IT Department and UC Merced's Central Authentication Service to develop a login system to facilitate the distribution and marking of ballots for the Academic Senate. The system shows current and past ballots without storing the User ID. Members were asked to provide feedback to improve the new system. All feedback received by CRE was positive. CRE found that the new voting system increased faculty participation by 15%.
- **Special Election:** As one of elected candidates for Committee on Committees (CoC) was not able to serve, CRE held a special election for a final vacancy on the committee. The call for nominations for this position was sent on April 23, 2013 and closed on May 6, 2013. Only one nomination was received and an electronic ballot was created using a new online voting system. The ballot was open for voting from June 26, 2013 and closed on July 9, 2013.

NEXT YEAR'S BUSINESS

- Review Graduate Group Bylaws to make sure they're complaint with campus and systemwide policies.
- Review the [Undergraduate](#) and [Graduate](#) Handbooks to make sure they're aligned with updated UC Merced Bylaws and Regulations.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Dale, Chair (SSHA)
Peter Berck (UC Berkeley)
Paul Almeida (SSHA)
Peter Vanderschraaf (SSHA)

Ex-Officio:

Peggy O'Day, Divisional Chair (SNS)
Ignacio López-Calvo, Divisional Vice Chair (SSHA)

Senate Staff:

Mayra Chavez, Senate Analyst

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)
ANNUAL REPORT
2012-2013**

To The Merced Division of the Academic Senate:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its standing subcommittees held a total of 9 regularly scheduled in person meetings and conducted some business via email with respect to its duties as outlined in UC Merced's Senate [Bylaw II.4.B](#). Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate subcommittee(s), followed by full Council review. The issues that UGC considered this year are described briefly below.

Undergraduate Council Organization

The Undergraduate Council designated several subcommittees that met separately throughout the year:

- General Education
Anne Zanzucchi, Kelvin Lwin, Henry Forman (non-UGC member) and VPUE Jack Vevea (ex-officio)
- Program Review
Cristián Ricci (Chair), Virginia Adan-Lifante (UGC), Jeffrey Gilger, Tanya Golash-Boza, Mukesh Singhal
- Admissions/Financial Aid
Virginia Adan-Lifante, Wei-Chun Chin, Mike Beman and Chon Ruiz (ex-officio)
- Undergraduate Academic Programs/Policies/Courses
Sholeh Quinn and Lei, Yue

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

Academic Program Reviews

- UGC approved the School of Engineering's request to defer the CSE (Computer Science and Engineering) program review for one year.
- UGC accepted the Chemistry, Economics, Cognitive Science and History program review reports and made recommendations to the Administration to close the reviews of those programs. The Management program review site visit will take place in Fall 2013.

Admissions

UGC received reports from the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jane Lawrence and Director of Admissions Ruiz. Items discussed included admissions, enrollment data, recruiting, and scholarships. The UGC admissions subcommittee collaborated with the UCM Office of Admissions to discuss Admission policies and enrollment data.

Catalog

In accordance with the UGC Academic Program Calendar distributed to Schools early in the academic year, the three Schools submitted to UGC their respective sections of the Catalog. UGC reviewed revised sections of the Catalog and provided feedback to the Office of the Registrar in April for SSHA and June for SOE and SNS.

Courses and CRF System

According to the UCM Bylaws, UGC is charged on behalf of the Division to review and approve all new undergraduate courses and modifications to existing undergraduate courses, including withdrawal, conduct, credit evaluation, description, and classification of existing courses. The UGC analyst transmitted CRFs to UGC via the web-based system. UGC reviewed and approved over 160 courses, changes to existing courses and discontinuation of courses. In academic year 2013-2014, a joint undergraduate/graduate CRF will be implemented.

Items Reviewed/Approved/Revised by UGC

- **Life and Environmental Sciences Bylaw 55 Unit Proposal:** UGC recommended approval of the establishment of LES Bylaw 55 Unit in the School of Natural Sciences (9/26/12).
- **Principles of Assessment:** UGC reviewed and provided comments to the Division Council on the proposed Principles of Assessment proposed by the Campus Assessment Working Group (10/12/12).
- **Changes to CROPS system:** UGC sent a memo to the Registrar and to the LMS Committee outlining some concerns expressed by faculty regarding changes to the CROPS system, specifically, changes that allow instructors and TAs to be automatically added as “Instructors” and have equal rights in assigning and altering grades (10/15/12).
- **Political Science and Sociology Bylaw Units Proposals:** Although the review and approval of this proposal was not under the purview of UGC, the majority of members expressed a favorable opinion for its establishment. Among the aspects of the proposal that were briefly discussed, UGC highlighted its interdisciplinary breadth, with affiliate faculty from disciplines such as Economics, Cognitive Science, Philosophy, and Psychology. The proposal’s interdisciplinary focus and student-centered research opportunities might be important priorities for both degree programs (BA and MA/PhD). Comments were sent to the Division Council on 11/14/12.
- **Summer 2013 Calendar:** UGC provided comments to DivCo on the proposal to add a six-week summer session to follow the first session (12/5/12).
- **WASC Revised Handbook:** The WASC process was redesigned with a focus on accountability for student learning and student success. The revised handbook reflects a shift from improvement orientation to accountability orientation. UGC comments on the Handbook revisions were sent to the ALO on 12/14/12.
- **MAPP:** Comments were sent to DivCo for transmittal to APO (3/20/13).

- **SSHA Amendment to PSY Major and Minor Exit Requirement:** Under this proposal, students who major and minor in Psychology are no longer required to complete the PSY Exit Exam requirement for graduation from UCM. Council members approved this request effective immediately and recommended retroactive approval for all students who were admitted from Fall 2009 to Spring 2012.
- **B.A. in English and B.A. in Spanish** - On February 6, 2013, UGC voted electronically and unanimously approved both majors, effective Fall 2013.
- **Request from VCSA to institutionalize Mid-Semester Grade Reporting** – In 2005, UGC approved the proposal for a 3-year trial to require mid-semester grade reporting for all lower division courses. In 2008, informed by the effectiveness of the program and student satisfaction with it, UGC approved a five year continuation, ending in 2013. UGC approved the VCSA’s request to institutionalize mid-semester grade reporting.

Systemwide Review Items

- **UCOLASC Open Access Policy:** UGC discussed the Open Access Policy developed by the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). The Council fully supported the Policy and felt that public access to research done by University of California faculty will be beneficial to undergraduate students who, once the policy is implemented, will themselves be able to enjoy open access to such research both before they enter the university and after they graduate.
- **Rebenching Committee Report and Recommendations:** The goal of rebenching is to ensure that money is equally distributed across campuses according to the size of the student population. This will not apply to UCM for several years due to the campus’ small size. UGC discussed but did not provide formal comments to DivCo.
- **Proposed Revisions to APM 430 - Visiting Scholars:** The proposed policy was drafted in response to campus requests to create a new title to accommodate domestic and international visitors who are students enrolled in universities in the US and abroad, and academics employed at other institutions who are visiting the University of California for short-term academic or cultural exchange experiences. Rebecca Sweeley, Director of the Office of International Relations, provided a brief overview of the issue as it relates to visas. UGC had no objections to the proposed policy.
- **Proposed Revisions to APM 700 – Leaves of Absence:** This revision would create a presumption of resignation and spell out procedures for notifying the academic employee of that presumption in certain circumstances in which an academic employee is absent from his/her duties without having secured a leave of absence. UGC had no objections to the proposed policy.

Upcoming Business

- Proposed Revisions to SACAP Charge and Membership
- Academic Honesty Policy Task Force
In AY 11-12 UGC developed a charge for a task force that would revise the Academic Honesty Policy. Membership of the committee will consist of a UGC member, a GRC member, the Coordinator for Institutional Assessment, students, and staff.
- Policy for Program Reviews
- Procedures for Discontinuing Minors
- Revisit Online Course Policy

UGC Guests

- On 11/14/12, Laura Martin, campus ALO and Coordinator of Institutional Assessment, spoke to UGC about the WASC revised Handbook.
- Rebecca Sweeley, Director, International Affairs participated in UGC meetings to report on International Affairs and EAP.
- Diana Ralls, Director, Financial Aid and Scholarships updated members on Regents
- The Regents' Scholarship; Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) and Return to Aid Fund
- Professors Goggans, Brokaw, López-Calvo and Martin-Rodriguez attended the January 17 meeting to answer questions about the English and Spanish majors.
- UC Online Education Interim Director Keith Williams gave a presentation on Online Education in February 2013.

Systemwide Representation

BOARS: Professor J. Michael Beman (SNS) – non UGC member

UCEP: Professor Cristián Ricci, UGC Chair (SSHA)

UCIE: Professor Katherine Brokaw (SSHA) – non-UGC member

UCOPE: Professor Suzanne Sindi (SNS) – non-UGC member

Regular reports on the activities of UCEP, General Education and CAPRA were provided at the UGC meetings.

Respectfully Submitted:

- [Cristian Ricci](#), Chair, School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts, [UCEP](#) Representative
- [Jay Sharping](#), Vice Chair (Spring Term Only), School of Natural Sciences
- [Virginia Adan-Lifante](#), School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
- [Wei-Chun Chin](#) (Fall Term Only), School of Engineering
- [Teamrat Ghezzehei](#), School of Natural Sciences
- [Kelvin Lwin](#), School of Engineering
- [Sholeh Quinn](#) (Fall Term Only), School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts

- [Florin Rusu](#), School of Engineering
- [Lei, Yue](#), School of Natural Sciences
- Anne Zanzucchi, School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
- Jacob Gutierrez, Undergraduate Student Representative (Non-Voting)

Ex-Officio (Non-Voting):

- Jane F. Lawrence, Vice Chancellor for [Student Affairs](#)
- [Jack Vevea](#), Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
- [Peggy O'Day](#), Senate Chair, School of Natural Sciences
- [Ignacio Lopez-Calvo](#), Senate Vice Chair, School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts

Unit 18 Lecturer Representatives (Non-voting):

- Kamal Dulai, School of Natural Sciences
- Melissa Fabros, Merritt Writing Program

Staff:

Fatima Paul

REGULATIONS OF THE MERCED DIVISION

PART I GENERAL REGULATIONS UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

50. GRADES (Am 30 Jan 08)

A. Grading System

UC Merced's grading system is as follows.

A	Excellent
B	Good
C	Fair
D	Barely passing
F	Not passing
P	Passed (grade of C- or better by an undergraduate student)
S	Satisfactory (passed at a minimum level of B or better by a graduate student)
NP	Not passed
U	Unsatisfactory
I	Incomplete
IP	In progress
W	Withdrew
NR	No report (when an instructor fails to report a grade for a student)

a. Credit Toward Degree Requirements

A course in which the grade A, B, C, D, P or S is received is counted toward degree requirements. A course in which the grade F or NP is received is not counted toward degree requirements. Grades of I or IP are not counted until such times as they are replaced by grades A, B, C, D, P or S.

b. Grade Points

Grades of A, B, C and D may be modified by a plus (+) or minus (-). Grade points are assigned as follows: A+ = 4.0; A = 4.0; A- = 3.7; B+ = 3.3; B = 3.0; B- = 2.7; C+ = 2.3; C = 2.0; C- = 1.7; D+ = 1.3; D = 1.0; D- = 0.7; F = 0.0; I = 0.0; P/NP = n/a. The grades P, S, NP, U, I, and IP carry no grade points and the units in courses so graded are excluded in determination of the grade-point average.

B. Change of Grade

All grades except Incomplete and In-Progress are considered final when assigned by an instructor at the end of a term. An instructor may request a change of grade when a computational or procedural error occurred in the original assignment of a grade, but a grade

may not be changed as a result of re-evaluation of a student's work. No final grade may be revised as a result of reexamination or the submission of additional work after the close of term.

C. Incomplete (I)

The grade of I may be assigned when the instructor determines that a student's work is of passing quality and represents a significant portion of the requirements for a final grade, but is incomplete for a good cause. (Good cause may include current illness, serious personal problems, an accident, a recent death in the immediate family, a large and necessary increase in working hours or other situations of equal gravity.) It is the student's responsibility to obtain written permission from the instructor to receive an I grade as opposed to a nonpassing grade. The Incomplete petition is available from the Registrar and it must be filed prior to the end of the final examination period.

If an I grade is assigned, students may receive unit credit and grade points by satisfactorily completing the coursework as specified by the instructor. Students should not reenroll in the course; if they do, it is recorded twice on the transcript. Once an I grade is assigned, it remains permanently on the transcript along with the passing grade students may later receive for that course.

I grades are not counted in computing the grade point average. An I grade received in the fall term must be replaced by the first day of instruction in the following fall term. An I grade received in the spring or summer terms must be replaced by the first day of instruction in the following spring term.

Except as noted below, any I grade that has not been replaced within the above deadlines will be converted to grade F (or NP/U if taken passed/not passed). After that time, but not retroactively, the grade is counted in computing a student's grade-point average.

Exception: If a degree is conferred before the end of the above deadlines following the assignment of an I grade, the grade will not be converted to an F (or NP/U). However, the student still has the option of removing the I grade within the above deadlines.

Students with 15 or more units of I on their record may not register without permission of the appropriate Dean.

D. In Progress (IP)

For a course extending over more than one term, where the evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final term, provisional grades of In Progress (IP) shall be assigned in the intervening terms. The provisional grades shall be replaced by the final grade, if the student completes the full sequence. The grade IP is not included in the grade-point average. If the full sequence of courses is not completed, the IP will be replaced by a grade

of Incomplete. Further changes in the student's record will be subject to the rules pertaining to I grades.

E. Passed/Not Passed (P/NP)

Undergraduate students in good standing who are enrolled in at least 12 units may take certain courses on a Passed/Not Passed (P/NP) basis. Students may enroll in one course each term on a P/NP basis (two courses if they have not elected the P/NP in the preceding term).

Changes to and from the P/NP option must be made during the enrollment period. No changes can be made after the first two weeks of classes without the approval of the appropriate Dean.

The grade P is assigned for a letter grade of C- or better. If the student earns a grade of D+ or below, the grade will be recorded as NP. In both cases, the student's grade will not be computed into the grade point average. A student may not repeat on a P/NP basis a course that was previously taken on a letter-graded basis.

Credit for courses taken on a P/NP bases is limited to one-third of the total units taken and passed on the UC Merced campus at the time the degree is awarded.

A course that is required, or a prerequisite, for a student's major may be taken on a P/NP basis only upon approval of the Faculty. Academic Schools may designate some courses as Passed/Not Passed only. Students do not have the option of taking these courses for a letter grade.

F. Grade Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory (S/U)

The grade of S is awarded to graduate students for work in graduate courses that otherwise would receive a grade of B or better.

Graduate students, under certain circumstances, may be assigned grades of S or U, but units earned in this way will not be counted in calculating the grade point average. Petitions to elect S/U grading are available from the Graduate School's web site at gradstudies.ucmerced.edu and must be signed by the student's graduate advisor. Graduate students may petition to take no more than one course per semester on a S/U grading basis. A graduate course I which a C, D or F grade is received may not be repeated with the S/U option.

In specific approved courses, instructors will assign only Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory grades. Such courses count toward the maximum number of units graded S allowable toward the degree, as specified by each degree program.

55. NORMAL PROGRESS TO DEGREE

UC Merced undergraduate degree programs are designed to be completed in 8 terms or 4 academic years. To meet the normal progress requirement, undergraduate students are expected to enroll in and pass an average of 15 credits per term, completing the 120 credits necessary for graduation in 4 years. The Registrar's Office and the appropriate Dean will ensure that students are making normal progress towards their degrees. Extensions of enrollment beyond 9 terms require the approval of the student's School. In order to remain in good standing, students must meet the minimum progress requirements of the campus. (See Section 65, Academic Probation and Dismissal.)

A. Unit Conversion

Unit credit earned by students on any campus of the University of California, while that campus is on a quarter calendar, will be equivalent to credit earned on the Merced Campus as follows: Each quarter unit is equivalent to two-thirds of a semester unit.

B. Multiple Major Policy

A student in good academic standing who wishes to declare more than one major must petition the undergraduate School(s) responsible for the majors and receive School Dean's (Deans') approval. A School Dean may deny the petition for the additional major(s) if it is determined by the School(s) that there is too much overlap in the proposed coursework to justify allowing the student to receive the additional major(s).

No more than 12 upper-division units (excluding units required for School and university-level general education) may be used to satisfy requirements for all majors simultaneously, whether these units are explicitly required by the majors or count as electives toward the majors.

Students must satisfy all requirements for each major, including general education requirements across Schools, if applicable. Coursework for the majors must be completed in 165 semester units or 11 semesters, whichever is greater, from the onset of college work, including AP and transfer credit.

Majors earned will be noted on the student's transcript and diploma. If the majors lead to different degrees (B.A. and B.S.), that fact will be noted on the transcript and the two-degree designations will appear on the diploma. A student who has declared multiple majors may choose to graduate with fewer majors, but if so may not continue at the University to complete any remaining major(s).

60. REPETITION OF COURSES

A student may repeat only those courses in which a grade of D, F, or Not Passed was received. Courses in which a grade of D or F has been earned may not be repeated on a Passed/Not Passed basis.

Repetition of a course more than once requires approval by the appropriate Dean in all instances. Degree credit for a course will be given only once, but the grade assigned at each enrollment shall be permanently recorded.

In computing grade point average of an undergraduate who repeats courses in which the student received a D or F, only the most recently earned grade and grade points shall be used for the first 16 units repeated. In the case of further repetitions, the grade point average shall be based on all grades assigned and total units attempted.

65. ACADEMIC PROBATION, DISMISSAL, AND MINIMUM PROGRESS (Am 04 Mar 09)

A. Academic Probation

An undergraduate student is placed on academic probation if one of the following occurs:

- (1) The student's semester grade point average is less than 2.0,
- or
- (2) The student's cumulative University of California grade point average is less than 2.0.

Probation Status: Academic review occurs at the end of each academic semester. When a student is placed on academic probation, the university notifies the student, and the student's official transcript states "Academic Probation" for the affected semester. While on academic probation, the student is under the supervision of his/her School or advising unit.

Removal from Declared Major: A student on probation may be removed from a declared major or changed to Undeclared due to failure to meet the particular standards or fulfill specific requirements that the student's School may impose. If the student is removed from a declared major or changed to Undeclared, the student may apply to be reinstated to a School as follows:

Lower Division Students (fewer than 60 units earned at the end of the semester in which the student applies) must meet these requirements:

- a. Cumulative University of California grade point average of at least 2.0
- b. Current semester grade point average of at least 2.0

- c. Major grade point average of 2.0-2.5 (minimum varies by School)
- d. Completion of all lower division major courses with grades of C- or higher

Upper Division Students (greater than 60 units earned at the end of the semester in which the student applies) must meet the requirements listed above for Lower Division students and must also complete 8-16 units (minimum varies by School) of upper division major requirements.

Return to Good Standing: Once a student has met grade point average standards listed above, the student's academic status returns to regular academic standing.

B. Academic Dismissal

An undergraduate student is subject to academic dismissal from the university if one of the following occurs:

- (1) The student has been on academic probation for two or more semesters and the student's cumulative grade point average is less than 2.0,
- or
- (2) The student's semester grade point average is less than 1.5 and the student's cumulative grade point average is less than 2.0.

Academic Dismissal Appeals: A student not previously on probation who earns a semester grade point average below 1.5 is offered the opportunity to appeal dismissal. The student who is subject to academic dismissal and does not complete the appeal process as prescribed is automatically dismissed. The student whose appeal is approved returns on probation and is under the supervision of the appropriate School or advising unit.

Dismissal Status: When a student is academically dismissed, the university notifies the student, and the student's official transcript states "Academic Dismissal" for the affected semester.

Note: A student who is academically dismissed may return after fulfilling reinstatement requirements (see the [Reinstatement policy](#) on the Office of the Registrar website).

C. Minimum Progress

An undergraduate student is subject to administrative probation if the student does not complete a minimum of 24 University of California units during an academic year, including summer.

Return to Good Standing: Once the student has completed 24 units during a subsequent academic year, the student's minimum progress status returns to good standing.

Note: Minimum unit completion does not apply to part-time students or to students who have a Dean's approval to carry fewer units than the minimum progress load (reasons may include medical disability, employment, a serious personal problem, a recent death in the immediate family, the primary responsibility for the care of a family, or a serious accident involving the student).

70. COURSE SCHEDULE CHANGES

A. Adding a Course

During the first week of instruction students may add a course(s) provided that 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 class only with the permission of both the instructor and the appropriate Dean. A fee will be assessed for adding a course after the third week.

1 st week	students may add if space available
2 nd - 3 rd week	with instructor's approval
after 3 rd week	fee assessed and only with instructor's and appropriate Dean's approval

B. Dropping a Course

During the first four weeks of instruction, students may drop a course or courses without paying a fee and without further approval. After the fourth week of instruction and until the end of the tenth week of instruction (close of business on the Friday of that week), a student may drop 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 (i.e. students who have successfully appealed disqualification), (2) dropping the course would be to the educational benefit of the student (in the judgment of the instructor and Dean), and (3) the student is not being investigated for academic dishonesty in that course. Dropping between the 4th and 10th weeks will be approved only provided the student submits a written description of the special circumstances warranting this action; therefore students should continue to attend the course until their drop request is approved. Any request to drop beginning in the eleventh week of instruction will only be considered under exceptional circumstances (illness or injury substantiated by a doctor's note; recent death in the immediate family or other circumstances of equal gravity), and will only be considered following both signed approval of the instructor of record and submission of a petition that is approved by the dean of the school with which the student is affiliated.

All drops must be received by the Office of the Registrar by the deadlines specified. For students dropping after the fourth week of instruction, a fee will be assessed and a "W" notation will be assigned by the Office of the Registrar and appear under the course grade 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 fourth week of instruction. It does not indicate whether the student was passing or failing. (Am 22 May 08)

C. 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 readmitted. 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 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.

75. HONORS AT GRADUATION (SR 640)

To be eligible for honors at graduation, a student must have completed a minimum of 50 semester units at the University of California, of which a minimum of 43 units must have been taken for a letter grade and a minimum of 30 units must have been completed at UC Merced. The grade point average achieved must rank in the top 2 percent of the student's School for highest honors, the next 4 percent for high honors, and the next 10 percent for honors at graduation. The number of recipients eligible under these percentages shall be rounded up to the next higher integer. (En 30 Jan 08)

Dean's Honor List

Students will be eligible for the Dean's Honor List if they have earned in any one semester a minimum of 12 graded units with a 3.5 grade point average or better with no grade of I or NP.

Dean's Honors are listed on student transcripts. Any student who has been found to violate the academic integrity policies during an academic year will not be eligible for the Dean's Honor List during that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

Chancellor's Honor List

Students who are placed on the Dean's Honor List for both semesters in a single academic year (fall and spring) will be placed on the Chancellor's Honor List for that academic year. (En 11 Jun 08)

Appendix C

Memorandum of Understanding: Financial Commitment between University of California, Merced and University of California Office of the President

Introduction

For much of its eight-year history, University of California, Merced, has been provided financial support from the University of California, Office of the President, through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that will expire at the end of the 2013-2014 academic year.

While the campus has made significant strides towards financial self-sufficiency, the campus will need continued support from the Office of the President until it reaches its near-term enrollment goal of 10,000 students. Thus a successor MOU is needed to specify the nature of continuing support and the metrics that will measure the campus's progress towards reaching maturity as a financially self-sufficient and viable University of California campus. This MOU is to be finalized with President Napolitano.

MOU Goals of Objectives

This new MOU for 2014 recognizes that UC Merced must meet three challenges: to mature as a research university in the same intellectual class as the other UC campuses, which will require focused attention and investment in graduate programs and the research enterprise; to continue to play an important role in fulfilling the UC's Master Plan commitment to find a place for every eligible student; and to preserve the unique academic and cultural character of a campus intentionally placed in California's San Joaquin Valley.

The MOU will articulate in quantitative terms how far the campus has come in meeting the metrics established in the current MOU. Almost all of the metrics were achieved, and for those few exceptions the campus has identified contributing circumstances and ways to ameliorate those difficulties going forward.

Background: Building a Research University

From its inception, UC Merced has hired faculty with the expectation that they contribute with distinction to research, teaching and service. However, as UC Merced accepted ever larger classes of undergraduate students to admission, greater reliance on instructors was necessitated in order to provide an acceptable array of curricular offerings. This has led to a ratio of instructors to ladder-rank faculty that is substantially out of proportion to other University of California campuses and insufficient to support the graduate and research mission of the campus.

A related challenge is that the current MOU calls for greater emphasis on recruiting faculty in social sciences, humanities and arts (SSHA), not for strategic pedagogical reasons, but because it was less expensive to do so, and because it allowed UCM to grow undergraduate programs more rapidly than otherwise would have been possible. While maintaining the campus's important role in meeting the undergraduate educational needs of California residents, the campus must now also make a concerted effort to grow the graduate and research programs that will achieve the campus's place in the Carnegie High or Very High research classification.

UC Merced's greatest challenge for enrollment growth, both graduate and undergraduate, is sufficient and timely capital development. Therefore, the successor MOU must provide a statement of system-wide commitment not only to the continued growth and development of the Merced

campus but also to the real estate and financial communities that the UC system is committed to the continued success of its tenth campus.

Campus Initiatives and Legacy Commitments that Inform the Successor MOU

The 2020 Project. The 2020 Project represents the ensuing phase of development of the Merced campus and constitutes what was envisioned as the next portion (Phase 2) of the long-term development proposed under the 2009 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The 2020 Project includes the facilities needed to support an enrollment level of 10,000 students, including academic, administrative, research, and recreational buildings, student residences and student services buildings, utilities and infrastructure, outdoor recreation areas, and associated roadways, parking, and landscaping.

Strategic Academic Focusing. Strategic Academic Focusing relates primarily to the current and future directions of campus academic programs, both at the undergraduate and graduate level. The exercise recognizes the critical importance of identifying a longer-term trajectory of academic program growth and development that will enable the campus to become a full-fledged University of California-quality research university. Nascent areas of interdisciplinary research that align with current UC Merced strengths will be identified and faculty recruited to strengthen and initiate work in these areas. UC Merced also will bolster the infrastructure support for its research-active faculty to a level comparable to other UC campuses, so that it can retain these professors and not lose them to other institutions.

Historic Commitments – Wetlands Mitigation. The University must comply with the environmental mitigation requirements under its Section 404 permit, agreed to by The Regents prior to construction of the current campus. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“Army Corps”) requires the University to secure a compensatory mitigation site that fully offsets impacts to waters of the United States, including wetlands authorized under the Department of Army permit (SPK-1999-00203) for the UC Merced and campus community projects. The Army Corps has informed the campus that, if construction on the mitigation site is not started by May 1, 2014 based on an approved plan, the University will be out of compliance with our permit.

Immediate Infrastructure Needs. The completion of new facilities currently under development will put a significant strain on campus infrastructure that will impact the reliability of the campus central plant and telecommunications infrastructure. The campus must upgrade its central plant and telecommunications facilities in the near-term to avoid significant operating risk when buildings under construction are completed.

MOU Funding Requests

Through this MOU, we will address three key areas necessary for the campus to move forward strategically in an integrated, coordinated way.

- First, ***continued support for enrollment growth***, both undergraduate and graduate, will provide the necessary financial resources for the faculty and staff to support that growth. To that end, we request that the UCOP commitment of an addition to the UCM base budget of \$10,000 per new student be continued, based on an annual growth rate of 600 students.
- Second, in order to facilitate the hiring of outstanding research-active faculty, we request a one-time permanent addition of \$5M to the budget base, with those funds to be used ***to partially fund start-up packages*** for the 18-25 new faculty we expect to bring in per year over the next 7 years.

- Finally, we ask that the Office of the President and UC Merced form a clear partnership for *the financing of Project 2020* as well as its near-term capital development needs. In addition, the MOU proposes that the Office of the President provide funding to support the campus' central plant and telecommunications reliability upgrade and the acquisition and construction of off-site compensatory wetlands mitigation required the University's Section 404 permit. The campus will evaluate its ability to finance projects related to the recruitment and retention of faculty and students from campus funds.

Issues for Consideration

The MOU negotiations between President Napolitano and the campus will require consideration of a number of issues. They include:

1. While UC Merced remains committed to enrolling an average of 600 additional students per year from AY14-15 through AY20-21, the overall growth rate cannot be linear.
2. UC Merced is committed to playing an important role in fulfilling the UC's Master Plan commitment to find a place for every eligible student, but it cannot be the *only* UC campus serving this role.
3. To further demonstrate its continued commitment to undergraduate education, UC Merced will limit out-of-state and international enrollment opportunities—and the income that comes from non-resident tuition (NRT)—so we can continue to admit as many qualified California applicants as possible, in so far as space allows.
4. UC Merced will continue to increase its graduate student population by approximately 90 students per year from a current enrollment of 375 to a target enrollment of 1,000 students, or 10% of the total student population, by AY20-21.
5. Special emphasis will be placed on hiring faculty with the highest potential of developing internationally recognized research programs that involve graduate students and, to some degree, undergraduate students, in the discovery process.
6. The UC Merced campus currently struggles with a significant structural budget deficit, because the campus has historically utilized estimated “salary savings” in temporary academic staff and/or faculty start-up commitments in the year the savings were accrued. The FY2014 budget for the University of California Merced is found in Appendix D.
7. UC Merced will continue to look for creative solutions to its space challenges prior to delivery of facilities under the 2020 Project. These solutions will temporarily increase operating costs for the campus and/or require capital investments with extraordinarily short amortization periods, including for renovations to leased space. The campus may need special financial support in order to implement interim space solutions.
8. The initial development of campus was assisted through the provision of several internal loans provided by the Office of the President. During the initial MOU, additional internal loans were utilized to provide funding for annual operations. As these loans begin to amortize, the campus will experience a significant increase in internal loan debt service over the next several years.